CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

June 1, 2011

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:10 p.m.

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

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated at the next meeting of the Design Review Committee (DRC), Assistant City Attorney, Gary Sheatz, would be present for a refresher on the Brown Act, which could be done during the Administrative Session of the meeting.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the DRC meeting of May 18, 2011. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present with one open position.

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 CALENDAR:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 18, 2011

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 18, 2011 DRC meeting with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4525-10 – THE PACKING HOUSE

- A proposal for a small deli and exterior façade changes to an existing building.
- 964 N. Batavia Street, Unit C
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Mike Christian, address on file, stated he owned a company called Deli King and he distributed Boar's Head brand deli items in the area. He had a spot up front in the building and he wanted to use the site to serve the public and try out some new items. He wanted to work with the products before they went out to the field. Their sales would consist mostly of deli sandwiches and deli-type food.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the rest of the building was all distribution?

Mr. Christian stated yes, it was all distribution. He had three sites and he lived in Orange.

Chair Cathcart opened the item for any questions for Staff or the applicant. There were none.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated the proposed project would really add to the streetscape. On the lower portion of the building where a metal base was added there was a call-out for a distressed wood cap. He asked for an explanation of that detail.

Mr. Christian stated there would be corrugated metal with a 3" wood cap to cover the metal. They wanted wood, as the look they were going for was the look of an old packing house. The inside of the restaurant would be made to look like old orange crates to go with the City of Orange.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he also had concerns about the distressed wood, but if that element was going to be used on the inside of the building too, it would be okay. He stated the proposal was a very good solution as far as an improvement to the building. He was a bit

concerned about the plan details. There was a distressed wood rail shown on the top of the corrugated metal and he asked if there was going to be wood at the corner?

Mr. Christian stated yes, there was wood at the corners.

Committee Member Wheeler asked would that also include the windows and on the corner where it stopped to bring the trim around the corner?

Mr. Christian stated that was the intent.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the awning over the deli it appeared that the ends would be closed.

Mr. Christian stated the plan was to have an open end. The architect had not checked the rules and he had originally designed it at 25' out and that would encroach on the easement. It would be an open end.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the horizontal member around the awning and on the overhang was, metal or wood?

Mr. Christian stated metal, it was a channel. The plan had been to build the awning out of steel and they had thought they would just cover the existing awning frame; however, when they attempted to cover it they realized it had disintegrated inside.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the overhang of the warehouse entrance there was not a side elevation shown.

Mr. Christian stated it would have a square frame that would stick out about 4' with cables that would hold it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they should note how far it would come out and when there was something like that, the top needed to have a slope.

Mr. Christian stated it would not be sloped and made from wire mesh.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they would need to specify some of those details. The fascia on the overhang would be steel and the Deli King entrance would come out 4' and the trim would wrap around the corrugated metal. The only other thing that he had was on page PL2, there was mechanical equipment on the roof with a notation that the equipment screen would match the building. He was certain they had not meant concrete.

Mr. Christian stated it would be corrugated metal to match.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as the proposal approval had not included signage there was a sign shown on the drawings and he wanted it to be clear that signage was not a part of the proposed approval.

Committee Member Woollett asked on page PL1, accent walls, what had that referred to?

Mr. Christian stated those were dividers for the planters.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it was "Pour in Place" or was it "Precision Block?"

Mr. Christian stated they would use block with a stucco finish, the same color as the building with a smooth coat.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on PL1, on the parking analysis, there was a statement that noted natural stone with engraved signage; he asked what that was?

Mr. Christian stated there had not been any signage turned in with the project.

Committee Member McCormack asked what the intent of the proposed landscape improvement was?

Mr. Christian stated currently there was no landscape and he had just wanted to have the building look better from the street.

Committee Member McCormack stated it appeared that the concept was to add a patio, however, there were no tables shown. There was a fountain shown and typically trees the height of those noted on the plans would not provide any shade. There were a few Palm trees and he asked if those would be pulled over to another area? He suggested that the landscape be more functional and not just visual. There could be shade on the patio, canopy trees, for people eating on the patio. The Palm trees that would work would be very expensive. He suggested putting money where the intent of shade was and to use canopy trees.

Mr. Christian stated he had chosen Palm trees as they would not need much water and maintenance.

Committee Member McCormack stated instead of putting the trees high in the air, to use the trees as a more functional element and to shade the patrons. He also recommended that the wall height be 18" for a comfortable seat height.

Mr. Garcia stated there would be no outdoor dining on the proposed project. It would increase the site seating capacity, which would in turn increase the parking demand.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval of DRC No. 4525-10, The Packing House, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The fascia of both the awning and the covering over the warehouse entrance shall be steel
- 2. Cover over the warehouse entrance to extend a maximum of 48" from the building face.
- 3. The corrugated metal on the building be trimmed on all sides with wood.
- 4. The covering for the canopy over the warehouse entrance be an open screen material.
- 5. No signage shall be included in the recommendation of approval.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a factor of required landscape from building face to right-of-way?

Mr. Garcia stated typically we ask for landscape in the front area, as much as possible. It was an industrial site and not a commercial site, which carried a stricter landscape requirement. Typically, landscape was recommended for the front setback area.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, asked if Committee Member McCormack was referring to a ratio of hardscape to softscape?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes.

Mr. Garcia stated that was only required in a residential area.

Chair Cathcart stated they could also recommend that although the plan showed Palm trees, to use canopy-type trees.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was the use of Turf Block or decomposed granite for parking, in an area that he pointed out to on the plans.

Mr. Garcia stated the intent of that area was not for parking.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4539-11 – STADIUM NISSAN

- A proposal for a new showroom building at an existing new car dealership and exterior remodel.
- 1140 W. Katella Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Community Development Director

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

Applicant, Matt Menloue, address on file, was present for questions.

Chair Cathcart opened the item for any questions to Staff. There were none.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked why the proposed project did not have to meet the tree requirement?

Mr. Garcia stated he believed it had.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had done a quick calculation.

Mr. Menloue stated the thing that happened specifically with car dealers was that the merchandise and product was being displayed and trees blocked that. It was always a struggle.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that more trees were being taken out than the number being put in.

Chair Cathcart stated they were taking out 10 and adding 10 trees.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they were taking out 17.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were Ficus trees being removed along the street.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in a real rough calculation, he came up with 490' for the perimeter. He figured the building was roughly 300' x 290' and 2 times each of those divided by 36, he came up with just under 41 required trees. The calculation had not counted any trees required for parking; it could be argued that it was inappropriate in a storage area for cars, but it seemed that there were a lot of trees that were not there.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had the same issue, but came up with a different number. He was wondering what the requirement was on the street improvement issue with the seven Ficus trees being conditioned on the project, to have the Ficus trees removed and replaced with 24"-box Fan Palm trees that would not even be as tall as he was. The streetscape took a big hit; he asked Staff for an explanation of why the street trees had become a part of the proposed project before them?

Mr. Garcia stated Public Works requested that the applicant remove the Ficus trees and plant the Palm trees; it was a Public Works request and not a City requirement that could be imposed on the applicant.

Mr. Menloue stated that the trees were damaging the sidewalk and that had created a trip hazard and part of the project had accommodations for sidewalk repair and tree removal.

Committee Member McCormack asked if Public Works had completed a study of the streetscape, or was a piece-meal decision made parcel by parcel along Katella?

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there was an overall street tree plan and the plan included removal of Ficus trees to be replaced.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was speaking about an urban design plan that would have a determination, for example, on Katella from Main to Glassell, or Main to Tustin.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she was not certain about Katella, but it had been done on Main Street. On Main Street with brick on the sidewalks and that type of thing; she was not certain about Katella.

Committee Member McCormack stated when the Tuskatella project came in he was not certain what trees had come in with that and he was questioning the plan and he understood the Ficus tree issue; it seemed that on such a large street to put in 24" Fan Palms was not appropriate.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the other issue was when looking down Katella all the other Fan Palm trees were set back behind the sidewalk and the proposed project had the trees out in the sidewalk. That was one of the great things about the Mexican Fan Palm tree was how they looked when they were aligned in beautiful rows; now there would be a row that jogged back and forth and it seemed very inappropriate.

Committee Member McCormack stated as they were the Design Review Committee those were the types of things that needed to be looked at.

Chair Cathcart stated in going down Katella further to the west there were Date Palm trees that were perfectly lined up.

Committee Member Woollett stated the tree suggested was a much broader tree than the Date Palm.

Chair Cathcart stated no, it was a much taller tree.

The Committee Members discussed the size and shapes of Palm trees.

Chair Cathcart asked if upon removal of the Ficus trees the new Palm trees would be placed in the same tree wells?

Mr. Garcia stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated those would be in the sidewalk and not consistent with the other plantings on Katella.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was anyway they could look at that; it was a remove and replace and it was a poor decision.

Chair Cathcart stated they were looking at two things; the applicant's proposal and Public Works recommendations. Perhaps the DRC should set up a meeting with Public Works to discuss the proposal.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they could certainly find out what the plan was and many of the trees were being replaced; but beyond that she was not well versed on what was occurring on Katella. They had not spoken about the building yet, but the DRC could certainly ask for the landscape plan to come back once they got more answers; something along those lines. If the Committee moved forward on the building portion of the proposal, the applicant would have a good idea of what was needed and they could go through plan check. She was just putting that out there so they could discuss that.

Chair Cathcart stated he had not wanted to hold up the applicant due to the Public Works suggestions and they could meet with Public Works.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they had just not known what the plan was.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the proposed project be bifurcated and to have the landscape plan return, addressing the tree count issue based on the zoning code.

Chair Cathcart stated the formula in many cases, and having dealt with it a lot, placed the designer in a position to plant more trees than was horticulturally acceptable. He would suggest to the applicant if they could not meet the tree count per the formula to return with a reason why that could not be met when they returned.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet 1L100, the one Ficus tree that would remain between the two different parts of the property was the one on the north end. But looking on sheet AS101 there was a call-out in the same spot on note 14 for some sort of a Nissan pylon sign. It would certainly be difficult to have the Ficus tree there with a pylon sign.

Mr. Menloue stated he believed the pylon sign would override the tree.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the plan it read: "one Ficus tree to remain." It was only on the one sheet and had not shown up on the landscape plan; if it was to remain it should

be there. The landscape architect should show what would be happening there. There were a lot of details missing. There were some hydro-zone issues going on there in terms of compatibility; the water needs for those zones were very different for the proposed plants. He wondered why there were not two trees (in an area he pointed to on the plans), as typically in those areas they anchored trees there to frame the buildings and they saw that all the time whether it was an auto dealer, warehouse, or Stater Bros. grocery store.

Mr. Menloue stated barring some other code, in the area Committee Member McCormack was referring to, there was a space where a car could be displayed.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a walkway; the space said "no car" and he felt there needed to be a tree at those two points, especially if the site was 30 trees shy.

Chair Cathcart stated they should move on to the building and he believed they had enough notes to bifurcate the landscape.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet AS101 there were some details of a roof plan; on the roof plan there was a rectangle that was not called-out and he was wondering if that was a mechanical screen.

Mr. Menloue stated he understood that the mechanical equipment had been moved to the ground and screened off without equipment on the roof.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on several sheets it showed some sort of a projecting element, but it showed a dotted line over that past the doorway. He reviewed the drawings with the applicant.

Mr. Menloue stated on the elevation on page A201 there was the Nissan sign above the front door and he believed that was what the dotted line represented.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not thought it was for the sign.

Mr. Menloue stated the Nissan element protruded from the building consistent with a column that he pointed out on the plans to the Committee Members. It was all to the Nissan standard that all dealerships had to follow; it was a worldwide program with all pre-made details. It would be the same material as the other signage and the protrusion would match the building material. He reviewed the drawings with the Committee Members.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans with the applicant and Mr. Menloue explained how the signage and building protrusion would work.

Committee Member Wheeler stated currently there was a tall sign in the setback and he asked if it would remain or be moved?

Mr. Menloue stated it would be replaced.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the signage would return to the DRC?

Mr. Garcia stated the signage would return to the DRC.

Committee Member McCormack stated the windows appeared as if they were just placed in the field of joints and asked if it would make more sense to have the windows line up with the panel joints?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be better, but there was no consistency in how they lined up and both windows were not lined up with the panels.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was just questioning whether it would pose a construction problem?

Committee Member Woollett stated not necessarily. The windows would appear to be punched through the façade, and not part of the façade, and it was a design element.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it had not bothered him as proposed.

Committee Member Woollett stated the colors were fine as proposed and he asked if there were any color samples for review?

Mr. Menloue stated there were no samples. The finish would be smooth.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Community Development Director of DRC No. 4539-11, Stadium Nissan, subject to the conditions and findings found in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The approval would not include signage, including a free-standing pylon sign included with the drawings.
- 2. There shall be no mechanical equipment on the roof.
- 3. The landscape portion of the proposal shall return to the Design Review Committee at a time preferred by the applicant and prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 4. The landscape plans to show more irrigation detail and would detail how the proposal met the tree requirement of the Commercial Zoning Code.
- 5. The street tree placement shall be studied for alignment.

Mr. Menloue asked if there was to be mechanical equipment on the roof could it be screened with a lightweight material to match the building finish?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be a bit nervous about that as the drawings appeared to be in conflict regarding the mechanical equipment and he would want to see the screen if screening was necessary.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(4) DRC No. 4551-11 – SALON 9–SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal for new pedestrian and projecting blade signs for a new beauty salon within the multi-tenant Jensen Building in the Plaza Historic District.
- 190 S. Glassell Street, Unit "A" (fronting on Almond Avenue)
- 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.

The applicants were present for any questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack stated he understood that the mountings and all the wiring would be the same.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the way he saw it was that the blade sign was in part an internally illuminated sign; in fact, it was noted that way on the detail. In the Old Towne Design Standards it was clearly stated that no internally illuminated signs shall be permitted or replaced. The proposal was more of a hybrid; part neon which was very nice, but in part it was half one and half the other and they would be starting down a slippery slope to allow a little portion of internal illumination. If someone came along and wanted more they would end up with cabinet signs.

Committee Member Woollett stated the reason it was different was that it was a metal cabinet, not plastic, and it was a push-through and a totally different concept. There was not a plastic sheath on the front; it was a metal sign and it simply had the cut-outs with push-through material that was allowed all the time in Old Towne.

Mr. Ryan stated that was true. Historically in what was called a cabinet sign, neon signs had originally been cabinets. The neon would go through with the fusing in the back and from that for blade signs they had metal cut-outs, which was a type of combination of both.

Chair Cathcart stated there was an Al Ricci sign at Art Angles and he asked if that was all neon or some push-through?

Mr. Ryan stated there were some push-throughs over there.

Chair Cathcart stated he was not certain how it had worked.

Mr. Ryan stated it was an area for clarification when the updates for Old Towne came through and there would be discussion on that topic.

Committee Member Woollett stated one of the reasons he noticed the push-through, and he was not certain how it was done, but it seemed complicated and expensive.

Committee Member McCormack pointed to an area on the sign and asked how an area was pushed-through?

Chair Cathcart stated he had seen it, but was not familiar with the process.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would seem as if some of the interior pieces would fall out and had nothing to hold on to. He understood the intent, but in looking at the forms some of the parts were so thin he was not certain how that was accomplished.

Mr. Ryan stated some of that might be an overlay. In reviewing the proposal it read "applied 3M white vinyl letters," but it was actually a design.

Committee Member McCormack stated just with gravity the pieces of metal would fall out.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in reviewing the detail on page 2 of 7, there was nothing shown protruding in that swirl design area. There was only the protruding oval and the protruding letters and numbers. It could be a surface design. The section shown also had not shown any internal lighting. There were wires for the external lighting, but not for the internal lighting. It might be a detail that had not yet been decided on.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wondered how they could be more informed about the process?

Committee Member McCormack stated the "donut" in the number "9" would fall out.

Committee Member Wheeler stated just applying a vinyl on top of the push-through could keep those forms in place.

Committee Member Woollett stated note B might be giving that information. It read: "push-through acrylic copy and graphic with surface applied 3m black vinyl overlay."

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they had approved other push-throughs in Old Towne he would not have a case. It was something they should watch out for so it would not grow.

Chair Cathcart stated it would be nice if Staff could have one of the sign company representatives be present during an Administrative Session to provide a presentation of how the process was done.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated they could do that as long as there was not anything in process for the sign vendor. Also, they would not need to use an Old Towne sign as an example since the DRC was more curious about the process in general.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was curious on the hanging sign. It had not seemed to be the same as the sign that appeared in the drawings. It called out for a 2" deep panel and it looked like foam or wood that was cut out. On note D the first layer was called out as ¼" white acrylic and the second layer was ¼" black acrylic; but he thought the first layer was just a thin film and not as thick. Note C referred to 3M vinyl border and it appeared to be a plastic piece that was applied.

Committee Member Woollett stated the sign could be made of 1/4" white acrylic, with 1/4" vinyl over the face of it for the whole sign.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared to be a foam block and he had been tempted to knock on the sign to see what it was made of.

Mr. Ryan stated he had not taken that close a look at the sign.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4551-11, Salon 9 Sign Program, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report, and with the additional condition:

1. The sign mounting brackets shall match the same mounting brackets as Haven Gastropub and Kimmie's restaurants.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, June 15, 2011.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:36 p.m.