CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

August 17, 2011

Committee Members Present: 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 Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

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

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda. There was no Policy or Procedural information to impart.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting of July 20, 2011. The minutes from the DRC meeting on August 3, 2011 would be held over to the next meeting due to lack of quorum. Corrections and changes were noted.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if there was anything further to discuss. There was nothing further.

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

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Bill Cathcart was absent and there was one open seat on the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

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:

(a) July 20, 2011

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting of July 20, 2011 with changes and corrections as noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(b) August 3, 2011

This set of minutes was held over for the next meeting, due to lack of quorum of Committee Members who had been present at the August 3, 2011 Design Review Committee meeting.

The following Item 2 was removed from the Consent Items and opened for discussion:

(2) DRC No. 4297-07 - MAIN MEDICAL PLAZA

- A proposal to extend the original entitlement for 3 years.
- 396 S. Main Street
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

The reading of the Staff Report was waived.

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

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans had not appeared to align with the report. Staff had stated there were changes to the plant palette and the changes had not appeared on the plans. He was referring to the change to the Raphiolepis to make sure it was Clara.

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated what had happened was that originally there were plans that had been submitted to the DRC as part of the DRC's original review; the changes required to the plans would not have been made until the applicant submitted construction documents to the Building Division. The plans that had been originally submitted would be the plans that would need to be approved and reapproved now.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the changes to the landscape were additional conditions that had been made to the original plans.

Ms. Nguyen stated that was correct and the changes would be made prior to submitting to the Building Division.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the proposal be approved for renewal in three years based on the conditions that had been discussed and documented at the original DRC review.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the plans would return to the DRC to be reviewed for the landscape changes? The City had not had a landscape person who could review the plans.

Ms. Nguyen stated City Staff would review the changes to the plans. The applicant had made the changes on a set of plans that she had received from the applicant. It had been decided that since those plans were different than the original entitlement that the originally reviewed plans would be used.

Vice Chair Woollett stated if the proposal before them was approved they would be extending the original entitlement, which included the original plans and the original additional conditions.

Applicant, Amer Kasm, address on file, stated nothing was changing except extension of the entitlements.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans would be changed to confirm to the conditions.

Ms. Nguyen stated that was correct.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was one thing on there that he had recommended; he would state it again as he had a strong opinion on the grass choice. The plans noted that the swale grass used would be the Leather Leaf Sedge and he had mentioned the Sedge would be a brown color. It was a swale area that typically had water and that plant would normally be green if flushed with water, but the sedge was brown. It would appear somewhat odd to have a brown plant in a water area and would typically signify that the plant was dead. In fact, it would not be dead as it was a naturally brown-colored plant, but most people would assume a brown plant was dead. He wanted to caution the applicant and suggest using an alternate plant choice. It was also the largest plantable area on the plans, which would appear dead all year and he wanted the applicant to be aware that the plant would be brown all year. He suggested that another grass choice be made, something that belonged in an area with a lot of water in it and would stay green. The applicant would not need to return to the DRC to change the grass species.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to extend the approval of DRC No. 4297-07, Main Medical Plaza, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report; subject to the conditions contained in the original approval and with the added recommendation for a change of plant material as provided by Committee Member McCormack.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4558-11 – THE BRUERY PROVISIONS

- A proposal to install a 528 sq. ft. outdoor patio at the rear of a beer/wine specialty food store.
- 141 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

This item could not be heard due to a lack of quorum of Design Review Committee Members. Committee Member Wheeler would be recused from the item due to the location of his business and Chair Cathcart was absent.

(4) DRC No. 4563-11 - PCH HOT DOGS

- A proposal to replace awnings and add new awnings and signage.
- 3438 E. 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, John Tomberlin, address on file, stated he represented PCH Hot Dogs and Abbot Awnings. He stated the current state of the location looked old and ratty and they were trying to improve the facility and also provide more shade to the patrons sitting at the benches. They were not adding any signage, except what was existing in the front of Pacific Coast Hot Dogs and there were existing monument signs. As far as the colors presented; those were their logo colors and it had been for 18 years and 15 years specifically at the Orange facility. He presented awning material and stated it was a Sunbrella material and they were trying to go with a vinyl product that would not fade. It would be stretched on a galvanized tube frame that would be powder-coated to match the material. The posts that held the awning were 2' x 2' posts, with not much live or dead load and those would be powder-coated black. The colors would match the existing colors. He presented photos and samples.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed with Staff's comments in that he found the proposal a bit disturbing. There were a couple of things that worried him; the first concern was the very low pitch. The low pitch seemed odd for a fabric structure and it would worry him from a technical nature that there would be areas that would pond water.

Mr. Tomberlin stated he believed they were over 25%; he probably needed ½ and 12. First of all the company would not warranty something too flat and they would not want water to puddle or have any staining. They liked the material choice that they could pressure wash.

Committee Member Wheeler stated his main concern was that the awning was being designed to cover the existing flatwork and following the profile of the flatwork; but in walking or driving by the structure it would not appear to agree with the building. It related to the pavement in terms of shade, but not to the building. It was burying the building and with the flat structure and the large expanse, it had all the charm of a carport and had not enhanced or worked with the building. He stated he had come up with some alternatives and presented the drawings to the applicant. They were suggestions. He suggested using a form that matched the octagon shape of the building and extended out as far as it could in the front and he suggested that a steeper pitch be used. Using a different approach would provide a better appearance. It would not cover as much of the pavement and the tables might need rearranging. Another alternative would be to

have an arched awning with a transept type of arch awning going in each direction. That would cover less space and be a bit more complicated. Another idea he had was to come out of each of three facets with an arched awning, but it was tricky geometry where the awnings came together.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had some of the same issues as presented by Committee Member Wheeler. When looking at the awnings, he wondered why the one in the front and the one in the back were different and he had a problem with it being so flat. There almost needed to be support pieces so close together and he was concerned with having a buildup of water. What was there currently caught your eye and the alternate suggestions that Committee Member Wheeler presented would be better choices. He liked alternate no. 2 of the suggestions provided by Committee Member Wheeler and he felt it was successful in grabbing attention and had a lot of appeal. The site had been there so long and if they changed it, it might have the appearance of a photo store. The site was always crowded and a familiar place to go.

Mr. Tomberlin stated he had looked at it in different ways. The arch they had now created a problem, their idea for years was that the site looked like a light house and that was their logo a light house. The current awning had not shown off the shape of the building as much as they would have liked. The roof design was very nice. Going back to the pitch, at its lowest point to the concrete, and it sloped quite a bit to the rear, at 6' 8" they would be more at a 1 and 12 pitch. They had a water problem and they lost a lot of business with water running onto their counters and a new awning would stop that. Another idea was to leave the site existing and attempt something else to divert the water, but they were getting way too low and the numbers were not working. They were really more concerned with the wind, water, and the gap that was currently there. They wanted to tie the new awning into one unit and show off the structure of the building. They wanted to attract more patrons year round. They had been in business for over 18 years and were planning on franchising up the coast, Pacific Coast Hot Dogs.

Vice Chair Woollett asked the applicant if he was open to any of the alternate suggestions that had been presented?

Mr. Tomberlin stated he was open to alternate no. 1, although that had not seemed to work for them because of the moisture as he had explained.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he was referring to where the awnings joined the structure?

Vice Chair Woollett stated it appeared that the alternate no. 1 was close to the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the idea for alternate no. 1 was that the awning would come off the existing fascia or just below it.

Mr. Tomberlin stated that was where they had attached to currently. Attaching below the fascia would not allow enough head room.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in alternate design no. 1 there would be less of a head room problem. He suggested that if the applicant went with a design as presented in his alternate no. 1 design, and to go as steep as they could and instead of using a rigid valance where it was wrapped around the metal frame to allow the awning to hang with a scalloped edge.

Mr. Tomberlin stated they had planned on having a valance.

Vice Chair Woollett asked Committee Member Wheeler if he considered the south edges of the proposals. They reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the current design had a post in a location where a car door opened; it was a questionable interpretation as to whether the post should be moved back about 2 feet. On the alternate that he presented he had not included any posts. They would need to configure the posts in reference to the car doors.

Mr. Tomberlin stated they had looked at that and that was why they would need to stay back and cantilever out. With the alternate no. 2 design there would be an ADA issue. He would certainly have no objection with that design, but there would be an issue with post placement.

Ms. Nguyen asked if the posts could be moved to the center of the tables?

Mr. Tomberlin stated it was something they could consider.

Ms. Nguyen asked if the DRC would recommend that the awning extend beyond the benches? On the north end the awning stopped at the bench. The 10' setback was from the front of the bench. There was a provision in the City Code that provided for an awning in the front that could come out as far as 1/3 the setback as long as the front of the pole was behind the setback.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was something that could be considered as long as it met the ordinance, and matched the design aesthetically.

Committee Member McCormack stated the post in the center of the pilaster made sense, to move it elsewhere would not make sense. The canopy going beyond would be another option.

Ms. Nguyen stated the canopy could cantilever beyond the post within the required setback.

Committee Member McCormack stated the posts on top of the pilasters could be the light house thematic statement, instead of the smaller low profile posts.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if people sat on the benches?

Mr. Tomberlin stated sometimes.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if people sat on the surfboards?

Mr. Tomberlin stated sometimes.

The Committee Members reviewed the setback area with Staff and the applicant.

Ms. Nguyen stated the current design stopped at the bench. She asked if the DRC would want the awning to extend beyond the bench?

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for August 17, 2011 Page 9 of 15

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be another option to consider. He could not promise they would approve that design, but something they could consider.

Ms. Nguyen asked if there was any issue with the color or the pitches not matching in the back and front?

Vice Chair Woollett and Committee Member McCormack stated they had no problems with the color.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with a greater pitch in the front it would be better and they might want the same pitch in the back.

Mr. Tomberlin stated they could do that. They were attempting to keep the fascia line the same to match the detail of the building for aesthetics. That could be lowered.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the slope in the front match the slope in the back, to have the same consistency in the front and the back.

Mr. Tomberlin stated in securing the awning to the fascia that they could stay with the same pitch to have it look uniform; it would be taller due to the grade.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4563-11, PCH Hot Dogs, to allow the applicant to explore alternate designs.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(5) DRC No. 4572-11 - FINE WORK TATTOO

- A proposal for a new wall sign on a one-story, non-contributing building located on a spoke street within the Old Towne Historic District.
- 745 W. Chapman 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, except that the maximum sign length should not exceed 20 feet as required for Plaza and Spoke Street wall signs.

Applicant, Jimmy Fuller, address on file was present for questions.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated regarding the sign length on his calculations the sign came to 29' with the medallions and 26' with just the lettering and that was quite a bit over the allowable sign length. The sign had not met the Design Standards. The plastic logos were contrary to the standards as well and removing them from the sign would be a plus. "Lexan" was plastic and he was not certain how they could work around that. He could not find anywhere in the Standards that back-lighting was acceptable. On page 20 of the Standards it read: No internally illuminated sign shall be permitted or replaced; it included individually mounted letters. The issues with the sign were the length, the way it was illuminated, and any plastic material that would be used.

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

Mr. Ryan stated Lexan on the back of the letters was to keep moisture and everything out, it would not be exposed. On the issue with the back-lighting, and there had been other projects that had been approved on an on-going basis with back-lighting or a hallo; because that would not be a direct point light source. When the sign ordinance was written, and it was a long time ago, the issue was with lighted cabinet signs. There were existing signs that had internal illumination. The existing building was already encroaching on the public right-of-way about a 1½ and it would be difficult to place externally illuminated lighting fixtures on the outside of the building. In considering neon, part of the classification of neon signs had use of back-lighting, or hallo lighting, and provided sufficient day time contrast. He agreed the City's sign code needed updating as to lighting technology. The intent was that the applicant wanted lighting and had not had the opportunity to encroach anymore onto the setback so back-lighting might be a good solution.

Vice Chair Woollett stated back-lit signs were allowed.

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated just for clarification the sign would not be more than 20' in length and not include the logos.

Mr. Fuller stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wondered what the nexus between LED and incandescence and how could they bridge that. Incandescent looked historical and LED looked modern and it had always been his issue. He always had a problem with an Old Towne light having a high efficiency modern bulb.

Mr. Ryan stated the light on the front of the Assistance League was being used to illuminate the street number; they were trying to soften the light so it would not appear as brand new light. In addition on another property where they had proposed Gooseneck lamps and the project was approved by the DRC, but when the applicant got to the Building counter the energy code kicked in and the applicant needed to find an energy efficient Gooseneck lamp. In the application of the Design Standards they were finding themselves butting up against the technology issues. The City's sign code needed to be brought up to current standards.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if the applicant had any discussion with the sign people regarding the color of the LED?

Mr. Fuller stated he was the sign person.

Vice Chair Woollett stated there were many options for the LED color and it would not need to be white.

Mr. Fuller stated they used different colors like red, green, and blue and he could not tell them if they had an off-white LED light available.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they could do orange.

Mr. Fuller stated they could research and find an LED manufacturer that offered other colors and to request a full product line of white lights.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were probably many historic districts that were having the same problems with lighting.

Mr. Ryan verified that the Committee Members were suggesting something warmer for the lighting?

Vice Chair Woollett stated he was trying to probe the intent of the Code because, as stated, the Code would not take into consideration the light sources that they now had. Normally when there was an objection to fluorescent lights it was the really cool bluish white that they would object to and the LED was not that cool color, it was more like a daylight white.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the Lexan backing had to be clear? He suggested that they use an off-white color.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was a good solution.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4572-11, Fine Work Tattoo, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report, and with the additional conditions:

- 1. Signage shall be revised to eliminate the logo stars on each end of the sign.
- 2. The total length of the sign shall be no more than 20'.
- 3. The height of the sign shall be no more that 2/3 the height of the band on the building in which the sign would be affixed.
- 4. The total area of the sign shall be no more than 33.5' square feet.
- 5. The Lexan material at the back of the sign shall be colored slightly to light beige.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(6) DRC No. 4582-11 – GOODE RESIDENCE

- A proposal to change out door and windows on a rear porch.
- 438 S. Grand 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, Jonathan Salmon, address on file, was present for questions.

Public Comment

Steve Bennett, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the plans had been reviewed and they were pleased with the design of the door in only making it wider; and they were taking out inconsistent siding and replacing it with something that was uniform. In the drawings, the windows had the appearance of the old style windows with the decorative ends at the bottom. They liked the idea of the banding continuing around the back. The OTPA supported the project.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated he very much liked service porches. He grew up in Pasadena in a home that was built in 1913 and it had a wonderful service porch. The home had all the modern conveniences of an electric kitchen, with a refrigerator but the neighbors had a service porch with an ice box and every day or so the ice truck would pull up. The ice man would open up the back of the truck and place a sack of burlap over his shoulder and grab the ice tongs, grab the ice, and put the ice block in the ice box. The kids would all reach for fragments of ice. There were ice men, bread men, butchers, and people would come and go delivering to the service porches. It was a real feature. All that went away when the service people went away. He thought it was important to maintain the memory of the service porch and he was in favor of continuing the trim band, and he would go just a bit further. He suggested maintaining the bead board; it was such an iconic feature of a service porch. He thought the horizontal siding in the upper band area would be appropriate, but to put "beadboard" around the base and keep the feel of the service porch.

Mr. Salmon stated he had his AutoCAD person put those in after he had received Dan's information and he had already thought that the trim should be maintained.

Mr. Ryan stated he had seen some service porches that had a continuous sill that wrapped around.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was what he was suggesting and if the applicant could find a similar bead board it would not have to match exactly, but it would keep the memory of that form there.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4582-11, Goode Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the additional condition:

1. A continuous head trim be maintained as mentioned in the Staff Report, and also a continuous sill trim under the windows be maintained under the windows that was previously the service porch and instead of horizontal siding below, that the use of "beadboard" be used to match the original as closely as possible.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 7, 2011.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:33 p.m.