CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

April 7, 2010

Committee Members Present:	Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	Bill Cathcart
Staff in Attendance:	Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Vice Chair Adrienne Gladson opened the Administrative Session with a review of the Agenda.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes or additions to the Agenda.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular meeting on March 17, 2010 and noted a correction.

Committee Member Woollett asked why an EIR was called for on the Coca-Cola item?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it was not an EIR but a Negative Declaration. The amount of square footage that the applicant was proposing to add was over the limit of what could be done within a categorical exemption and an environmental document was needed. It was not an EIR but a different level.

Committee Member McCormack asked why they had not received any civil plans with the Coca-Cola item?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the civil plans were not generally requested. The landscaping plans and the projects were required to coordinate with the civil plans for water quality. There had been projects where something had been completed and then it had been paved over.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had asked that question as the Best Management Practices (BMPs) were there, but not the civil; it was not substantiated by a plan that showed the written BMPs.

Committee Member Woollett stated the question would be since the civil plan was not included why were the BMPs included?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated a Water Quality Management Plan was prepared for Coca-Cola.

Committee Member Woollett asked why had it not been submitted to the DRC?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the DRC received the entire environmental document because the DRC's purview was the aesthetics of the proposed project and there was a portion of the document that pertained specifically to aesthetics. The DRC's input would only be on the aesthetics portion of the project. They would not be seeking the DRC's input on traffic, schools, or parks as the DRC's purview was set on aesthetics.

Committee Member Woollett stated their concern with water quality documents would be the effect that it would have on the aesthetics of the project.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated that was correct as it related to landscaping and aesthetics.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would not know specifically where the BMPs were located; he could guess, but if a civil plan had been included he would know where those features were.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the Water Quality Management Plan would include a menu of options that could be used by the developer and a plan would be developed from that.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was correct and they had spoken previously about pervious soil.

Vice Chair Gladson stated without speaking to a specific project the question they raised was if there was value in reviewing a conceptual grading plan?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it was not within the DRC's purview to review the grading plan. The Committee Members needed to look for specifics and a project could be conditioned, either to be subject to Staff review prior to permits being pulled or to be brought back to the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would not require anything further; it was just strange that the documents would have been included because there was really nothing they could do with them.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry asked what he meant and which documents he was referring to?

Committee Member Woollett stated he was referring to the water quality documentation. Until he could understand the implementation it would not be visible.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated when the Committee Members discussed the nuts and bolts of the project there could be an area of the project that they would want to review prior to permits being pulled.

Vice Chair Gladson stated when they were reviewing the environmental document it was a clearance document that provided information for all the issues and one of those issues could be the BMPs and the issues related to water and a menu of options. There could be items that required further clarification that pertained to the aesthetics of the project and those questions could be raised during the project review and specific items could be conditioned to return to the DRC. She understood where that would be a concern to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had concerns regarding a particular project that had gone through the DRC that had been completed and the work that had been done.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they would review the project for the aesthetics and not for whether it was effective as that component would be taken care of by the engineers.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could request a final landscape plan that would include those visual elements.

Committee Member McCormack stated the landscape plan typically would be available after the civil plan.

Committee Member Wheeler asked would the landscape plan reflect what would be done for water quality?

Committee Member Woollett stated they received a preliminary landscape plan.

Committee Member McCormack stated that plan would not necessarily contain many of the other elements.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would seem that the landscape plan at an early project stage was being presented too early.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the landscape plan would provide a concept of what they were planning for counts of trees, plant materials, and a general concept.

Committee Member Woollett stated perhaps if there was an extensive water quality program which would not be reflected in a landscape plan the DRC could ask for a review of the landscape plans at a later date.

Committee Member Wheeler stated which would include the water quality issues.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the water quality components were an aesthetic call in her view.

Committee Member Woollett stated although the water quality requirements have been in place for some time, his observation was that most cities had not implemented them except in the last 2-3 years and they were receiving plans that had those issues. He stated there would be an adjustment period and there would be an effect that the water quality issues had on the approval of projects.

Committee Member McCormack stated typically the landscape plan reacted to the water quality issues.

Committee Member Woollett stated it had not been an issue. Through the process that they had been going through for many years issues had not come up at a later date.

Vice Chair Gladson stated her understanding was that it all had become such a high level issue due to the mandatory requirements and previously there had been voluntary guidelines.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was his understanding that it was not as voluntary as everyone had thought and was now being enforced.

Vice Chair Gladson stated getting everyone to work together from start to finish on a project and bringing all the experts, from civil to landscape and the green experts and all of that was critical, but many times that was not done.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had a project in Santa Ana where they were below the street and there had not been an easement for drainage and the site had been in use for years and no one knew where the water went. They had found that the water was going in the ground and how would they get the city to agree to allow them to continue to put the water into the ground. He had a special meeting with the City's Public Works Director that had agreed to allow the water to continue to flow in the manner it had been flowing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they should be alert to bring up the question if they felt it would likely become an issue.

Committee Member McCormack stated they would not want a Walgreen's situation all over town.

Committee Member Woollett stated they might want to routinely look at landscape later.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she suspected that might be a direction that they would take.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had stopped by the counter and mentioned that the used car lot next to the 55 freeway appeared to be parking cars outside of the area that they had approved for parking. They were parking cars on a berm which he recalled should have been a landscaped area.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the city had that issue with that business off and on and it appeared a lot on the weekends.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was some type of light colored material on that area.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the parcel that the cars were on had not abutted the freeway and they were parking on a different parcel.

There was no further discussion.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Chairperson Bill 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 17, 2010

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting on March 17, 2010 with the correction noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4412-09 – COCA-COLA

- A proposal for a 51,045 sq. ft. addition onto an existing warehouse building, along with the addition of five loading docks, landscape, and irrigation.
- 700 W. Grove Avenue
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Carlos Cadiz, address on file, stated the proposed project would be a concrete tilt-up to match the existing buildings. Where the new building would meet the existing and due to the difference in roof height it would be difficult to add a concrete panel on the existing panel; the existing panel was 20' and the addition's roof height was 32' to accommodate stacking pallets at four high they needed that clearance. The material would be basically metal stud framing with metal siding for the portion between the existing and new parapets. The siding had 12" to 16" vertical lines and the joints would be visible; it could be texture coated, but the vertical lines would still be visible. The current facility was built-out in terms of serving the local area and the intent of the expansion was two-fold; one was to add the docks which would accommodate the new trucks that Coca-Cola would be using. Most of the delivery trucks currently were side loaders that required a driver to load product on a cart and then it was wheeled into a store. The new trucks would be a type that required loading and unloading through the rear of the truck from dock. The trucks would have a lift gate that would lower a cart that would be fully loaded with all of the products that would be taken into a store; the trucks would be able to deliver more product and would alleviate Worker Compensation issues as the new trucks would not require drivers to lift the products onto a cart. The docks were being added to the site to accommodate the new trucks. The truck count would be reduced as the new vehicles would be able to carry more product. The warehouse portion of the expansion (he referred to the photos he presented) had a great deal of activity that was been handled outdoors and those activities needed to move inside. Anytime there was product outdoors it collected dust, bird droppings, and it caused issues with Coca-Cola and they wanted to move all of the activities inside.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on note No. 7, Sheet 1, there was a statement that read construction work hours should be limited to the period between 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. for work that is not inherently noise-producing and he asked if this should read that way?

Mr. Cadiz stated he believed the word "not" should be eliminated.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he understood that a new break area was being added inside the existing building and there were windows noted between bay lines 6 and 7; however, in reviewing the exterior drawings they were located between bay lines 5 and 6. On the floor plans the stair was shown on the south end of the new building but it was drawn as a ramp.

Mr. Cadiz stated due to ADA requirements it had been changed to a ramp.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the canopy would match the height of the existing canopy.

Mr. Cadiz stated yes, it would. The way it had been drawn was incorrect as there were shelters on the doors and the canopies would need to be higher to accommodate the shelters which were the black rubber/foam areas.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he noticed the storage containers were being relocated behind the administrative building and asked if there was a way to screen the containers or could they be moved?

Mr. Cadiz stated the storage containers housed point-of-sale materials and the account managers used those supplies for marketing. From a practical standpoint it made sense to have them near the administrative offices and not near the warehouse. The containers were behind a building so from a public view they were not visible.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the containers would be more visible than where they currently were. It was such a tacky collection of storage sheds and he asked if they could be repainted to match the building?

Mr. Cadiz stated they could be painted. He discussed a few areas on the plans that they could be moved to.

Ms. Thakur asked how often would the containers be accessed?

Mr. Cadiz stated the account managers would access them approximately once a week, on different days of the week.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it sounded like the applicant was willing to discuss that with his client on some options for the container location.

Mr. Cadiz stated they were not a fixed element.

Committee Member Wheeler stated whatever they could do to make it appear better. He stated he would also want to add as a condition of approval some reference to the mitigation conditions and the Negative Declaration that began on page 59.

Committee Member McCormack stated they had discussed the side vs. rear load issue and he asked would that be occurring at the warehouse and not in the parking lot and was the parking lot just for storage of trucks?

Mr. Cadiz stated no trucks would be stored in the warehouse; they would be parked in the lot. Inside the warehouse was where the side loaders would be loaded.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the site would be fully parked on a daily basis or would there just be overflow trucks there?

Mr. Cadiz stated the facility would have approximately plus or minus 50 trucks that would be parked overnight at the facility. The trucks would leave early in the morning to make their routes and by 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. they would return and be parked in the parking stalls. During the evening the trucks would be brought into the warehouse to complete the loading of the trucks. The trucks would be re-parked and ready for deliveries the next day. It was a 24-hour operation. With the additional proposed warehouse space the product could be moved into the warehouse and the loading could be completed there.

Committee Member McCormack stated in reviewing the proposed project the DRC was asked to review the appropriateness of the proposed landscape and associated irrigation plans. He applauded the irrigation plan, it was a drip irrigation plan and it was perfect for the long expanses of landscape. He had an issue with some of the plant material choices and he would be coming from the standpoint of a big parking lot with big trucks. The first thing that glared out at him was that there were such small trees. He stated he was a firm believer in the right tree in the right place, a small tree for a small garden. The trees proposed probably could survive, but would be totally dwarfed by the trucks. Secondly, it was important to consider the tree selection form, a round-headed tree should not be near a path of travel or lane as the tree would not develop its canopy. Instead of using an umbrella type tree he suggested using a taller vertical type tree, and the whole point of having trees in a parking lot was to shade the paving to reduce heat gain and it was important to have a skyline tree that was not a big Oak type tree, but a tree that could do some shading. A small tree would have a tough time getting up and over the trucks. From a design standpoint, when reviewing large expanses of blacktop, a small lollipop tree looked out of place. He liked the Arbutus in a small garden or parking lot, they took forever to grow. He looked at the design from a standpoint of what the trees would look like in 15 years and choosing a different tree would be more appropriate.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what about using a Queen Palm tree?

Committee Member McCormack stated he would not use that type of tree in the space they were reviewing; Queen Palms were expensive and it was not a resort. They would want a tree that would shade. The trees could also be incorporated along the perimeter, and he suggested pulling in some of the Carrotwood trees.

The applicant's landscape architect, Laurie Levine, address on file, stated those trees had a very large canopy and it was the only Evergreen tree that was out there. There were Liquid Ambers and Platanus that were trimmed really high.

Committee Member McCormack stated one tree that rose to the top would be a Tristania or maybe a Eucalyptus grandis that would not pose a problem with root zone and he would not suggest using the Liquid Amber or aggressive root trees. It was important to use trees that would not cause problems with limb loss or root problems. Frankly, what they were proposing was to place trees in "a pot", and placing "smaller weak trees" on the site would be a waste of money. They had the problem when they were attempting to green-up parking lots and unless it was a tree that could grow without root problems it would not grow. There were only three tree types and he would not want to redesign the site for the applicants.

Ms. Levine asked if his objection was to the Arbutus tree? She liked the idea of using a Tristania and she had not liked using Eucalyptus due to the liability of limb drop.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had no objection to using just one tree, and most importantly a tree that would grow and shade. In areas where there would be an employee break area it would be nice to place a design theme there, but in a parking lot it would be only necessary to come up with just one tree that would shade. He liked the trees on the plans; however, they were not an appropriate tree for the spaces shown. They had spoken in the Administrative Session about the BMPs and there was a drainage area going through a consistent planting area that would need to be punched through, and they would not know if part of the water collection was behind an area he pointed to on the plans and was there a huge tank in the area and the reason for no landscape? He asked why an area was not landscaped and if it was access from the rail line?

Mr. Cadiz stated no, it was not an access route; it was just asphalt and existed currently in that state. The site currently sloped to the rear and it was a very flat site and there were concrete valley gutters that brought the water to the rear low point. At that point there were two large pumps that would pump the storm water out to the street. It was the existing storm drain system that existed on site. There were two lines that were 12" to 15" in diameter. They proposed to add a CDS underground filtration system that would filter water that came from the roof; the new roof area would drain underground.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was on a project where, and even after the fact that the systems came in, they were contained underground and it was basically a manhole and it was his point to see where those things were going and their purview was to look at the aesthetics and to mitigate huge manhole covers to insure they would not end up in a landscape area.

Mr. Cadiz stated all the construction documents for the project were complete and he could provide anything further that they wanted to understand.

Committee Member McCormack stated they would not want a lot of tree loss from the lines being punched through and trenched through that area.

Mr. Cadiz stated the lines already existed.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had noted all his comments on the plans. The irrigation system was perfect in where it needed to hit. There was an issue with the long expanses of edge with the shrub material, Myoporum pacificum that over time would have problems.

Ms. Levine stated it was Parvifolium just on the edge and there was ground cover along the edge.

Committee Member McCormack stated what he had found with that plant was that it tended to finger out and the maintenance crew would just chop it and over time it would become a brown edge rather than a green edge. That would occur over five years and he suggested using a plant that would not finger out, to choose a plant that was more of a grass or something that would stop at the curb.

Ms. Levine stated she could change that to a Blue fescue.

Committee Member McCormack stated the edges were a big problem with landscapes 5 to 10 years down the road and he suggested using a grass in that area.

Ms. Levine stated she had not liked using a lot of grasses as they required more maintenance, although there were certain ones that could be planted and left.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had a list of grasses that would not require a lot of maintenance.

Ms. Levine stated she would not want the plants behind it to be obscured.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would not obscure the plantings. There were grasses that were drought tolerant and required little maintenance.

Vice Chair Gladson asked if there was any discussion on the mix of 15 gallon and 24" plantings?

Committee Member McCormack stated on the proposed project it was important to keep within the letter of the law and however they wanted to get to that was fine and to place 24s in areas that required shade.

Ms. Thakur stated the requirement was seventy-five percent 15 gallon and twenty-five percent 24" box.

Mr. Cadiz stated he agreed with the suggestion for more vertical plantings.

Committee Member Woollett asked how would the steel parapet material be joined at the north and south ends of the parapet where it was visible from the street?

Mr. Cadiz stated there would be a concrete wall and there would be metal studs with metal siding and it would be set back.

Committee Member Woollett stated the corrugated metal would be back 2-3".

Mr. Cadiz stated the metal would go on top of the existing wall and he could do that with a little leg.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there could be a channel that would give it a break between the two and he asked what the finish would be?

Mr. Cadiz stated they would be using a panel that was textured coated; it would be a stucco finish that was sprayed on and then baked on. It would appear just like stucco. They could also just do the stucco.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could just leave it metal.

Mr. Cadiz stated as it would be only one horizontal band of metal up there they had wanted to tie it in with the rest of the building and it could be painted. He liked the textured look and once it was installed it would blend in.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was an area that was noted as sandblasted.

Mr. Cadiz stated there was a portion of the building that was sandblasted.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was nothing in Appendix D in terms of landscape maintenance or in Appendix E which had noted maintenance guidelines and he asked if there needed to be something included or if there would be reference to another area? The maintenance on the long planting areas would relate to the plant choices.

Ms. Levine stated the maintenance notations were on the plan specs.

Committee Member McCormack stated those were primarily generic and if it was not specific the grasses could be trimmed to squares.

Vice Chair Gladson stated that appendix and the water discussion was more of a conceptual plan for the conditions of approval. Item No. 5 would be the final water plans and had not been completely determined and she would be okay with letting that go through.

Ms. Levine stated she could delete the maintenance comments that would not relate to the project and it would be a very low maintenance landscape plan; to check things out and trim. In working with Coca-Cola and their maintenance people it was difficult to control who they hired and what they actually would do.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the applicant would have their own water quality plan that they would take ownership of and it would be an ongoing maintenance plan.

Ms. Levine stated the site was older and the maintenance was pretty good and what was out there worked for the site.

Committee Member McCormack stated the intent would be to choose new plant materials that would not require trimming.

Ms. Levine stated she used plants that would not require trimming.

Mr. Cadiz stated the reality of the situation was with a company such as Coca-Cola there was not an owner that was at the facility that would be hiring a maintenance crew. The reality was that there would be a warehouse manager that changed from facility to facility and would be in charge of reviewing maintenance contracts and hiring maintenance crews based on an annual budget.

Ms. Levine stated they could design the perfect plan, but they could not control the maintenance.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she felt things were getting better with the whole issue of water quality and water conservation.

Mr. Cadiz stated Coca-Cola was at the forefront. On April 21 there was a grand opening of a Gold Certified facility in Coachella Valley and the first one that they had built. The intent was to learn from that facility and implementation to the rest of their facilities. The roof on the proposed project had solar and photovoltaics, the urinals were waterless, and it was corporate policy to look at their environmental uses. The lights in the warehouse were off at night and the lights were on motion sensors which was a directive from their corporate office.

Committee Member Wheeler asked Ms. Thakur if there was any determination on using Condition No. 4 vs. Condition No. 9?

Ms. Thakur stated yes, prior to grading permits would be the time that the applicant or builder would need to pay the in lieu fees for the construction of a future sidewalk. She would follow Condition No. 4 and delete 9.

Committee Member McCormack stated in the past they had bifurcated the landscape and it would not stop the process. It would be a recheck with the BMPs to ensure that it was not a huge impact on the landscape and to have the item return for landscape to the DRC for a final check would be a good idea.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, DRC No. 4412-09, Coca-Cola, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

1. Delete Condition No. 9.
2. Reference the mitigation measures in the Negative Declaration which begin on page 59.
3. Take steps to ensure that the relocated storage containers where less unsightly.
4. To bifurcate the landscape portion of the project to have that portion return to the DRC for review with the recommendations given to the applicant during the discussion and to following the conditions of approval pertaining to landscape.
5. The metal siding shall be texture coated.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4461-09 – AYRES INN

- A proposal to remove over 514.5 sq. ft. of the existing boiler room and meeting room to construct a new swimming pool, spa, pool equipment building, and larger trash enclosure closer to the 3 Palms restaurant. The proposal also includes renovations to the front facade of the 3 Palms restaurant.
- 3737 W. Chapman Avenue
- 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.

Applicant, Bruce Ayres, stated he wanted to thank Doris; she was very diligent with getting things through and he concurred with the Conditions of Approval and he was available to answer any questions. They were in the process of submitting for their third hotel which would be a separate operation under a different name. The pool would be relocated with an area of the building being cut off which had been an old boiler room. They were getting ready to submit another packet for DRC's review and they were also working with the City's Redevelopment Agency on another project. He reviewed the plans with the Committee Members and explained where things would be located in the proposed project. The driveways would remain and the property would maintain the same ingress and egress.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was any relationship between two sites, which he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Ayres stated no, they would be two separate sites.

Ms. Nguyen stated there would be a remaining existing parking lot until the remodel took place.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there would be any pedestrian connections?

Mr. Ayres stated no, there would not be a pedestrian connection at this time; it will be considered with the future project..

Committee Member Wheeler stated he understood that the guests at the current hotel had privileges in the restaurant and would the same thing apply with the new hotel?

Mr. Ayres stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a notation that the existing pool and equipment room would be demolished under separate permit and was under the hotel's new scope of work. He asked if the existing pool would remain until the new pool was permitted?

Mr. Ayres stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had visions of an empty pool just sitting there.

Mr. Ayres stated it would be well maintained and the grading and demo would be done all at once.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the brick would be removed around the planters?

Mr. Ayres stated it would be removed all the way around to the restaurant and he pointed out the area where the brick would be left on.

Committee Member Wheeler stated one of his concerns was that there appeared to be a lot of different materials. There were two types of brick in the entry area currently and it seemed like a lot in such a small area. He suggesting allowing the area to have its own identity and not needing to add something from the other building.

Mr. Ayres stated the finish they proposed was so much nicer than the brick and the color would match the new building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated another thing that concerned him was the cornice and how it would terminate. There was an ornate cornice that stopped and turned into a rectangular form; he discussed the cornice area with the applicant. He stated it was a bad transition and he suggested taking the rectangular form that was already there and to have that be the belt course separating the upper and the lower. He suggested carrying the same form all the way around. If he wanted to use a cornice, to copy what existed currently on the hotel.

Committee Member McCormack asked how he would achieve the joints?

Mr. Ayres stated it would be hand troweled and it would appear very nice.

Committee Member McCormack asked how they would get the vertical tool lines?

Mr. Ayres stated it would be hand troweled and the people who applied the finish were artists. He wanted it perfect and they wanted it nice.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested if the ashlar would be ended in an area he pointed to on the plans, to add a little bit of a pilaster to allow for termination. He asked if the fire cabinet would be relocated.

Mr. Ayres stated it had been there since the 1960's and he was not certain if it really worked. They now had fire extinguishers everywhere.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the new pool equipment would there be a curb line?

Mr. Ayres stated yes, there would be a curb that would tie in with the driveway. He reviewed the plans with Committee Member McCormack.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there would be a wall?

Mr. Ayres stated there would be a pool fence and a solid wall around the trash enclosure.

Committee Member McCormack stated in some of the hotels the panic hardware could be accessed through the gate if not protected. Was it accessed through a card reader or a key? The card reader equipment was much more challenging to mount on the outside access gates.

Mr. Ayres stated all of the doors would use a card reader. The conduit would all be underground that tied into the electrical and they had experience with that type of installation.

Committee Member McCormack asked what the material for the shower pan would be and asked if there would be a door, which is missing on the plans?

Mr. Ayres stated the material would be tile and there would be a door to the pool equipment room.

Committee Member McCormack stated one of the plans showed a curb with a fence on top of it, but the plans he was reviewing showed something different. He had an issue with the plant material, as Boston ivy was very difficult to train on small pickets of metal and that was why he had questioned if it was a wall or a fence. The ivy would take forever to stick.

Mr. Ayres stated he would want to eliminate the vine as it became a maintenance issue when they wanted to paint the fence. He wanted to keep the trees and to add some Texas privet that would grow fast and have it trimmed to a hedge.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would actually prefer that rather than a vine. There were trees that were noted as existing. They needed a legend that showed what was occurring on the plan. There was a reference to a 5' planting area for a Coast Live Oak and that would not work for the area; it was the wrong tree for the wrong place. They had a nice selection of trees and he liked that trees were not added to an area he pointed to on the plans and suggested adding another tree elsewhere. The notations were for decorative brick, and pool/spa decking listed enriched concrete; he was unsure of what enriched meant, he wanted to have more specifics. The other issue aside from the Boston ivy was the Mitsuwa gazania which was very small.

Mr. Ayres stated he would take away all vines.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a notation for all finish grades for all landscape areas to be 3" below the surface and he understood the intent of creating a basin, but they would be creating another Walgreens and the area would actually settle leaving the landscape far below. If there was drainage along the edge at 2% it would fall another ½" and the

bottom of the concrete would be exposed. Typically they went with 2", or to leave it as proposed with a thickened edge.

Mr. Ayres stated he had not worried about keeping it below as when the landscape grew there would be the roots and with the irrigation it would all run off into the parking lot.

Committee Member McCormack stated what they needed was a thickened edge where the grade was 3" below the edge and they would not want water under the slab. He explained what he was suggesting with a drawing he reviewed with the applicant.

Ms. Nguyen stated that would be reviewed with the City's Public Work's Water Quality Division and Community Services Department.

Committee Member McCormack stated a deciduous tree would be nice next to the pool.

Mr. Ayres asked deciduous, meaning the leaves drop and he preferred to use an evergreen.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was correct, and with an evergreen there would be ever drop and those trees would drop all year vs. a deciduous tree that dropped leaves only at certain times of the year.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it appeared with the direction the Committee was going in that the landscape plan would be brought back. They had given him some suggestions and recommendations.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4461-09, Ayres Inn, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. That the triangular cornice being used mid-height on the wall be replaced with a rectangular cornice to match the existing one. The rectangular form to be carried around both walls over the simulated ashlar material. The applicant had the option to add a new cornice at the top of the 2nd story to match existing cornice on hotel tower.
2. The point where the simulated ashlar turned to stucco that there be a pilaster.
3. To have a final landscape plan return to the DRC for review.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4476-10 – KNORR RESIDENCE – NEW GARAGE

- A proposal to construct a 774 sq. ft. two-car garage and work shop.
- 266 S. Center Street, 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, Ken Lowe, address on file, stated the main reason for the project was the Volkswagen and some auxiliary storage areas in the yard. The property owners had grandchildren and wanted space in their yard. The property owners wanted to add space that would accommodate a washer and dryer that were currently located in a bathroom in the main house. Mr. Knorr, owner/builder, wanted a space to build cabinetry. The design would be a turn-of-the-century Carriage house; he presented photos to the Committee Members. They wanted a door to go in and out of the garage and they placed a rain cover over a nice door which gave it a bit more than an average door. He turned in the color drawings without color and he had gone back and took off some of the coloration items and there were exposed rafters and that had been the intent of the design. The only thing that they spoke about that was different was the height between the rear garage and the rear of the house, when he had lowered it to 15' the attic area went to 4' 3". Mr. Knorr was 6' + and it would be hard for him to maneuver in that space. They wanted 9' of space with a height of 6'. They wanted to get all the items that were in their current storage into that space. He understood the subordinate nature of the situation, but the garage would be so far back with the peak of the roof not being visible from the street. They were requesting the height due to the storage space needed. They agreed with all the other conditions and Mr. Ryan was a great guy and he was an asset to the City.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he felt it was a well designed project and they agreed with Staff that there was an issue with the massing. He was not quite sure that dropping it a foot would fix that, and he was aware that it was set back quite a distance. He was not certain that it would be visible from the line of site. It was a large structure for an accessory structure. Originally there was probably a single garage. It was more detailed than an accessory structure would be with the door and window details and generally the structures would be very plain. He asked if the siding was wood siding, and if the man door was wood? The design was complimentary to the neighborhood, but it was just a little bulky.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Mr. Lowe presented a picture of a Carriage house door and the siding that would be used and it would be wood. Mr. Knorr had stated that Ganahl Lumber had approved siding that he would be obtaining from them and he would be building the Carriage door himself. They would be matching the siding. The slab that was there from the burned out structure was 18' 6" x 27' 9"

and it was a rather deep structure. Turning it in the other direction fit pretty close to its size. In reducing the size they would need to cut from the laundry room. Mrs. Knorr had a Suburban and so the size of the doors could not be reduced. Regarding the mass, a Carriage House was used for a team of horses, and he had designed to the needs of the property owner.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the siding was the same type of wood that was on the house?

Mr. Lowe stated it was more than likely Douglas fir.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it could be Redwood.

Mr. Lowe stated it was probably a fir or a gum.

Committee Member Woollett stated they found a lot of Redwood in Orange. He was concerned that there were some non-wood sidings and with this proposed project they would want wood.

Mr. Lowe stated they were conscientious about that and they were using Marvin windows.

Committee Member Woollett stated one of the issues and he was not certain if he supported the scale, and with such a small house there probably would not have been a Carriage house.

Mr. Lowe stated he had designed a Carriage house true to the era, but not true to the house.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was where the issue came from. He noticed brackets were being used to support the barge boards. The brackets were fine; however, they had not appeared on the main house and would not seem very fitting.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there appeared to be one on the main house but it may have been added later.

Committee Member Woollett stated he understood where they would want the brackets over the doorway, but the other ones appeared strange. The main house had not had a cantilevered beam.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a 1x material that supported the barge and that had appeared elsewhere in town.

Mr. Lowe stated the 4 x 4's were in an area he pointed to on the plans.

Committee Member Woollett stated they understood the design of a Carriage house; however, the concern was that the design should be related to the main house as much as possible. In most cases the garages in town were very simple in comparison to the house.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed that accessory structures in Orange typically were much simpler than the house they supported and the proposed design was more ornate and he agreed with Committee Member Woollett in removing the brackets that had not occurred on the main house. On the floor plan, on the last sheet, there was the distance between the garage as 4'

and on the elevation it appeared as 3'. The advantage of 4' would be that the door could be centered under the ridge which would look better. He reviewed the plans with the applicant. Committee Member Wheeler stated his biggest issue was that there needed to be specifications on the drawings, he needed to know what they would be getting. He would need the applicant to return or to place enough conditions on an approval and specify everything that they needed. There was wood siding; there was no corner trim so he assumed there would be mitered corners.

Mr. Lowe stated the corners on the house varied and he was not certain what that treatment would be.

Committee Member Wheeler asked him if he thought they would use corner trim rather than mitered corners?

Mr. Lowe stated the house varied; he thought on some of the bump-outs there was no corner trim.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the left side looked mitered and he felt they should clarify what it would be. On the window trim he had mentioned wood and that should be specified on the plans.

Mr. Lowe stated the windows were Marvin and all wood and he had turned in that information.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he assumed the vent would be wood.

Mr. Lowe stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the Staff Report had mentioned overhang construction that would be in the traditional manner and asked the applicant if he understood what they were speaking of without any flat outlookers and the material and size of the barge needed to be specified. He suggested conditioning those items so it would be clear what was there.

Committee Member McCormack stated since the offset was on one side it could be reduced on that side.

Mr. Lowe stated 35 would be an odd size as wood came in 36 and he had not wanted to go to 32.

Committee Member Wheeler stated Condition No. 7 was recommending that the applicant obtain a record for the easement on the property to the north and he asked if that was a recommendation or should that be required?

Mr. Ryan stated required; he had since spoken with the applicant and there was not an issue in obtaining that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a concrete stoop that was not shown on the drawings and it looked like it encroached on the driveway a little more than the cantilevered pop-out and it might be an issue.

Mr. Lowe questioned what he meant by “the stoop”.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the stoop on the house. It appeared that it came out a bit further.

Mr. Lowe stated he would check that out.

Committee Member McCormack pointed to an area on the plans and asked if it was concrete?

Mr. Lowe questioned if he meant “existing”?

Committee Member McCormack stated he could not tell.

Mr. Lowe stated that was grass and they would be placing turf block in one area; there was also existing concrete and another area that would be grass.

Committee Member McCormack asked how would they deal with FAR as it related to useable open space and paved vs. landscaped areas?

Mr. Ryan stated open space was not defined in terms of material; it could be a balcony and a minimum width of 10’ in one direction.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was just asking as it appeared to have a lot of concrete.

Mr. Lowe stated he would not be adding any more concrete, it was all existing.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the ribbon driveway butted right up to the slab?

Mr. Lowe stated yes.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the garage would be set up on a 6” curb?

Mr. Lowe stated not any more.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the siding would run all the way down to grade?

Mr. Lowe stated it would be 6” above as a detail.

Committee Member Woollett asked if that 6” curb would run all the way through the workshop as well?

Mr. Lowe stated there would be a 6” curb all the way around. The door would be cut out. It was a garage and it would be able to be hosed out.

Committee Member McCormack asked if he knew which way it would drain? There was a lot of impervious material there.

Mr. Lowe stated it would be graded.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested putting the garage portion with a curb and to raise the workshop to a slab with a slight step down.

Mr. Lowe stated with the 16' height he would end up with a 7' 9" garage and he was afraid of raising anything.

Committee Member McCormack stated they would need to add a drain at the edge of the slab; and a French drain at the entrance.

Committee Member Wheeler stated since it was a requirement to slope the garage portion of the slab he asked if the workshop would be sloped as well?

Mr. Lowe stated the problem was with the ceiling height and it was one of the reasons he wanted to stick to the 16'.

Vice Chair Gladson asked if the rear yard setback needed to be 10'?

Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager, stated "yes."

Mr. Knorr stated with the 10' setback and on both sides the neighboring properties were across his property line.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she was wrestling with the FAR and she was not totally certain how she would go with that as the average was .19 and she understood what the applicant wanted to do. There was a Carriage garage that was embellished a bit more than was typical for a garage in Old Towne. Ideally it would be nice to have it be less massive and it was a secondary structure. The reality would be that the garage would need to be smaller and she was not troubled with the attic and the storage. If there was a thought to making it smaller she was open to that discussion. It was critical to have all the materials and specification listed in order to know that the project would have a predictable outcome. Some of the suggestions were to simplify the structure, but she was still struggling with the FAR.

Committee Member Wheeler stated his feeling on that was to make much of a dent it would need to be reduced a lot.

Vice Chair Gladson stated that would cause the laundry and workshop to be lost and she could not fault the property owner for wanting those on their property.

Mr. Ryan stated height was the issue. On a one-story structure there could be a bit more massing and to drop it down a foot would be a compromise. It was not uncommon to have one building on a block that had a larger FAR than others and the house was a larger Craftsman Bungalow.

Vice Chair Gladson stated that was another thing they wrestled with was the context of the streetscape and maintaining that rhythm and the cumulative issue of massing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was in favor of lowering the height by a foot and it was just the storage situation that would be affected.

Mr. Lowe stated the roof pitch would be lower and with a higher pitch it would be easier to stand in that area and the property owner was 6' 4".

Committee Member Wheeler stated it also gave him comfort that another owner in the future would not convert it into another use.

Committee Member McCormack stated in doing the math, on two dimensions he pointed to on the plans, it came to 9' and it ended right into the door. It was 9' to the edge of the building and he asked if there would be a stoop located in that area?

Mr. Lowe stated there could be a stoop with the turf block.

Committee Member McCormack stated the existing slab came out to the doorway and putting a stoop there could solve that.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4476-10, Knorr Residence new garage, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following conditions:

1. Remove finding No. 3 and add the word not to Condition No. 6.
2. Change requirement No. 7 to be a Condition.
3. Leave Condition No. 2, reducing the garage from 16' to 15'.
4. Siding shall be wood with mitered corners, window and door trim shall be wood, the garage door and man door shall be of wood construction, that the attic vent be wood, and the overhang be constructed in the traditional manner at the barge without the use of 2 x 4 flat outlookers, and the size of the barge board be larger than the outlooker rafters.
5. Center the garage door under the ridge and the diagonal braces to be removed.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4478-10 - RUBY'S RESTAURANT SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to change existing signage for a new restaurant located in the Santa Fe Depot Station.
- 186 N. Atchison Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Zoning Administrator

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

Applicant, Doug Cavanaugh, address on file, stated they were extremely excited about the project because they loved historic buildings; they had started on the historic Balboa Pier 27 years ago. Back then neon was forbidden in Newport Beach and it was an interesting start. There were some restaurants with neon and others with back lit LED's. In Anaheim they had just opened up a 30-40's diner with a ruby red neon sign on the roof and it fit the restaurant at that site and would also fit on the proposed project. They wanted to make a significant investment. The City had done a fabulous job on restoration of the building and it was mint condition on the outside. They were two blocks off of the Plaza and they needed some drawing power to get people inside. They were far from the Plaza and setback from Chapman and the signs they designed would give them some visibility. That was the logic behind their design and they would appreciate the DRC's consideration.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he understood the issue that the building was set pretty far back from the street and the need for advertising. As it was a historic structure they needed to be as sympathetic as possible and they would prefer adherence of the Standards for maximum allowance of square footage for signage. He agreed with Staff on the recommendation for internal illumination and felt that had been resolved. Neon had been discussed. Also, he hated to bring it up again, but there appeared to be a lot of plastic in the signs. It looked like a good project.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated another issue they wanted the Committee Members to consider was on the eyebrow there was a streamlined 1940's style of two red lines on the sign in Balboa that would simply highlight the eyebrow as the entrance. On the front of the building there appeared to be two entrances. There was the original Depot that had the identity of a big door and two windows and there was the other entrance. It would be something that would highlight the entrance.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated it seemed that neon would make a lot of sense and the City allowed neon in Old Towne. He asked if neon had been discussed?

Mr. Cavanaugh stated the Ruby's sign was a neon sign with exposed ruby red neon.

Committee Member Woollett asked about the breakfast, lunch, and dinner signage?

Applicant, Tim Pitts, address on file, stated they had proposed the letters with a channel that could be done with neon or LED. With LED it was cost effective for the tenant as it used less power and the maintenance issues were decreased. There would be a white outline that was visible and gave a look, not only during the day, that popped, at night the halo would shine back and make the sign color more visible rather than the wall color. What that would do, with the 10" letters would allow them to install the LED lights. With neon the width of the letter would need to be different. The use of LED lights would be to be green, and the maintenance issues would be less and they would fit into those letters. They had changed the letters in working with Staff to keep within the historic period. They could place neon in that space and it would be hard to tell the difference.

Committee Member Woollett stated the neon would be more visible.

Mr. Pitts stated the neon would be more visible from the street and if they went in that direction they would need to install the clear finish over them for the birds and the weather.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested placing a tavern-style sign in the window.

Vice Chair Gladson asked what other alternatives they had for the south facing wall?

Mr. Pitts stated there was a maintenance issue with the neon, when it got wet it shorted out. It was high voltage and when water got to it, the lights would short out. If it was not maintained in a proper timeframe the transformer would go out. With an LED strip, that they proposed to use over the front entrance, was a material that could be bent, it could be placed in water and it still looked wonderful. His advice if using neon would be to cover it.

Vice Chair Gladson asked if the wall signs got wet would they short out?

Mr. Pitts stated there was more of a chance without adding the clear faces to them and they had proposed the clear covers.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had gone to Santa Ana's and Fullerton's train stations and he found that there was a certain vernacular of letter out there that made the statement that it was a train station. He suggested using that vernacular of lettering; in Fullerton there was metal letters with back lighting. They could do the similar treatment to the breakfast, lunch, and dinner signs. When there were so many signs it looked temporary. They could add something that was historic and had the appearance of being there for a long time. They could add something unique. Santa Ana's train station had absolutely nothing on their walls and Fullerton had none either. He had not minded the Ruby's signs on the building.

Mr. Pitts stated the breakfast, lunch, and dinner signs were not plastic, they were all aluminum and reverse channel. It was described on the plans and would have LED illumination.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he agreed with Mr. Ryan that with the size and proportion of those letters they just looked like masses out from the point on the street from

which they would be read. They were what they were and they were on a long expanse. The letters were very similar to the BBQ restaurant and he had always thought those were too big and it cheapened the historic nature of the façade. The other signs worked and suggested they somehow incorporate historic lettering.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated he agreed with those ideas. They had recreated a 1939 World's Fair pavilion down in San Diego and it was called the World of Tomorrow. They had done 3-dimensional letters that were back lit and if they could get a contrast during the day and a shadow at night they could work.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they would not want the letters red?

Committee Member McCormack stated he suggested using metal.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated he would not mind the letters not being red and it could create a contrast. Those signs could be period appropriate.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the breakfast, lunch, and dinner signs not be one continuous strip.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she understood what they were attempting to convey as Ruby's had never been open for breakfast and they wanted patrons to know it was open for breakfast.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was concerned about the Ruby lady and why couldn't she be out by the train station sign?

Mr. Ryan stated they had proposed to have her at the monument sign.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the Ruby's lady had come up and over the monument sign and it was something that was not permitted.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she had not gotten her "just placement" on only a small place on the building and she suggested that she could be a blade or something like that. People would find the restaurant once they had been there. They may need to move that sign to another location. She liked the streamline diner and the use of brushed aluminum. If she was the Zoning Administrator and she was reviewing all the signage she would be reluctant to allow those signs if they had not gotten an outstanding recommendation from the DRC. Personally she felt there were too many signs.

Mr. Ryan stated they could use the lettering on the canopy for the breakfast, lunch and dinner.

Mr. Pitts stated they could propose a new layout for the metal signs.

Committee Member McCormack stated the one thing they could do historical was the breakfast, lunch, and dinner signs.

Mr. Ryan stated if they could use the same type face that was on the Ruby's monument sign on the other signs it would be more fitting, historically.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had to be careful because they would not want to design by Committee, and they had given their suggestions for the applicant to work out.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed. He asked if the monument sign was a can sign that was mounted on the face?

Mr. Pitts stated it was a cabinet sign and there was a hole in the brick that went all the way through. It was a double faced cabinet. They would pull the cabinet out and they wanted to keep the monument the same as it was. They would build the box to fit the cabinet. The sign was acrylic and vinyl.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if that sign could be neon?

Mr. Pitts stated they could use exposed neon with a clear cover over it. It was high voltage and they would not want anyone putting their fingers in the sign. It would most definitely pop from the street.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated they could take the Ruby lady and move her up to project off of the building.

Mr. Pitts stated it would be a double-faced blade sign. He would take a picture of the Anaheim Ruby's, as that sign was exactly what they were discussing.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated it would be more visible.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the area was becoming a much more pedestrian area.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to continue DRC No. 4478-10, Ruby's Restaurant sign program, to allow the applicant to incorporate the suggestions discussed.

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 Design Review Meeting on Wednesday, April 21, 2010. The meeting adjourned @8:27 p.m.

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

MOTION CARRIED.