

**CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL**

February 20, 2019

Committee Members Present: Anne McDermott - Chair
Mary Anne Skorpanich – Vice Chair
Tim McCormack
Carol Fox
Robert Imboden

Staff in Attendance: Anna Pehoushek, Assistant Community Development Director
Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner
Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner
Simonne Fannin, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:14

Chair McDermott opened the Administrative Session at 5:14 p.m. and inquired about Policy/Procedural Information.

Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner, stated there was nothing to report.

Chair McDermott stated she met with Bill Crouch, Community Development Director, and discussed the following:

- When the DRC meetings resume in the Council Chambers, the Pledge of Allegiance will be recited before the meetings.
- When the agenda is light, staff will provide educational presentations for the Committee such as the Brown Act or General Plan, or the Committee will have study sessions on lighting, signage, tree requirements or other topics
- The Committee will take time to review lessons learned on completed projects.

The Committee was reminded to fill out their Form 700.

The Committee provided edits to the February 6, 2019 minutes.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to close the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee meeting.

SECOND: Skorpanich
AYES: McCormack, Imboden, Skorpanich, McDermott and Fox
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Regular Session – 5:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Members McCormack, Imboden, Skorpanich, McDermott, and Fox were present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 6, 2019

Committee Member Skorpanich made a motion to approve the February 6, 2019 minutes as emended in the Administrative Session.

SECOND:	Fox
AYES:	McCormack, Skorpanich, McDermott, Fox and Imboden
NOES:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items

- (2) DRC No. 4864-16, Ophelia Apartments (formerly 999 Town and Country Mixed Use)
- Approval of final colors, materials, landscaping, and lighting for a new apartment building and related parking, representing Phase 2 of a horizontal mixed-use development.
 - 1055 Town and Country Road
 - Staff Contact: Anna Pehoushek, (714) 744-7228, apehoushek@cityoforange.org
DRC Action: Final determination.

Anna Pehoushek, Assistant Community Development Director, provided an overview of the project consistent with the staff report.

Chair McDermott asked the applicant if he had anything to add to the staff report.

Jeff Dolan, representing the applicant, did not have any further comments.

Chair McDermott opened the public comment portion of the meeting; there were no speakers so she brought it back to the Committee for comments and questions.

The Committee had questions and comments on the following:

- The position of the proposed colors and materials on the site plan. Mr. Dolan stated the split face wall will be natural gray along the west property line.
- The proposed retaining wall cap. Mr. Dolan stated a preference for the split face and cap in a natural gray finish.
- The “story” behind the design. The applicant stated their intent is contemporary and clean with monochromatic colors with accents used on the main corner where leasing office is located. Wood-looking textures will be used on the leasing portion of the building as well as the patio walls along Town & Country. The window frames will be black in order to provide contrast and to complement the architecture. The accent colors will consist of wood grain and black.
- The railing paint color. Mr. Dolan stated the railings will be painted monorail silver; the same as in the parking structure. Ed Cadavena, of the design team, responded the color was chosen to provide contrast and to tie in with the parking structure.
- The need for material call outs on the elevations.
- The difficult legibility of the plans.
- The need for detail at the corner trim and vertical reveal where the wood-like siding is being used.
- The jointing pattern for the stone veneer, noting that running bond is a poor choice for thinner frames.
- The frame on the northwest elevation appears to have different width legs.
- Satisfaction with the color and material substitution that was made from the previous approval.
- The wood material unifies the campus.
- Clarification of the use and finish of the stucco on the non-street facing exterior walls. The applicant stated there is a transition point between the two; however, it is around the

- side of the building where it will not be seen from the street. It will occur around the north side of the building along the freeway.
- Confirmation of what items will be returning to the DRC. Ms. Pehoushek stated the louvers/panels and light fixtures on the top deck of the parking structures would return. The Committee noted that it would be helpful to get a diagram of the stone layout on the frames, an image of what it looks like in a larger field and a sample of the corners that will be chosen.

Matt Jackson, landscape architect, explained the project's intention with their use of paving and paver patterns and how they want to create a pedestrian path of travel. Committee questions and comments continued as follows:

- The plans needed to convey a clearer sense of what pedestrians are going to see when they walk down the sidewalk.
- The need for physical samples of the various pavers for review.
- How the materials will be laid out.
- Confirmation that the paving plans would be clear to building inspectors. Mr. Dolan stated there is a paving legend that shows all the pictures of what it is and how it is laid out.
- The sidewalk finish. Ms. Pehoushek stated it will be finished per the City standard.
- The vehicular pavers have a smooth finish which could be very slippery when wet. The applicant agreed to add more texture/grit to the finish.
- The paver joints and selection of either a runner or a random runner; the DRC would like to have that pattern be a common thread.
- The stacked terrazzo is contemporary and the random running of the pavers is traditional; there should be a consistent contemporary look rather than falling back to a traditional runner. The applicant stated they are trying to match the existing look which is a straight running bond with a repeating pattern.
- Concern with the compatibility of the setting of the pedestrian and drive area pavers.
- Preference for the metal fence being painted black.
- The appropriateness of the bamboo hedge in the dog park was questioned. The applicant stated they will make sure there are no openings so that the dogs cannot get behind the bamboo.
- Satisfaction with the lighting choices.
- Expressed a preference for the stacked block retaining wall. The applicant stated that was a structural engineering decision.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4864-16 based on the findings and conditions that are listed in the staff report with the additional conditions as follows:

- The fiber cement corner details on the building will return to the DRC for further review prior to the certificate of occupancy for the parking structure.
- The stone cladding corner details and joint layouts shall return to the DRC for further review prior to the certificate of occupancy for the parking structure.
- The pavers with the grind finish shall be changed to shot blast finish.
- The perimeter retaining wall cap color is to match the field color finish and shall be flush to the face of the wall with grout to match the color of the block.
- The metal fences shall be painted black.

- All LED lighting shall be no more than 3000 Kelvin.
- Prior to certificate of occupancy for the parking structure, the DRC shall receive a cut sheet for the fiber cement paneling that shows the height of the scoring and panel sizes

SECOND: Imboden
AYES: McCormack, Skorpanich, Fox, McDermott and Imboden
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED.

- (3) DRC No. 4959-18, Sunrise Senior Assisted Living & Memory Care
- A proposal to demolish an existing 13,414 square foot office building to construct a 93-unit, 120 bed, 75,514 square foot, senior assisted living and memory care facility with 62 covered parking spaces. Concessions and waivers are requested under State Density Bonus Law for exceeding the floor area ratio and number of stories.
 - 1301 E. Lincoln Ave.
 - Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, (714) 744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
 - DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner, provided an overview of the senior assisted living and memory care facility consistent with the staff report.

Greg McCafferty, applicant, approached and introduced the team. He provided an explanation of how the site planning developed based on the terrain. He also discussed the limited visibility of the retaining wall.

Mark Hendrickson, architect, provided a history of HPI and consideration of the neighbors and the existing circulation patterns in the project design.

Jared Bohonus, landscape architect, explained that the landscape concept responds to current irrigation and water restrictions and provided brief overview of the proposed plant palette.

Chair McDermott asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the item. There were no speakers. She asked the applicant to provide a brief overview of how the building will be used.

Philip Kroskin explained the types of services that will be provided and the number of employees at the facility.

The Committee had comments and questions on the following:

- Need samples of the paving materials. Mr. Bohonus responded that he did not bring any, but explained the intent is to bring warmth to the landscape areas with the use of enhanced architectural paving finish.
- The garden patio on the lower level, in particular the limited outdoor space in relation to the number of assisted living residents, but a larger space for the memory care.
- The fence height relative to the street on Buena Vista. Mr. Hendrickson stated it is a 42 inch guardrail. Mr. Ortlieb explained the City has a chain link fence along the alley; however staff prefers that they put a wrought iron fence that is higher and safer. Staff suggested that the Committee supplement condition number 16 by adding some type of wording to instruct the applicant to provide additional fence height if there is an additional available concession or waiver.
- The need for an elevation that shows the height of the retaining wall in relation to the units. Mr. Hendrickson responded it is 6 to 7 feet above the finished floor.
- Clarification of the tree requirement for this project. Mr. Ortlieb responded that a tree removal permit will be required and staff is using the Landscape Design Standards as a guideline. The project does not meet the City's requirements but concessions and waivers are also available under State Density Bonus Law.

- The height of the fence in relation to the Municipal Code's maximum height. Mr. Ortlieb responded that the commercial regulations do not have any specifics on wall heights on the lower side of the wall.
- Clarification of the parking requirement. Mr. Ortlieb explained that staff required a parking demand study which showed ample parking, with surplus, even at peak times.
- Whether there are any special setback, streetscape or landscape requirements along Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Ortlieb responded there is nothing special and they meet all of the setback requirements.
- Concern about views from the residents who live up above on Oceanview and removal of mature trees; in this instance there are a lesser number of trees that are going back in and they are all smaller stature than what is being removed. The tree vocabulary should honor the park; many of the proposed trees are more suitable for patios.
- Concern about the neighbors who have not been notified about this project before it goes to the Planning Commission; especially the ones who will be looking down on the development.
- The landscaping is not responding to the loudness of the architecture, walls and edges.
- Supported a higher fence adjacent to the alley and the park.
- Concern about the scale and massing of the project on the property; it is very tight on that site.
- The narrow width of the sidewalk from the main entrance along Oceanview and a deep alley created along the northern edge next to the retaining wall. The sunken terrace is a lot larger than the patio space; there is an imbalance.
- Pleased with the imaginative use of an odd-shaped site.
- Concern about the change of the back of the site from being fairly wooded to becoming very harsh.
- Clarification of the direction of the roof slope on the plans.
- A desire to reduce the massing of the tower near the alley and to move the stairs to the roof access to a tower that is closer to the park or Lincoln Avenue.
- Encouraged the applicant to further pop out the double bay frames on Lincoln to achieve more relief on the façade.
- Suggested integrating trees along the fence to soften it.
- Noted that the center element on the north façade that has the shed roof is working against fitting in with the neighborhood. It would fit in better if the roof was continuous.
- Suggested turning the two hipped roofs into gables.
- The elevator exiting out to the bistro seems odd and it may be difficult to navigate for people with wheelchairs; they should try to keep the circulation simple and direct.
- The intensification of development on the site is very heavy and the landscaping needs to be stronger if it is going to be a successful project. A consistent edge would create unity and softness.
- Suggested that the fence be made of alternating panels, planters, or use of vines to break it up.
- Suggested pulling the tiered planters on the other side of the fence at the northwest corner up high enough so that they also become the perimeter wall to the project.
- Suggested creating some armature that is more residential by putting an arbor on the retaining wall with vines on it to create a landscape edge.

- Suggested making the entry court round, instead of square, to be more efficient and open up some planter space against the building.
- The lighting should have clear direction for safety and highlighting the landscaping.
- Concern that there was such a large elevation with no lighting on the building. Mr. Bohonus responded that they don't have a tendency to highlight the architecture; they don't want lights shining into the rooms.
- Suggested planting larger trees with pendant lights to light the ground plane or placing lights under the roof sheds. The applicant stated they could consider lighting in the landscape.

Chair McDermott asked the applicant if they would like to continue the item in order to refine some of the concerns of the Committee rather than having the committee recommend denial of the project. Mr. McCafferty was in favor of a continuance and stated they will work on the following:

- Review the landscaping, especially along the north edge.
- Focus on the north elevation and figure out how they can make it less foreboding.
- Review the exterior lighting to make sure suits the need of the facility.
- Refine some of the roof structure so that it is more cohesive.
- Placement of the stair tower.
- Breaking up the fence treatment
- They cannot do anything with the setback along Lincoln due to the utility poles.

Committee Member Imboden reiterated that the largest visual impact this project will have is to the people above it and they have been ignored. Right now they look at mature trees, but this project is offering a rooftop with AC units, no trees and a fence. The roof form could be made more attractive by screening the rooftop equipment and planting large trees on that end. The Committee feels the architectural style is appropriate. The neighbors will be noticed when the project goes to Planning Commission and it is better to be sensitive to them now.

Mr. McCafferty stated they will do neighborhood outreach.

Committee Member Skorpanich made a motion to continue DRC No. 4959-18, Sunrise Senior Assisted Living & Memory Care in order to give the applicant an opportunity to revise the plans based on the Committee's comments and recommendations.

SECOND: McCormack
AYES: McDermott, McCormack, Skorpanich, Fox, and Imboden
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made to adjourn at 9:33 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, March 6, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

MOTION: Imboden
SECOND: Skorpanich
AYES: McDermott, McCormack, Skorpanich, Imboden and Fox
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.