CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

April 4, 2012

Committee Members Present: Carol Fox

Robert Imboden Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:06 p.m. with a review of the Agenda.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, stated Agenda Item No. 3 had been deleted from the Agenda tonight and there were no additional changes or procedural information to impart. He welcomed Committee Member Imboden to the Design Review Committee.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of March 7, 2012. Corrections and changes were noted.

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

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, 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 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: March 7, 2012

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled meeting of the Design Review Committee on March 7, 2012 with changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Robert Imboden

ABSENT: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4528-11 - LOTUS WELLNESS CENTER

- A preliminary review to seek direction regarding exterior design changes to a DRC approved project on August 3, 2011.
- 900 E. Lincoln Avenue

• Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org

Previous DRC Review: August 3, 2011DRC Action: Preliminary Review

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

Applicant, Deepak Moosad, address on file, stated they had started to expand the building and it appeared as a little house getting a big expansion. They had clients that would be looking for a commercial building and drive past their business as it appeared more like a home. They were spending so much money to remodel and it was the right time to incorporate a change; they wanted to blend in more with the surrounding community. Doug Ely had agreed to review the project with them and provide his expertise. One of the problems was the need to maximize their parking and also provide for an outdoor space for patients.

The applicant's architect, Doug Ely, address on file, stated he had received a call from Mr. Moosad that they were wanting to make some changes to their initial concept, but that the project had already begun as initially proposed. He went out and reviewed what was planned and looked at the site context. The concept they wanted was something more contemporary. He presented plans of the initial submittal and of what had been approved. Three of the DRC members who were present had been present at the time the project had initially come through.

Mr. Ely pointed out the various elements on the plans he presented and where the addition was located and the landscape areas. He presented the current existing construction document elevations. The Committee Members reviewed the documents. On the east side there was an existing wall, which had been a property line. Since then the lots had been joined together. In expanding to the other property line, the plans had called for a property line roof. The building official had stated that the type of roof proposed was not required, however, it was the roof that had been approved by the DRC. They were an odd set of conditions as they had been written in, but not shown on the plans. There had not been a plan to cohesively unify the roof; there were several individual roofs all coming together. In order to get a sense of what that roof would look like they created a 3D model. He presented an aerial view to the Committee Members and pointed out the various portions of the project. There were no window openings or fenestrations on one wall that he pointed out on the plans. In discussing Mr. Moosad's concerns and also the fact that there was not sufficient overflow space, their waiting room was very small, and there was a portion of the site that had not been addressed. He proposed the addition of a plastered wall to provide for a closed-off space and landscaping. There was also a sidewalk that would

link to the public sidewalk. They had submitted a few approaches to Staff and Staff selected one of the two that was preferred. It was before the DRC for review and recommendations that would allow them to determine if the project would move forward. The proposal before them had parapet walls around the perimeter and to envelope the current design with a series of walls that responded to some contextual issues. He presented photos of surrounding properties. The properties across the street were "fast retail." The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Mr. Ely stated the back of the building was not resolved. On walls that were on the property line, and he was proposing a recess with a perforated metal screen to provide for some visual relief. There was an opportunity to put in a trellis over the patio area, which was something the center would like to have. The windows on the original design were divided light windows, double-hung. With the new windows being the single panes of glass, it would blend in with what they had. It was never the intention to replace all of their windows.

Mr. Ely pointed out the entry and what he was proposing and stated he proposed to add a column and add a flared element and entrance that was more appropriate for state of the art health care. It was tough to blend in with what was already in construction. Construction had stopped, as they wanted to see if there was a way that the building could be handled and it could be done without changing the interior spaces. He pointed out various aspects of the project and the changes he proposed to make. There was a strange thing happening with windows and he was surprised it had been approved. There was a very low window and he would bring that up. He wanted to unify everything and have a more contemporary look.

Mr. Ely stated he was before the DRC to get advice, to see if the DRC was in support of the changes he was proposing before they went through the changes. There were many details that had not been worked out yet.

Chair Woollett asked what the Building Department issues were, and was that why a Building Department representative was present; he asked the audience member if he was present for the item that was being presented?

The City's Building Official, David Khorram, stated no, he was just present to observe the meeting.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Fox asked if the roof drainage had been resolved?

Mr. Ely stated a cricket would be required, with a scupper and a downspout.

Committee Member Fox asked if there would be any internal drain lines?

Mr. Ely stated he felt that would be too cumbersome to take on and from a detail element he could design them sympathetically. The drain lines could be confined to a few points. There was a portion where the roof drained and would be collected in a gutter; he showed where that was on the drawings.

Committee Member Fox stated there were so many little parts of roofs and there would be a lot of downspouts needed.

Mr. Ely stated surprisingly there would not be that many. There was an area where spillage would go to one area and with two other downspouts, with everything shedding off the back. It was not a design element he had worked out yet.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was a huge opportunity to turn it into a more contemporary design and the scuppers could enter the landscape as a feature. The scupper could go into a pot and become a landscape treatment. The manner in which the water collection was treated could become part of the landscape treatment.

Mr. Ely asked if he was thinking instead of downspouts to use chains and things?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes, it was an opportunity to do something different.

Chair Woollett stated Mr. Ely was before them to gather if it was appropriate to move forward with the project; he had no problem with what was being proposed. They had just approved another healthcare facility that was going through some substantial changes for the same reasons. His only concern was the fact that there was not representation on the south side.

Committee Member Fox stated the direction was very appropriate and responded to the context quite well. As far as the design direction, the detailing of the parapet with the double trim was a really nice direction.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed. To have it appear more contemporary and not look like a day care facility.

Mr. Ely stated he was also cautious of it not appearing as if it was tacked on. With the traffic on that street going so fast, a person's eye had not looked toward the residential units, but in seeing a continuous mass that was recognizable. With updating the site it would be recognizable and it would fit in with other businesses on that street.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the direction he was presenting was fine and it would be a great asset to the street and the building. On the rendering there were exposed parapet ends, on sheet 5 there was an example, and to him it appeared very weak. He suggested an expansion to have a larger end to the parapets. He would suggest on the roof plan to have a box out.

Committee Member Fox stated the east and west elevations were well resolved, but the one facing the street had the weakest application of the concept.

Committee Member Wheeler reviewed that detail on the drawings with the applicant.

Committee Member Fox stated she felt it was not enough, the ordering of it appeared tacked on, the front façade had a tacked-on quality with those ends and it might be better to take that off and have the roof shed exposed. With a mix of sheds and parapets.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it could be boxed off?

Mr. Ely stated he had another approach, which had been submitted to Staff and that was the direction he was exploring. He provided a drawing of another concept. It had the mix of parapet, shed and parapet. The problem on the one end was there was a Gable roof.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested adding some heavy returns, to conceal the thin end.

Mr. Ely stated there would be too much expense to take off the roof.

Committee Member Imboden stated there were clearly two different concepts; where one added pieces and allowed the roof to peek out, and where the other worked more to conceal the roof. He was finding the same weakness that the concept was not carried out everywhere. He suggested to either thicken the ends or returning the ends and have the concept be more consistent. The decision needed to be made whether they were looking at volumes or looking at walls. He was fine with either design, and overall it was a very good project.

Chair Woollett stated in terms of the south elevation and if there had not been anything done to that elevation due to the cost involved, the other approach might work better.

Mr. Ely stated that was the reason for the alternate renderings as the back had fallen apart a bit and without the parapet wall going all the way across. The back was not visible and he had not wanted to state that because it was not visible who would care. He wanted the architecture to be resolved no matter what vantage point it was being viewed from. On a scale of how it was experienced that elevation was the least viewed.

Committee Member Imboden stated the properties to the back were at a lower elevation than the subject site. The area directly behind the building was not accessible.

Mr. Moosad stated it would be the employee parking area and was only accessible from the other side. They had a shared driveway. There were only four parking spots and the trash enclosure was in that area.

Chair Woollett stated with the building being a wellness center and having a holistic approach, the integrity of the design was important; the wrong message would be sent if there was not consistency around the entire building.

Committee Member Fox stated the alternate design would be a more cost-effective solution and he could get away without doing the back with the use of the cubic pavilions.

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for April 4, 2012 Page 7 of 29

Mr. Ely stated where the wall would be pealed away at that particular point, they could express what was there and not hide anything. There was the combination of parapet wall, Gable, and shed roofs.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt it was a statement of just ignoring the back of the building and he could not personally accept that and the theme needed to be carried around to the back of the building, and not feel that the people who parked in the back were not important; it would be a vital mistake in the design.

Mr. Ely stated the only way to resolve that would be to adopt the other approach.

Committee Member Fox stated she would be okay with the back not being addressed so strongly and in doing the peaking out of roofs.

Committee Member McCormack stated one of the things on the site plan was that the two paths touched and where was the front entry? He suggested that one of the paths be subordinated and the other be more celebrated to differentiate the two. On the trellis to not have the post hit in there (he pointed out the area on the drawings) and to have the trellis hover above the entry as a type of top to the initial celebratory entrance. He reviewed the area with Mr. Ely.

Chair Woollett asked the applicant if they had provided sufficient input?

Mr. Ely stated yes, and he felt he was on the right course.

The item was presented for preliminary review. A motion was not needed.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4625-12 - SANTA FE DEPOT SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE

- A comprehensive update to the 1993 Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan that proposes new guidance for urban design, historic building design guidelines, and modifications to building height standards.
- Santa Fe Depot Specific Plan planning area; approximately 102 acres generally bounded by Walnut Avenue on the north, Palmyra Avenue on the south, Olive Street on the east, and Pixley Street on the west
- Staff Contact: Anna Pehoushek, 714-744-7228, apehoushek@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

This Item was removed from the Agenda due to location conflicts of Committee Members.

(4) DRC No. 4605-11 – CHAPORANGE CENTER

- A proposal to remodel the façade of the building and create a sign program.
- 2832-2844 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, Hyung Jin Seo, address on file, stated he was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the doors would be replaced?

Mr. Seo stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what was happening with the fence in the back?

Mr. Seo stated it would remain as is.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if any thought had been given to putting stucco around the trash enclosure?

Mr. Seo stated they could do that.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the Palm tree out in front was dead?

Mr. Seo reviewed the photos for the Palm tree.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the biggest design issue would be the cornice; he was not certain it added anything and he suggested a simpler rectangular cornice. He suggested a replacement of the fence at the back of the property with something to match and add stucco around the trash enclosure.

Committee Member Fox stated on the site plan she asked what the return walls with an overhead beam were for as it had not appeared on the elevations?

Mr. Seo stated it was just indicating the roof overhang and should have appeared with dashed lines.

Committee Member Fox stated she felt the proposal was a great improvement to what was there, with the stone and stucco and a huge improvement to the building. The stone placement in some areas might not work; there were a lot of ins and outs and they would want to check to ensure the door openings were not impeded, those areas needed to be resolved.

Mr. Seo stated there were details on the plan sheet A6. They reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Fox stated the angled areas needed to be looked at for the thickness of the veneer or if the doors needed to be shifted. Staff's question regarding the extension of the parapet, she found that a bit problematic to have the parapet just sort of flapping in the breeze. She suggested that it should connect back and thicken it and she would be okay with that. The sign should be squared off as drainage behind the sign would be a problem. The building was so visible from Chapman and given that there was the stucco and stone it was creating more of a mass and the thin wall areas also needed to be thickened.

Committee Member McCormack stated the improvements were much better than the wood siding, but he had gotten stuck on the proposed red roof and he suggested a champagne colored metal, a more contemporary roof. The roof as proposed was just glaring.

Mr. Seo stated that had been his recommendation to the owner as well, but for some reason she wanted a red roof.

Committee Member McCormack stated all the stone and color choices for the building were all earthy, and then there was a red roof. A metal roof would be a better choice.

Mr. Seo stated his design approach was to match with the store front color.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was not only the color but the bulkiness of the proposed material.

Committee Member Imboden stated adding another texture of the red tile to the roof would not get them further along. He wanted to understand any lighting that was being proposed. All the signs, whether they were on the building or free-standing, were proposed to be internally lit. There were also exterior wall sconces, but there was not a detail for those. He wanted to be very sensitive to the point of the light and visibility to neighboring properties, people driving by, and pedestrians on site. He had not wanted spot lights shining directly into anyone's face. He believed in site lighting, but not glare that would come from an exposed source point.

Mr. Seo stated they would choose an indirect light source.

Committee Member Imboden stated he concurred with what had already been stated. The red tile was not awful, but there might be a better choice.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the Staff Report had mentioned that the DRC had not normally approved cabinet signs. There were cabinet signs on the project west of the site and they were absolutely hideous. They had not approved cabinet signs in Orange, unless it was a

hardship. The signs proposed would be applied to stucco and he would be in favor of suggesting channel letters rather than cabinet signs. The monument sign was okay.

Committee Member McCormack stated the last one that they approved was on Tustin and had not turned out very well. He agreed that channel letters should be used.

Applicant, In Young Kim, stated he had five tenants that preferred the cabinet signs. If they had not agreed with the new sign program he would scrap the sign program. He would in the future as new tenants moved in propose that condition to new tenants that would require a change to channel letters. He could not force his current tenants to change their signs to channel letters.

Chair Woollett stated the sign changes would be paid for by the tenants.

Mr. Kim stated to make it easier for his tenants they would share the costs. All the tenants had economy problems and he wanted the DRC to take that into consideration on requesting changes to the existing tenant signage.

Chair Woollett stated it was not against the rules to have those, but there was so much glare connected with them. He wondered if there were other materials that would not have so much glare and they had come to solutions such as this in the past to mitigate the effect of the glare.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not so much the glare from that type of signage, but those types of signs were typically not well maintained. When a tenant changed, a new piece of plastic was just put on and the cabinet remained the same and over time there was deterioration, with rusted cabinets and such. With the use of channel letters the entire sign was changed and more care seemed to be given to that type of signage.

Mr. Kim stated he wanted to establish a new sign program and new tenants would need to adopt the new conditions.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was willing to suggest that any time the tenants changed the new tenants would switch to channel letters.

Mr. Kim stated that would be agreeable to him.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would be easy to change those out.

Chair Woollett stated there might be some tenants that were willing to change to channel letters and there would be both types of signage on the building and over time with new tenants coming in those would change to the new sign format.

Committee Member Fox asked on the monument sign if they were keeping the same signage and just changing out the lettering?

Mr. Kim stated those would remain and he would be adding the address at the top. The background of the sign would be white, with the business lettering being in color.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that stone be added to the sign base to tie that element in.

Chair Woollett asked if there would be two monument signs out front?

Ms. Nguyen stated there was the base of an older monument sign still on site and she was requiring that the base of the other sign be removed.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would be also okay to take the hedge out at the other side that obscured the sign. Removing that portion of the hedge would make the sign more visible.

The Committee reviewed a motion with the suggestions and conditions they had discussed.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4605-11, Chaporange Center, in accordance with the findings in the Staff Report and in accordance with the conditions in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- That the roof changes be more solid to carry the roofing back to tie into the existing roof so there was not a recess in it.
- That the existing trash enclosure be faced with stucco.
- That the entry doors be adjusted as necessary to ensure that they can be opened without hitting the stone veneer.
- That the cornice be simplified to a rectangular single or double rectangular form and to eliminate the more eclectic cornice shown.
- That the signage may be cabinet signs as shown on the sign program with the requirement that future tenants would be required to do their signs with channel letters and existing tenants may do so as they wished following the OMC.
- Another condition that the Palm tree in the front be removed or replaced with similar size and species of Palm tree if in fact it was dead.
- That the sconces shown on the exterior walls be hooded so as to prevent glare to people in the parking lot.

And with the following recommendations that the roofing be revised:

- The exposed roofing be revised from tile to standing seam metal roof.
- That the existing fence at the rear of the property be replaced with a low stucco wall.
- That these conditions be submitted to Staff for approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(5) DRC No. 4608-11 – TUSTIN SQUARE

- A proposal for a sign program.
- 1888-1998 N. Tustin 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.

Applicant, Jesus Chavarria, address on file, stated the reason they were doing it was because there were towers that they wanted to use for a few of the tenants there. They had an old sign program and they just wanted to update it. New tenants would follow the new rules.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 3, he suggested the addition of another tenant requirement to clarify that the building would be repaired after removal of signage.

Mr. Garcia stated that would be covered in Condition No. 2 of the Staff Report.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 4, item 14, the requirement for illumination to be LED. In the past they had added a statement that other UL approved devices could be used with equal efficiency; so in the future if new technology became available it could be used. On page 5, item 14 stated in no case shall the manufacturer's label be visible from the street and he suggested adding "or public walkways." A pet peeve of his, on page 5, he was referring to window signs and asked Mr. Garcia if the City Code would cover that?

Mr. Garcia stated yes. They would only be allowed to have up to 25% of the individual window covered with signage.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how about animated or electronic signs in the windows that were visible from the outside?

Mr. Garcia stated electronic flashing signs were not permitted in the City of Orange.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was referring to signs that had text scrolling across them.

Mr. Garcia stated those were not permitted in the City of Orange.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they should add something or were they covered by the code?

Mr. Garcia stated it was addressed in the code, and it could be added in the sign program to spell it out more clearly.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 7 for the shop tenant tower sign, the height was 4'-6", but he assumed that would be a maximum and it should be clarified as such. On sheet 14 it showed the same sign, but at 2' high.

Mr. Chavarria stated that was an error.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page 8 it showed what was there, Der Weinershnitzel, but it had not addressed what the sign would be if a new tenant moved into that location.

Mr. Chavarria stated a new tenant would follow the sign program and have channel letters. He read from the specifications page.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested to add that future tenants would use channel letters. On the same sheet, about the 6th line down, regarding the maximum sign height, there was a sentence that needed to be removed.

Mr. Garcia stated on the original submittal the sign height had been greater; it was changed and the wording had not been corrected.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet 10 it was noted as a type C sign; but at the bottom it was noted as type A and it appeared to him to be a type B sign.

Mr. Chavarria stated that should be a type B sign.

Committee Member Imboden stated he appreciated the thoroughness of the application.

Chair Woollett stated the comments presented would be the practice motion.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would make a motion to recommend approval of DRC No. 4608-11, Tustin Square, with the conditions and findings in the Staff Report and with the following conditions as follows:

- On page no. 3, a twelfth item be added to the sign program to specify, as stated in the condition, that building surfaces will be repaired after removal of signs.
- A condition that on page no. 5 a new item be added to refer to the OMC requirement on window signs to make it clear that it was part of this sign program.
- Another item be added on page no. 5 to specify that lighted or animated signs on the interior that were visible from the exterior have to comply with the OMC.
- On page 7, that the height of the sign be changed to read 4' 6" maximum, or maybe you have that already and maybe you could say not to exceed the recommended height, but on the specifications it should also say 48" maximum.

- Another condition on page 8, it should be clarified that future signs for the pad tenant should be in accordance with the other signs in this package and be constructed of channel letters.
- That the specifications on page 8 be clarified to redo the double sentence relating to the height of the vertical surface.
- On page 10 that the page be modified that it is a type B sign both at the top and at the bottom of the sheet, and that applied to sheet 11.
- The recommendation that if they chose to do so that item no. 14 on page no. 4 be modified, so that in the future lighting devices that were as efficient as LED that are approved by UL can be used to replace LED.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(6) DRC No. 4612-12 – KONA CLEANERS

- A proposal to conduct a façade remodel to the south (street facing) and a portion of the east elevations of an existing industrial building.
- 821 W. Taft Avenue
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Bobby Patel, address on file, stated he was available for questions and he was attempting to build corporate headquarters for his company, and for it to appear nicer to bring clients to that location. It was a very ugly building and he wanted to improve it.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett asked to be shown the cracked concrete area on the site plans?

Mr. Ortlieb pointed the area out on the plans.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was great. He was curious on the front elevation if he had considered using the same type of fenestration that was used on the other side?

Mr. Patel stated there was not a window there and he felt it looked better as it was designed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was making such a huge improvement, and it was something Mr. Patel might want to review.

Committee Member Fox asked if there was a window wrapping the corner?

Mr. Patel stated no, it was just the façade.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the window was being closed off?

Mr. Patel stated that was not a window. The window they had was a window that could be looked through to the outside, but no one could look in.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the soffit material was?

Mr. Patel stated it was metal, underneath.

Committee Member Fox stated there was one on the tower that was stucco.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that they all be stucco, instead of attempting to wrap the metal material around them, and it might be easier. On sheet A5 the tower element had a slope of 1/4" per foot; he wanted to make sure the whole thing was not slanted and a sloping edge would not be visible.

Mr. Patel stated that was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet A7 there was information missing and he was not certain if there was material missing that they had needed to review.

Mr. Ortlieb stated it referred to the awnings and such.

Mr. Patel apologized as that information had not come through.

Committee Member McCormack asked on the ramp, normally there would be a wall, and he asked if it was a level planter or a sloping planter?

Committee Members Fox and Wheeler stated it was sloping.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the soil sloping with the ramp there should be some sort of treatment on the building so the soil would not be up against the building. Between the Horsetail and the ramp; something that would maintain the feel and he suggested a little wall in order to not expose the footing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the plans showed the planter at the same level as the walkway. The footing would need to slope.

The Committee Members reviewed the landscape area.

Committee Member McCormack stated there needed to be coordination between the landscape planter and detail A, sheet A5.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a curb on one side.

Committee Member McCormack reviewed his suggestions with the applicant.

Mr. Patel asked if it would take away from the design?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes, as the concrete edge would be visible.

Committee Member McCormack stated if the applicant applied what he was suggesting it would be a feature corner. If he chose not to add anything, then let the planter be at the sloping area and add some treatment along the building to conceal the exposed footing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was what they were proposing and it appeared to work.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the plant palette he would suggest the Sago Palm instead of the Pigmy Palm. The Dwarf Flax species they had listed was one he had not heard of and on the Horsetail a quantity should not be called out, but to plant them in 1-gallon every 16". The Horsetail would grow under the ramp and out if it was not contained. He would repeat the same ground plane treatment with the beach rock, and to have both planting areas match. On the Palm tree there needed to be some sort of perforated drain line with a drain to remove the water out of the pit to maintain and not lose the Palm tree.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what he thought about landscaping the concrete area?

Committee Member McCormack stated he suggested they use the area as a planting area and to use beach rock in that area. He had not wanted to create any undo hardship, but to add some flax and if they had not wanted to add irrigation just go with beach rock. It would all tie in together. He suggested crowning the area too.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there would be any equipment added to the roof?

Mr. Patel stated their equipment would be in place at the back of the building and they had obtained a separate permit for that equipment.

Chair Woollett suggested regarding the high space, and it was not something that was proposed, but the space could contain a window and be used as actual space.

Mr. Patel stated he would look into that and he needed a nice office.

Chair Woollett asked if anyone had comments on the color palette presented?

Committee Member Fox reviewed the color choices and stated the colors were gorgeous and she cautioned that they check the colors, as the photos of the stone had a pink hue to it.

Committee Member McCormack stated with those color choices he recommended the use of white Hibiscus to be used.

The Committee Members discussed a motion.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a final determination to approve DRC No. 4612-12, Kona Cleaners, pursuant to the conditions in the Staff Report with some additional items noted:

- That the landscaped areas all receive the beach rock ground cover, in the planted areas and also in the side driveway concrete damaged area with an additional recommendation to slightly crown that area.
- That the Dwarf Flax be Dark Delight and Sago Palm be used instead of the Phoenix roebelenii.
- That the Horsetail be spaced 16" on center from 1 gallon.
- The Hibiscus be of a white flower color to compliment the tower color.

- That the railing for the ramps and the entry steps to be the same, in like and kind materials.
- That there be indirect lighting for the steps and the ramp.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Mr. Patel asked if those were recommendations?

Chair Woollett stated they were conditions with one recommendation.

(7) DRC No. 4614-12 – ORANGE FINANCIAL CENTER

- A proposal for a sign program.
- 681-721 S. Parker Street
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Chair Woollett asked the Committee Members if they felt a need to discuss the item. There were no issues for him on the proposed project.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had something very minor and technically it was a question as to whether one of the signs exceeded the 2/3rd height limit.

Applicant, John Myres, address on file, stated there were 17 existing signs that were already out there.

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

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Imboden inquired about the 2/3rd height requirement.

Mr. Garcia stated on a typical wall sign, the sign could be a maximum of 2/3rds of the surface of the wall it was being applied to. If it was on the fascia it could only be 2/3rds of that height. The sign that Committee Member Wheeler was referring to was the high rise sign and he had not believed that the 2/3rds rule had applied to that signage. He read from the code: the height maximum was 1 foot per story, with a maximum height of 12', therefore, the 2/3rd limit would not apply to that particular sign.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on page A2, there was reference to raceways and he suggested that be removed.

Mr. Myres stated he would agree to that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet C1 on the sign for the top, it was listed as having a 55' length and being equal on each side, but he asked if that was equal to the right or the center line?

Mr. Myres stated it was equal to the center line of the building. There was an existing sign there and they had not felt it was necessary to change that. The code allowed for one tower sign per

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for April 4, 2012 Page 21 of 29

elevation and since there was already one there, they would have one sign remain in that same place.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested in the future for a new sign it might be better to move the sign over and line it up with the step in the fenestration below.

Mr. Myres stated the reason why it was in that location was that on the north side it was on the most visible portion of the wall to the 22 freeway to the east.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on sheet G1, that sheet had not worked and it was hard to read and he would want to add a condition to provide a drawn example as the photo was not clear.

Mr. Myres stated he agreed and a drawing might be better. They could enlarge that and fold it into the program.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would just need to be a legible copy.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Fox stated she moved to recommend approval, to approve the project, for DRC No. 4614-12, and with the conditions that Staff has in their report and based on the findings in the report, with the additional conditions:

- That on sheet A2, item N, the second sentence be stricken (exposed raceways).
- On sheet G1 the drawing be replaced with a more legible version of the site plan.
- These conditions can be evaluated by Staff for compliance.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(8) DRC No. 4619-12 – SCALES RESIDENCE

- A proposal to demolish an 18 sq. ft. addition and construct a new 271 sq. ft. bedroom and bath addition to the rear of a contributing 1922 Bungalow.
- 165 N. Cleveland 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, Albert Scales, address on file, stated the windows on the garage were originally on the house. He agreed with everything that was in the Staff Report and putting the siding back to the original siding and having it fit in with the neighborhood.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, congratulated Commissioner Imboden on his appointment to the DRC and stated that it was nice to have a full DRC. He met with the applicant about four months ago and the only suggestion he had was to make the height of the addition secondary to the house. There was nothing in the Standards that required that, and he was not certain he could accommodate that suggestion. It was a plus that the inappropriate siding was being removed to expose the original Clapboard siding underneath; the applicant would be restoring that siding as well. There were some matching windows on the front façade that were removed from the other side of the house in the 1940's and it would be appropriate to use those windows on the addition. He actually would not have a problem with having a different window on the rear façade and having it appear different than the house itself, as it was an addition. It was a sympathetic addition and it was not visible from the street. The OTPA supported the project and agreed with Staff on the louvered vents.

Mr. Scales stated there were two windows that were in the bedroom that would be removed and he asked if they could use one of those windows in the bathroom?

Committee Member Fox stated that would be nice.

Mr. Scales pointed out which windows would be repurposed.

Committee Member Wheeler clarified which windows he would be removing.

Mr. Scales pointed out the various windows and which ones he intended to reuse.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would want to check the size of the windows as it appeared a bit too long and may conflict with the counter in the bathroom.

Mr. Scales stated he would check that.

Committee Member Fox stated in using the historic windows that would be removed, they would be more in keeping with the front elevation as those windows had casements. If he used the double-hung windows in the new addition the Building Department would get him, as the egress would not work. What a charming room that would be. There was a louvered attic vent in the back and she wondered if they could reuse that?

Mr. Scales stated he thought the vent was a different size and they might not be able to use that. They would reuse any materials that they could.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there was a portion of the wall that was part of the original house?

Mr. Scales stated yes.

Committee Member Imboden stated he understood now, the vent was too low.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the existing house had exposed rafter tails, but the plans were drawn with a fascia. He suggested that the rafter tails be retained in the new construction. He could not find anything in the drawings that stated the fiber siding would be removed and the original wood siding was being restored, and he would want that to be clear on the drawings.

Committee Member Fox stated it was noted as existing wood siding to be repaired.

Chair Woollett asked when the wood siding was removed how would the nail holes be taken care of?

Mr. Scales stated he would just fill them up; there were not many nail holes. Each piece of siding only had two nails in it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the back steps, on sheet 1.0 showed the steps going straight down, but the elevations showed an L shape design for the steps.

Mr. Scales stated they were supposed to go straight out of the back with a railing.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the type of material for the railing should be specified, whether it was wood or metal.

Mr. Scales stated it would be a wood railing.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what was generic for the siding, was it fiber board?

Chair Woollett stated it was fiber cement board.

The Committee Members discussed the changes and conditions that would be needed.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had a couple of larger issues before they discussed a motion. There were two things that he was not finding or understanding. He was not finding any kind of differentiation at all between the old and the new.

Committee Member Fox stated the 1x trim?

Commissioner Imboden stated that was a line of demarcation. It appeared that the building matched exactly, everything about it was the same; the siding, windows, roofing, etc.

Committee Member Fox asked if he was concerned with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards?

Committee Member Imboden stated there needed to be some form of differentiation.

Mr. Scales pointed out an area on the back of the property.

Committee Member Imboden stated a line of demarcation and differentiation of old and new construction were two separate issues.

Mr. Scales stated (on an area he pointed to on the plans) would be showing the existing.

Committee Member Imboden stated the Standards required subtle, but distinct differences in the construction. The reason for that was to avoid any misunderstanding of what part of the building was truly historic and what portion was a later addition. The other thing that he was not quite clear on was the relocation of the windows. He asked what was driving the relocation?

Mr. Scales stated he was attempting to balance the walls out and the other window would be in a walk-in closet.

Committee Member Wheeler stated what they had done on other projects was to specify that the exposure of the siding on the new construction be slightly different.

Committee Member Imboden stated the plans showed that the siding would go all the way to the ground.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was speaking to the exposure, and they had requested a change to identify the addition.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was probably more aesthetically pleasing ways to go about that. He was struggling with the fact that the building was being extruded; which was something that the Standards had not recommended. The Standards required a line of demarcation; they asked for some kind of recognition between old and new, and they were subtle things. He felt they were ignoring the Standards. The roof was just being extended and there was no change. The scale and design was very appropriate for Old Towne, but there were minor details to take the proposal from non-compliant to compliant. He was also struggling with the proposal to relocate historic windows simply due to furniture placement inside; the addition was

driving changes to the historic resource. The window could remain in the closet, whether it was built over or not and the other window could remain in its present location and another window could be placed to the outside. What should be an addition, was going towards a remodel of the historic part of the house, which he felt was not necessary. He would feel different if there had been minor offsets proposed, or the roof plane was different.

Committee Member Fox stated they had not extruded the entire flat roof section and it was more than just a line of demarcation; it was actually a roof form change. The other side had appeared more extruded. She felt the roof change was a distinct differentiation on the back façade.

Committee Member Imboden stated the portion which Committee Member Fox spoke to only occurred on the new part of the roof.

Committee Member Fox stated she was speaking to the area where the flat part ended and it was a differentiation, the entire roof form had not been extruded.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not wanted to imply that the entire roof form was being extruded.

Committee Member Fox stated she could certainly understand having a change on the laundry room side of the house, possibly a couple inches of wall plane change could create more of a differentiation. If it was necessary to take 2" off of the building it would be one way to take care of that issue. She pointed out the area she spoke to on the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the roof would need to be jogged a bit?

Chair Woollett stated it was an issue that they had discussed and he had been a member of the Design Review Committee for a long time, since 1992.; not that they had done everything correct as it was a learning and development process. Committee Member Imboden's comments were welcome, however, it was a dynamic process and in the past they had not made an issue of roofs. The DRC had settled for some form of divider strip on the siding.

Mr. Ryan stated in some instances they had requested an offset of 4" to 6" or to have the roof tucked under to gain a change.

Chair Woollett stated they had set a precedent, although it was not completely responsive to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. They found that the Standards would allow for interpretation and it depended on the classification of a building and what rules applied to that specific structure. According the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, they would be justified in placing a modern addition to the back of the existing building; creating a dramatic stylistic change and that was the preferred choice. If the building was historically important they had not wanted to mitigate its historic quality; and they had chosen not to do that. In the past, in his mind at least, the DRC had chosen on additions such as the one before them, to use in-kind materials and it was more in keeping with what occurred in Old Towne to maintain consistency in the building's design, and not to make stylistic changes.

Mr. Ryan stated it was a way of looking at the overall integrity of the building and not creating a false sense of history. They had gone to different degrees on different projects, whether an offset was required and sometimes that related to the mass and in some cases they had gone the other way; when a secondary Gable was lower to the roof and trim had just been added to both sides.

Chair Woollett stated there had been many cases when there needed to be a demarcation of some sort on the exterior wall, but they had not insisted on a demarcation on the roof.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not asking for all of those things, which were issue items for him, to occur on the proposal before them. His concern was that they were using continuations of existing roof lines, wall plane, materials and details; they were also taking windows from a historic resource and migrating them into the new addition. None of those things could be justified by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and when all of those things added up he had issues with the project. The Standards had not had a loose interpretation; certainly the issues that he referred to had very clear standards that addressed them. Overall he was pleased with the scale and sensitivity of the addition, maybe a bit over sensitive where the Standards had been overlooked; Standards that they were bound by.

Committee Member Fox stated she could agree on the window migration. It was not that much of a change to keep at least one of those windows. The window in the closet was problematic for her.

Committee Member Imboden stated they had allowed windows in the past to be built over, if that was what the applicant chose to do. The building would keep its integrity.

Committee Member Fox stated that was something that they could request be maintained. A jog in the wall, at the laundry room, would provide the change and also get the applicant closer to where the size needed to be at; 2" of shifting would do it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be difficult to shift the roof line and they had avoided asking that roof changes such as those be made.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans with the applicant.

Committee Member Wheeler stated moving the wall in would be a way to change the FAR. He would suggest that a different siding exposure was used, it was an addition. He would not want to suggest that the roof be jogged.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted everyone to understand that he was not asking that all of the issue items he discussed be changed. It was a matter of when all the things came together they were at odds with the Standards.

Committee Member Fox stated if they were moving the wall in, a roof change might work if the hip roof could be moved under the fascia by dropping it down. It would only be a 2" to 4" change.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would be a 2" to 6", and it would be an unfortunate change and it would not do much good for the Standards.

Committee Member Imboden stated with running a hip into the roof as designed it would be difficult to roof that slightly lower area and created the potential for water to find its way in there.

Chair Woollett asked if there was a general agreement to shift the wall in at the laundry room?

Committee Member Wheeler stated they had a precedent set for a long time and it seemed a bit unfair to change.

Committee Member Fox stated if the walk-in closet wall was to align with the post between the set of double-hungs, it would shift 24", and with the shift in the laundry room and with the slightly different exposure to the slightly bring them closer to where they needed to be.

Chair Woollett stated with no break on the north wall.

Committee Member Fox stated in moving a window that would also require the siding to be patched, in keeping the windows that would not be necessary.

Committee Member Imboden stated there were two windows on the back of the house that were not currently included in the plans.

Chair Woollett asked Mr. Scales if they were creating acid in his stomach.

Mr. Scales stated they already had.

Chair Woollett stated it was a precedent situation and they wanted to be careful, and they also had not wanted to require difficult things.

Mr. Scales stated they had attempted to make the addition appear the same as the existing building. They had people tell him to just throw a shed roof on the back and the DRC would be happy.

Committee Member Imboden stated historic properties had a different set of rules.

Committee Member Fox stated the small changes would make the difference. She was pleased that they were taking care of the house, as historic homes needed people who loved them.

The Committee Members discussed a motion.

Mr. Scales stated on the windows he asked if they needed to remain?

Committee Member Fox stated that was what they were conditioning.

Committee Member Imboden stated there would be a window in the closet and the other window on the outside, the closet window could be covered up, the window would not need to remain exposed to the outside. He reviewed the plans with the applicant, and the window requirements. The objective would be to maintain the building's exterior.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4619-12, Scales Addition,

- Subject to the findings in the Staff Report, with the exception of paragraph B of finding No.1 to be deleted; and
- In accordance with the conditions in the Staff Report with the exception of condition No. 2 specific to the project be deleted; and with the following additional conditions:
- That the exposed rafter tails be maintained on the existing structure with the same on the new addition with exposed rafter tails to match.
- The rear steps be fabricated of concrete designed to match what was in the floor plan rather than what was show on the elevations.
- The railing for the rear steps to be of wood construction.
- That it be clarified that the existing fiber cement siding material be removed and the underlying or existing original siding to be preserved, repaired and refinished.
- The new horizontal siding on the new addition to have a slightly different exposure, bigger or smaller, to clarify what was new construction.
- The existing windows on the north side master bedroom be maintained in place and the new wardrobe wall separating the wardrobe from the bedroom be adjusted to occur at the post between the two existing windows and that the applicant may close off the interior of the window that would be in the new wardrobe.
- The south wall of the new laundry room be setback in from the south wall of the house by 2" to 4" to again clarify where new construction occurred.
- The roof may continue without interruption on both the north and south sides.
- The north arrow on sheet A 0.1 be corrected to show north as it exists in the City of Orange.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was not so much that it was exposed rafter tails, but that there shall be no use of a fascia board.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the rafter tails should match in size.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on April 18, 2012.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.