CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

August 18, 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 Robert Garcia, Associate Planner 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 Gladson opened the Administrative Session at 5:10 p.m.

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated there were no changes to the Agenda and nothing additional to report. Ms. Nguyen mentioned that she understood there could be a lack of quorum on Agenda Item No. 6.

Committee Members Wheeler and Woollett stated they would be recused from the item presentation and with Chair Cathcart's absence they would not have a quorum.

Ms. Nguyen stated they would contact the applicant and advise them of the postponement.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of August 4, 2010. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Committee Member McCormack arrived late and submitted his corrections to the Minutes to the Recording Secretary.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Member Cathcart was absent.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There was none.

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

---

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 4, 2010

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting on August 4, 2010, with changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(2) DRC No. 4500-10 - ORANGE COUNTY MATTRESS

- A proposal to rescind the existing sign program.
- 914 E. Katella Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4500-10, Orange County Mattress, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report

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:

(3) DRC No. 4445-09 – HAVEN GASTROPUB RESTAURANT

- A proposal to construct a new outdoor patio dining area on the Glassell Street elevation, install railing, wood entry door, heaters, and external walk-in cooler.
- 190 S. Glassell Street, Units C & D, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from January 20, 2010 DRC Meeting
- DRC Action: Final Determination

The applicant was not present when the item was called. The item was heard out of sequence when the applicant arrived.

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the item's presentation due to a conflict of interest based on the location of his business.

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

Vice Chair Gladson asked if the Committee had any specific questions for Staff?

Committee Member Woollett stated he had mentioned heaters and he had thought the heater issue had been dropped.

Mr. Ryan stated last he heard the heaters were still part of the proposal.

Applicant, Alkesh Patel, address on file, stated Mr. Ryan had pretty well covered the proposal and he was available for questions.

Mr. Ryan asked if the bottom of the canopies would need modification to accommodate the heaters.

Mr. Patel stated the heaters would not be able to be installed under the canopy as there was not enough clearance to allow the heater unit installed there. They had found a better heater at a trade show that was less obtrusive looking, but required a one foot clearance and they had thought they could be installed deep against the wall so they would not stick out and hang just below the canopy. He presented a proposal for the heaters and reviewed how they would attach to the wall area.

Public Comment

Steve Bennett, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated it was interesting that they were considering replacing the door as during the original construction there had been a lot of

discussion and argument regarding the doors and now they were doing an about-face and allowing a new door. The primary concern with the OTPA, and personally as a home owner, was that there was a cumulative effect of what was going on with all the restaurants in Old Towne and there were more and more people out on the street. There would be a fence that would allow the restaurant to serve alcoholic beverages out on the sidewalk and it was the only one being planned that way in the Historic District and would set a precedent upon approval. He knew there were other sites with tables sitting out on the sidewalk, however, they would not serve alcohol and not encroach on an off-the-plane area from the building, which he felt was an element in the City's planning guide. He noticed that 1/3 of the way down the building there was a reduction in the sidewalk width due to parking and he wondered if the seating would encroach on the public right-of-way in that area. He would also like to understand the amount of sidewalk that was owned by the property owner.

Vice Chair Gladson stated they would consider all of Mr. Bennett's questions and concerns and attempt to answer them collectively.

Sue Vaurs, address on file, representing the OTPA and herself, stated there were more and more restaurants coming into Old Towne and more sidewalk dining which was changing the Historic District; it had not fit in with the historic groups. She had personally had to walk in the street to get past the dining areas and had not wanted it to occur anymore in the downtown area as it could turn into a food court.

Vice Chair Gladson asked the applicant if he wished to address any of the comments heard through public comment?

Mr. Patel stated Francoli and Gabbi's both had patios and served alcohol on their patios. The patio of Haven Gastropub was within their property line; the line extended 6' out and was scored on the sidewalk. The patio area was 6" within that property line. There was still adequate public right of way where the curb cut in. On the door there had been a lot of debate about it and they had chosen a door that was representative of their restaurant theme. It was historic in nature and it was not the same door they were replacing and it fit the business. It was his opinion that it was not an eyesore.

Vice Chair Gladson asked Staff for some further clarification on the tapering of the sidewalk in regard to the property line.

Mr. Ryan stated the sidewalk tapered, but the patio was still within the applicant's property line. Several properties along Glassell Street had extended property lines out to the sidewalk and Staff had to review each one separately to see where the property line extended out to. It was a consideration when there was a request for outdoor dining to ensure where the property lines extended to. In reviewing earlier Staff Reports, the door had been installed and then received approval; it was after the fact. Irrespective of that, since the change was reversible and the applicant would keep the old door, Staff had felt there was not an issue with the new door. There had been a discussion at the last meeting about patrons waiting to be seated and it was requested that those patrons queue around the alley, around the antique store. Currently there were several other ABC applications downtown and it appeared that everyone wanted to serve some type of beer or wine and business owners believed they needed that to have a competitive edge. There was concern regarding over concentration and each application would be reviewed carefully.

Vice Chair Gladson asked if it was fair to state that the use-part element of the ABC CUPs were outside of the purview of the DRC and the use of an outdoor dining area fell to the Planning Commission?

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct; the DRC was charged with the review and recommendations on the design and aesthetics of the project.

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

Committee Member Woollett stated the walk-in freezer was to be painted the same color of the wall, and that would be difficult to do because the wall was multi-color.

Mr. Patel stated the wall was brick and the door was painted a brick color.

Committee Member Woollett stated the freezer would be painted to match the door.

Mr. Patel stated that was correct. He presented photos of the building and stated it would not be very attractive looking; they wanted to cover the refrigerator with some material that represented brick or to paint it. They could just paint it the color of the doors.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the freezer sat on feet, were there any vents/pipes going into it, and was there a door?

Mr. Patel stated the freezer would have a sliding door on the outside north side and the freezer would sit tight against the wall. There would be no place to get behind it.

Committee Member Woollett stated the concrete it would sit on was not level and the wall was vertical. It would need something underneath it to raise it up; it needed to be set plumb, horizontal, and all that. There would be space underneath it.

Mr. Patel stated the unit would be built in place and the floor of the unit would be level and there would be no space beneath it.

Committee Member Woollett stated when the area was washed there would be water along the bottom.

Mr. Patel stated “no.”

Committee Member Woollett asked what he meant by “no”.

Mr. Patel stated the unit would be sitting on the concrete and there would be no way to get water under it.

Committee Member Woollett asked if it would be caulked? Water would go underneath it. There would be seams in the metal and the DRC had not known what it would look like, if the sliding door would be riveted on from the outside. The reason he brought up these points was that it could look really junky, depending on how it was executed.

Mr. Patel stated it would be very nice, it would have nice strong hinges, similar to an inside refrigeration unit.

Vice Chair Gladson stated often the inside refrigeration units were inside the kitchen and they would not want the general public to see it. She had the same concerns and the freezer to her was troubling as she had not received enough detail to know if it would be executed well or if it would be compatible with the building. She had no problem with adding on freezer space for a restaurant, but it felt that it was just getting slapped on out there without much thought.

Mr. Patel stated it would be a custom-built refrigerator.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the drawings had not helped her understand how it would look.

Committee Member Woollett asked Staff if they had concerns?

Mr. Ryan stated he thought the applicant was going to provide a catalog with photos of the intended freezer.

Mr. Patel stated it would be a custom-built unit; he had asked the manufacturer for a catalog, but it was custom. He understood what they were stating.

Committee Member Woollett stated he should have a shop drawing from the manufacturer.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the space that would be occupied by the freezer was designated for a use?

Mr. Ryan stated "no."

Committee Member Woollett stated many times there would be a concrete curb underneath the unit and the freezer would be set on it; it could be a 2" to 4" curb and the freezer unit might overhang a bit. It would be a nice clean detail and there would be no concern of water getting underneath the unit. The galvanized metal would eventually rust. With galvanized metal on concrete, water would pool directly where the metal met the concrete and it would rust out.

Mr. Patel stated there was a curb that would be built into it; he had not had those details or the specs for that.

Committee Member Woollett asked Mr. Ryan if he would be comfortable reviewing a drawing without the applicant returning to the DRC?

Mr. Ryan stated he felt comfortable reviewing it; however, the expectation had been that there would be an example presented. In looking at old Coke machines, the bottoms would be all rusted out. With Airstream trailers, they looked nice by themselves, and that was one end of the spectrum; the other end was how to hide it or have it fit in.

Committee Member McCormack stated with what was occurring in Old Towne, with more restaurants coming in and being in a compacted space, the applicant was requiring more room

and it would be something that would be occurring with other restaurants. They were in a precedent-setting issue and Committee Member Woollett hit a chord in that there was not enough detail in what was being presented. They would be approving for the very first time that restaurants could stick a big huge refrigerator out in the parking lot, and unfortunately the application before them was the first, so the scrutiny was there. That was the issue. What would happen when a car occupant had too many Gastro's and hit the thing; those were a lot of the issues. He had the same issues and agreed with Committee Members Woollett and Gladson. It wasn't that they had not wanted the applicant to have a refrigerator; it was just that they wanted it to last and to know how it would look. There were a lot of things.

Vice Chair Gladson stated they might need to place a wall around it. There were a lot of options.

Committee Member Woollett stated if it was designed right it could work.

Committee Member McCormack stated if it was designed for durability, visual aesthetics, and function, those three things needed to come out in the detail.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she wanted to go back to the patio and review that.

Committee Member Woollett, referring to the railing drawing, pointed out an area that would not work. It would be 8' 5" long and the top rail was shown as 2" x 3" and it looked like it was 3/8" in one dimension and 2" in another dimension, and at 8' long with solid iron that would be too flexible.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was no section on it. The last time they had a section to review.

Committee Member Woollett noticed the drawing showed the pole support at 6' minimum and he thought that should read maximum.

Committee Member McCormack stated last time they reviewed it the posts were at the joints.

Committee Member Woollett stated he could only assume it was 6' maximum, which made more sense. The post in the middle would not do anything to keep the rail from tipping over because it had not gone all the way up to the top.

The Committee Members reviewed the drawings with Staff and the applicant.

Committee Member Woollett thought the load should be 40 lbs. horizontal load per linear foot. He asked if 42" high was the ABC requirement? It appeared really high and was almost a guard rail.

Mr. Patel stated that it came from ABC Licensing.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated ABC Licensing had the 42" requirement for any outside alcohol service.

Committee Member McCormack stated the drawing showed 2”x 3” thick, yet the posts were called out as a 1 ¼” square. They would need to review that detail; how that would embrace the smaller post was something they would need to review.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was certain the rail should read 6’ maximum, to support the load of the horizontal pieces it needed to go all the way up.

Mr. Patel stated they were told it could span 8’ with just 2 posts; he was not a structural engineer, but this was what he had been told by the fence builder. It was just the one section, as the other sections were smaller.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the City’s Building Division had reviewed the plans?

Mr. Ryan stated it had been to the Building Division.

Committee Member Woollett stated his concern was if it got bent, pushed over, it could be an aesthetic problem. If no one checked the engineering, that could be an issue.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the design of the railing had not bothered her. As it was a concept only, they needed to review the detail with a predictable image to assure what would be installed. When they had previously reviewed the project the DRC was concerned in having everything be accurate. They seemed to be in the same boat.

Committee Member Woollett stated the drawing was not very clear.

Committee Member McCormack stated the details were important, it was something as simple as the base shoe; specifically in Old Towne the use of a 4” base shoe would be the cover to a 4” core drill that would be required to be used to support the posts. Those could span out 1” beyond the fence and, depending on the thickness of that, it could become a trip hazard if the shoe was not beveled. The details affected the safety issues in the right-of-way.

Mr. Patel stated it would be beveled.

Committee Member Woollett stated due to the other obvious errors, it was the reason he questioned the 42”, because the fence designer was used to drawing guard rails and 42” was the required height for guardrails.

Mr. Patel stated he was told by ABC that the requirement was 42” and asked that the rail be drawn at 42”.

Committee Member Woollett stated on the door issue, he understood the comments by the OTPA, but he felt justified in the door choice for the restaurant.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the 42”, and having seating out there, the rail would be at eye level when patrons were seated and could become a distracting railing, and he felt they should revisit that requirement.

Mr. Patel stated he would check with ABC Licensing.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the rail needed to be at that height they could consider more bar stool seating.

Mr. Patel stated that presented an ADA issue.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had previously had an issue on how the railing came to the center part and although it was on the outside they would want to have it appear as if it had always been there. They had wanted the room, but integrity-wise, on the return to have the inside and outside both the same.

Mr. Patel stated they had it that way; the inside hit the column, but in a comment stated at the last meeting it was suggested that when coming from around the corner someone might not know it was there, and that was the reason they moved it to the outside edge.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed the details with the applicant. He suggested having some plants as a buffer in that area. On an area he pointed to on the drawing he asked why they could not have a sliding door there?

Mr. Patel stated it was an emergency exit and it had to have panic hardware.

Mr. Ryan stated they had suggested pots or plants last time.

Mr. Patel stated on the planting issue, he agreed it would look great; however, his concern was the water run-off could get messy and stain the concrete. The landlord had the same concerns. There was no proper drainage there.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they would still have lions in the front?

Mr. Patel stated they were still looking at that.

Vice Chair Gladson asked what the Committees wishes were on the project and had they wanted to bifurcate the project?

Mr. Patel stated in terms of the refrigerator, the street fair was coming up and they had wanted to get that built and installed, as they would not be able to accommodate the patrons with their current space based on what they had gone through last year. He asked if they could outline some of the concerns the DRC had and review those details with Mr. Ryan, as his concern was that if they needed to return to the DRC it could be another month. They really needed the refrigerated space.

Vice Chair Gladson stated based on what had been presented she was uncomfortable moving forward with the freezer issue. She was inclined to suggest a continuation.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed that what they would approve would be the example and set a precedent for future installations. He was certain they could come up with a temporary measure for the street fair.

Mr. Ryan stated they wanted the proposed project to be the good example.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to continue DRC No. 4445-09, Haven Gastropub Restaurant, in order to allow the applicant to return with additional details for the outside refrigerator and railing details.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Ryan asked if the applicant had a sample railing that he could present?

Mr. Patel stated the fence builder had given them a sample rail a few months ago, but they had taken it back.

Committee Member Woollett stated what had been presented with regard to the center rod would not work and the 6' minimum should read "maximum", and if that was the case there was 8' there.

Mr. Patel asked if they could just agree to add a center post so it would be symmetrical.

Committee Member Woollett stated the details had not made sense at all; it was not drawn correctly and would there be a 5" minimum space between pickets?

Mr. Patel stated there would be 4" between posts.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4499-10 – RUSTY LEAF SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to modify an existing sign program for an existing shopping center.
- 133 Yorba 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.

Applicants, Patti Skoglund, address on file, stated the blade sign had been eliminated and the secondary free-standing sign was added to address concerns of the other minor tenants.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Woollett stated he had not been present for the initial items presentation, but he noticed there was some discussion regarding the Café sign and he wanted to understand what changes had been made.

Ms. Skoglund stated the lettering had been changed from push-through to individual channel letters. The letters became individual illuminated letters and it added more dimension and maintained the theme of the shopping center.

Committee Member Woollett stated the yellow portion on top was mounted on top of the red.

Committee Member McCormack stated he thought it looked great and he asked what the bottom and top of a sign he pointed out on the drawings would be?

Ms. Skoglund stated it would be red all the way around and would not be illuminated. The red area would not be lit. The only thing that would be illuminated would be the Café lettering and the Denny's logo. She reviewed the drawing with Committee Member McCormack.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had several items to discuss. With the signage program, on page 7 on the 1st section, regarding internally lit signs, he wondered if they should add on the last line they should clarify that it applied to logo signs.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had a concern about that as well, and she wondered about the logos for anchors and major tenants; it could be a trademark issue and she agreed with Committee Member Wheeler.

Mr. Garcia stated there could be tenants such as Dominos or Subway that had a much smaller sign, but would use their logo.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he wanted it to be clear that those would be the only cabinets allowed in the sign program.

Committee Member Wheeler stated under canopy signs on item 2, he suggested adding something regarding the minimum clearance to the walkway below the canopy signs.

Ms. Skoglund stated she was not aware of the clearance and she could look into that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated under "window graphics", he was a menu-grazer and he liked to look at menus on the outside of restaurants and suggested allowing restaurants to display a menu outside, in a box or outside the window. On page 8, section L, which spoke to LED or fluorescent lighting, he wondered if they should include a sentence that would state the allowance of future technology innovations that were UL approved and at least as efficient as LED.

Ms. Skoglund stated they could add language that read of the equivalent; they would not want to step too far outside of the UL boundaries.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would eliminate having to re-write the sign program to allow new technology. Adding UL approved would need to be included. On item N, regarding the back of exposed neon signs requiring opaque painting, he thought there were no exposed neon signs.

Ms. Skoglund stated there were none proposed, however, in future additions they wanted to add that requirement.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they were allowed?

Mr. Garcia stated "yes."

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 9 there was still language included for blade signs.

Mr. Garcia stated that would be removed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 11, on the last bullet item, he suggested adding that the sign element should not exceed greater than 2/3 of the height of the façade element that it was being located on.

Mr. Garcia stated they could use the language plane or façade surface.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it also applied to page 12. On page 16, he suggested eliminating the decorative tie rods that existed.

Ms. Skoglund stated she was not certain what that was and she would advise the landlord about the removal as it would require patching.

Committee Member Gladson stated there was that type of material on the pylon sign and she agreed with Committee Member Wheeler's suggestion.

Committee Member Wheeler, referring to the new monument sign on page 17, asked if the Rusty Leaf Plaza was illuminated?

Ms. Skoglund stated ultimately it would be whatever the landlord agreed to. She felt it should be lit.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the monument sign return for review prior to final approval. He wanted some more details on the material and colors.

Mr. Garcia stated they could add that as a condition.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 6 he was curious in regard to the logo face; it read "vinyl in six colors" and asked if there were actually six colors?

Ms. Skoglund stated there were six colors. There were several color variations that were laid down and overlapped each other.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 10, it also applied to the French diamond logo, he wanted it to be clear that on the areas that stuck out beyond the background that those areas be finished. He felt there was an issue with the structural integrity of the sign; they needed to work on that sign. With the slightest movement the sign would bend. He reviewed the sign with the applicant.

Ms. Skoglund agreed; she had not thought it was a good sign and felt it was not structurally sound. It needed a frame around the entire sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated the only way to do it without the vertical rods would be to hide the horizontal bars, and that would be okay with him.

Ms. Skoglund stated to clarify the pieces that were on the left and right were not areas they intended to use; she pointed out the pieces she was referring to on the plans. They would be taken out by the landlord.

Mr. Garcia discussed the sign with the applicant and the Committee Members; he reviewed what existed at the center and what was proposed.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she was concerned with having the sign attached to a pole on the ground when there was an open element at the base.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the pole would not be visible; it would go through the sign to the base.

Committee Member McCormack stated on page 13 the awning colors were shown in three different colors and he asked if they were using three different colors?

Ms. Skoglund stated they were options for tenants if they had not wanted striping; the center currently had awnings that were not consistent with anything. There were several different colors in the center. She stated on the new monument sign the direction was to match the existing tile that existed at the center and she would obtain the specs on that to match.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4499-10, Rusty Leaf Sign Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the editorial comments discussed during the meeting discussion and with the additional condition:

1. That the new monument sign shown on page 17 of the sign program be resubmitted to the DRC prior to issuance of a building permit.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4458-09 – SPRINT WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to replace three 4' panel antennas and three new 2' microwave dishes on an existing monopole. One equipment cabinet would be constructed inside the existing equipment building and one GPS antenna would be attached to the outside of the existing building.
- 639 S. Tustin Street
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Celly Adamo, address on file, stated they had spoken about the fencing and it was actually a shelter that Sprint had; there was a chain link fence and they were attempting to figure out how to install a CMU wall around it. If it covered everything they would need a 9' wall, which would be a very tall wall. The Code stated the equipment needed to be inside a shelter and the equipment was already located inside a shelter. The shelter had fencing around it. One of the requirements was in removing the chain link fence the electrical meter would need to go inside the shelter and this was something they could not do, as the meter belonged to SCE and needed to be located outside for meter reading. They needed to conceal the shelter and the cables that existed at the site.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Woollett asked if the 9' wall height would it require a variance?

Ms. Nguyen stated that was correct. The reason for that was in prior discussions Staff was not certain that the equipment could be re-located inside the facility and the only option would be a wall.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was glad the applicant used the word shelter as that was what it actually was.

Ms. Adamo stated all the equipment was inside the shelter.

Committee Member Woollett asked if SCE would allow the meter to be inside the block wall enclosure?

Ms. Adamo stated "no." The SCE meters needed outside access.

Ms. Nguyen stated SCE could get inside the gate; with a walled enclosure there would be a gate to gain access.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was not concerned with the meter being visible. He was concerned with the cables.

Ms. Adamo stated those would be concealed. Sprint was willing to remove the fencing.

Ms. Nguyen stated with a non-stealth, non co-located site the proposed project needed to go to Planning Commission and the variance would not be an issue.

Ms. Adamo stated having a 9' CMU wall concerned her and they needed to remove the chain link which had not met the Code requirements.

Ms. Nguyen stated chain link was no longer allowed. The wireless Code stated there needed to be an 8' CMU wall or wrought iron with landscaping; or equipment needed to be housed inside of a building.

Ms. Adamo stated it was a Catch 22, as all the equipment was inside a building, with a chain link fence around that and would that wall be required to be as tall as the building?

Ms. Nguyen stated if all the equipment, including the meter, were inside of the building they could just remove the chain link and the building could stand alone as it would screen the equipment inside, with a shroud enclosing the cables.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was due to an upgrade of the facility that required bringing the site up to current standards.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the other alternative would be wrought iron with landscaping and it had not appeared that there was enough room to accommodate landscaping.

Ms. Nguyen stated normally the Code only allowed a 6' wall, as the equipment was taller they allowed 8'. The chain link was currently 6' tall and the equipment was 8' 5", with the rear area facing the residences at 9' 1" with a back flap.

Committee Member Wheeler stated previous applications had alternative enclosures, such as metal and looked fairly good.

Ms. Nguyen stated it would be at the DRC's discretion that the equipment would need to be fully screened.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the trash enclosure was CMU.

Committee Member McCormack stated from a design perspective it would be to reduce the visual clutter by utilizing similar materials and that was the key.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was another application with a building installation in front, closer to Tustin Street. That building would match the design of the hotel, which was another application,

an application that had been approved. It would be a mono-Eucalyptus tree with a building closer to Tustin Street and the Sprint facility would be less visible.

Committee Member Woollett stated in driving around that area with all the other poles out there, the cell tower was one of the better looking things in the area, it was terrific.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4458-10, Sprint Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and especially with the recommendation by Staff for a CMU enclosure at the height to conceal the wireless equipment requiring a variance and materials to match the CMU trash enclosure.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4475-10 – CHUCK YAGHI–ACCESSORY 2ND UNIT

- A proposal for new detached accessory second-unit and rehabilitation of an existing single-family residence.
- 812 E. Washington Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

The presentation of the item was postponed due to a lack of a quorum based on conflict of interest for Committee Members Wheeler and Woollett.

(7) DRC No. 4494-10 – GARCIA RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a new two-story, single-family residence in the Rossiter Ranch six-lot subdivision.
- 6027 Jack Pine Lane
- 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, Ryan White, stated he was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the stucco texture would be?

Mr. White stated they proposed a knock down, not completely smooth, and to use a smoother finish around the windows.

Committee Member Wheeler stated, pointing to an area on the plans, someone needed to review the area a bit more. The plan showed the intermediate members were coming out to the same point as the buttresses on both sides, but it appeared that would be difficult to do because there was a trim member that went across with the other element sitting on top of them.

Mr. White stated it actually was all in the front of that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he believed the plan was set back further.

Mr. White stated the windows and doors were all on the same plane and the floor plan might need updating. He reviewed the plans with Committee Member Wheeler.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the gate arrangement it was shown in one area but not the other.

Mr. White stated the property owner wanted to put in some sort of garden and they had penciled in a potential wall; he was not certain if they would still be putting that in.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the shower windows were very large.

Mr. White stated that was what the property owner wanted; they had thought to put in a wall with a private garden off of the master bedroom so if someone was in the shower they could look out to the garden.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was a long walk down the hallway, to the stairway to the front door.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a long entry way. There was a long entry and it had not appeared to go anywhere.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it could be a problem with certain cultures.

Mr. White stated it was an issue that had come up in one of their meetings.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she was fine with the proposed project. Irrigation would also need to go in as noted in the Staff Report and she liked that with a custom house on a big lot that the garages had been placed on the side with the house having a nice prominence on the street.

Ms. Thakur stated the Staff Report noted a requirement for an automatic irrigation system and a minimum 40% front yard setback landscaping.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4494-10, Garcia Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(8) DRC No. 4503-10 - THE BRUERY

- A proposal for new signage for a specialty store in the Plaza.
- 143 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the item's presentation due to a conflict of interest based on the location of his business.

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

Applicant, Patrick Rue, address on file, stated one concern they had was with the tree in front blocking visibility to the sign wherever they placed it. They felt placing it on the edge of the canopy would allow more visibility.

Applicant, J. Casey Rue, address on file, stated there was a visibility issue and he presented photos of where they wanted the sign placement. They wanted placement to be more north, to gain more visibility. They were fine with painting the background of the sign.

Public Comment

None.

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

Mr. Ryan stated the other part of this proposal was that he had researched if the building originally had a canopy. It had been added much later and in reviewing where the sign would go, where would it have been. He was not suggesting removal of the canopy. The other issue was that the closer the sign was placed to the canopy the less visible it became to pedestrians and vehicles. On the Orange Camera sign that was placed back further it was more visible due to the placement and angle. Getting back to where would people look for a sign and having the sign up higher would be more visible. The applicant would be spending a considerable amount on the sign and it was a nice looking sign and they wanted the maximum exposure for the business. They had looked at that issue as well.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the sign would be placed between the upper and lower windows on the brick?

Committee Member McCormack stated it would not be at the same level as the Orange Camera sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was correct; he asked why the Orange Camera sign was still there?

Mr. Ryan stated he thought it would be removed to allow more light into the building and the sign was not historic and should not be an issue.

Committee Member Woollett asked if there was prismatic glass on the building?

Mr. J Casey Rue stated there were three panels.

Mr. Ryan stated on one-half of the tenant space there was no glass, and the other half had the prismatic glass. The property owner, Mr. Selman, wanted to add glass to match the other half.

Committee Member Woollett stated too bad there was not prismatic glass on the north end; if there was any clear glass it should be in the middle.

Mr. J. Casey Rue stated with the sign on the wall they would want the tree thinned out to allow north bound traffic to see it.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she was not certain the north bound traffic would see it from that orientation. It would be visible for south bound traffic.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had a blade sign for pedestrian visibility.

Mr. J. Casey Rue stated the jeweler across the street had awnings and their sign had been placed at the end of the awning.

Committee Member McCormack stated Staff's recommendation had hit the spot and he liked the sign, it had that night time look. He asked if anything would cover the side of the sign, to cover the cove light and would they use LED?

Mr. J. Casey Rue stated they could build a return. They had spoken with sign representatives and one person stated LED was the way to go and another person stated there were T8 fluorescent power saving bulbs that gave more of a consistent light.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt in Old Towne they should have old lighting. He understood the energy thing.

Mr. J. Casey Rue stated they could use the warmer colored bulbs.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the Starbucks' sign it had that appeal, that night time glow. He suggested using high efficiency incandescent lighting.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was no such thing.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were high efficiency incandescent lights, the color was warmer.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were not very efficient.

Committee Member McCormack asked how they would illuminate the blade sign?

Mr. Ryan stated it would not be lit.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the sign in the back he asked how they would handle the back?

Mr. Patrick Rue stated there would be a return that would cover the back.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would be nice to have something that had not looked like a cage.

The Committee Members reviewed the sign in the back with the applicants.

Committee Member McCormack stated as they were going through the effort to cover the sign, he suggested doing something to dress it up and to have the rear entrance sign stand out, to run the metal up on the two sides as a design feature. They could add lighting too.

Mr. Patrick Rue stated they could incorporate the top and bring it down to match the bottom.

Vice Chair Gladson asked that if the property owner was interested in removing the canopy would the applicants be agreeable to that?

Mr. Patrick Rue stated he had not thought that they would want to do that. The sun in the afternoon was intense.

Committee Member Woollett stated with the rear sign there was a guard cage with two condensers and the sign would be placed in front of the condensers and he asked for clarification of what would happen with the sides of that sign?

Mr. J. Casey Rue stated they would build a box around it with returns to cover the sides.

Committee Member Woollett stated they would want to assure that it would not interfere with the air conditioner.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4503-10, The Bruery, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. The front sign be placed on the building, centered on the 2nd story middle section brick area, placed between the upper and lower windows.
2. The sign be designed to conceal the lighting fixture.
3. The rear sign be designed with a return to the north and south sides, to be vented for the air conditioning condensers.
4. The attachment of the wall sign shall be offset with spacers placed in the mortar bed.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 1, 2010.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.