CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

October 17, 2012

Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack

Carol Fox

Robert Imboden Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:05 p.m. with a review of the meeting minutes of October 3, 2012. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was missing a portion of the Staff Report on the NV Property item.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a date error; the sheets appeared to have the October 3 date.

Committee Member Imboden stated they should probably walk through the Staff Report and verify what each page began with; he had pages that were missing.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were only five pages.

Committee Member Fox stated there was the report from October 3 and the new report for October 17, 2012.

The Committee Members reviewed the information that was included in their binders and verified they had the correct and current information for the items on the Agenda before them.

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

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Chair Woollett re-opened the Administrative Session.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated there were no changes to the Agenda.

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

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Regular Session at 5:33 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: October 3, 2012

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of October 3, 2012, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Joe Woollett

ABSENT: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4644-12 – NV PROPERTIES

- A proposal to upgrade existing landscaping, reconstruct a front entry courtyard, install a water feature, and provide new walkways for a contributing commercial office building.
- 1015 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC meeting: October 3, 2012
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Dominic Masielio, address on file, stated he had plans to review with the Committee Members. In the original aerial from 1938 to 1947, the walkway was slightly shifted to the western side. He was able to make the curve softer and he reviewed the walkway and where it led. He welcomed suggestions on where to end the planter lines. At the last meeting Committee Member McCormack had provided him with some sketches and he had reconfigured the plans to those ideas. The handrail detail was included in the plans. The main porch would be left alone and the sign was an existing sign. The two Ficus trees would be removed. On page LC-1, the wall was pushed out another 12" and that provided for more space in the planting area. The walkway was revised and the modular squares would remain in a concrete top cast finish material. Page LC-2 had no changes to that plan page. The handrail on page LC-3 was very basic, just an iron handrail detail; that was one thing that had not been included on the last set of plans. He reviewed the plant materials and placement for the planting plan. He concluded the overview and stated he hoped that he had hit on all the suggestions and recommendations from the previous meeting.

Mr. Ryan asked if the rail was repeated or was it open down the steps? He stated the rail appeared a bit contemporary and he was thinking wrought iron would be more appropriate.

Mr. Masielio stated he would agree to that. The suggestion from the previous meeting was for something very basic, and the drawings had a very basic handrail. He could use wrought iron in place of the tubular steel. There were no rails coming down, it was just open at the steps.

Committee Member Fox stated the elevation change between the porch and the steps was not more than 30" and would not require a guard rail at the porch.

Committee Member Imboden stated the plans had not reflected an accurate drawing of the porch detail. There were more steps shown on the plans and it was not what actually occurred on the site. The porch deck was different.

Mr. Masielio stated there was a third step reflected in the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated it appeared to be a standard detail that had just been cut and pasted to the plans. He asked if the intention was to modify the step area?

Mr. Masielio stated no, the steps and porch remained as existing.

Committee Member Fox stated she believed the drawings were for the rail detail and the plans noted the steps and porch to remain as existing.

Mr. Ryan stated a steel tube rail currently existed at the site.

Mr. Masielio stated he believed the tubular steel was not the original rail.

Committee Member Fox stated that type of rail was present on many of the historic homes, however, it was generally not that thick.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to share his concerns. He had not thought in reality that it would be a problem, but the way it was drawn had not reflected the field condition and because the first set of plans had shown a re-work of the porch area, somehow to move forward he wanted it indicated for the record that the porch deck remained as existing and it was not part of the project. He would also recommend that the rail come down to the first step, rather than coring into the porch deck. He was not certain if the existing rail was anchored into the deck and he would not want someone to feel the need to clean up the area and put the project where he had not wanted it to go, in terms of re-finishing the deck. If the applicant was willing to accept those suggestions, he was not troubled with the rail design.

Committee Member Fox stated she was not clear on the suggestion by Committee Member Imboden.

Mr. Masielio stated he understood that the suggestion was to dowel into the step and carry that across instead of anchoring into the actual deck.

Committee Member Imboden stated the porch was not constructed per the detail that was included in the handrail design.

Mr. Masielio stated he believed the steps were original.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was certain the porch had not existed as per the detail in the drawings. He believed it was a 3" slab sitting on top of the stem wall.

Committee Member Fox stated which would be able to accept a drill. It sounded, from the conversation, that it needed to be clear that the concrete elements in the detail were existing and to remain.

Committee Member Imboden stated what he was getting at was it appeared that the steps were a solid concrete pour, because they were not very big, and those would accept the detail much better than going in from the top. The detail only needed to go 12" past the top deck and he suggested just moving it out to the top tread.

Committee Member McCormack, referring to the new set of plans, asked if that was the condition that existed on site?

Committee Member Imboden stated no. He explained how the condition occurred.

Committee Member Imboden and Committee Member McCormack reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had concerns that the field conditions would not accept the detail as presented.

Mr. Masielio stated he had no problem doweling into the top deck; that would not change the design.

Chair Woollett asked if the issue they were discussing was a Building Department issue?

Mr. Ryan stated it was not over 30" and not required.

Committee Member Fox stated a handrail was required, however, a guard rail was not needed.

Committee Member McCormack stated something was sticking in his head about 20" or 24" and it was a Code issue, and it had not mattered as ADA would govern that and the rail may need to be constructed completely different than what was being presented.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not agreed with that statement. If someone was presenting a vision for a property the detail had to both meet the Code and the design requirements.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the end result would not match the detail as presented.

Committee Member Fox stated she believed the Code had changed for the return.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had recalled that.

Chair Woollett asked if the Committee Members could anticipate if there were changes necessary to meet the ADA requirements that wouldn't jeopardize the design? The handrail would be designed to meet the ADA requirements and that was how it would be.

Committee Member Fox stated the designer would take the responsibility for meeting Code and they, as a Committee, do not circumvent the need to meet that responsibility by re-designing that detail for the applicant. She was also concerned with that.

Chair Woollett stated as long as it was not an aesthetic issue; he believed they should not belabor the issue.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the Committee had entered into their discussion period?

Chair Woollett stated yes, as there had been no one present to speak from the public.

Mr. Ryan stated the Committee could discuss the material and leave the design requirements to meet Code.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had the same issue with the [City of Orange] library project regarding the railing; it was designed to match a railing detail inside the library. It met Code, but also had a bit of detail and design to it. His comment on seeing basically three different elements, the railing, the gate, and the trellis, was that those three things should have a common thread and some relationship to each other. They should not appear as three separate elements that were pulled off three separate projects. There was a pattern in the concrete, so there was a lot going on.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the existing handrails needed to be replaced?

Mr. Masielio stated aesthetically they were not the greatest and they were not very reachable.

Committee Member Imboden stated aesthetically he had not believed the existing related to a different language and the existing condition was not a hold up for him.

Committee Member Fox stated she had understood Committee Member Imboden's concern that the post needed to be borne by the thing that it was anchored into. If the top was cast concrete with a stem wall under it, if they bored into where indicated that there would be some slab of concrete and she felt it would appear better coming from the top.

Committee Member Imboden stated where he was coming from was that there was an undefined treatment of the porch deck. He saw a detail that probably would not work and his concern was that it would change and then the project would change. If they could come to a level where they were comfortable with the situation, he had not believed a simple handrail was something they would need to discuss at length, but he wanted to ensure that a problem would not occur later.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the railing, gate, and trellis, he would like to have them relate to each other; if those elements were on a larger lot without a visual connection he would not be making that statement. In looking at the railing and the escutcheon, it seemed problematic on how to get that around two pipes with a horizontal member, unless it was a two-piece escutcheon. Unless the escutcheon was mounted on first with the rail to fit into it. That would be difficult to pull off. There were some details in the construction that could be opportunities lost. He suggested more of a relationship.

Mr. Masielio stated on the gate detail there were some circles and it mimicked the venting on the property. There could be more opportunities to match and pick up some other details.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would not want it to appear as if the civil engineer had done the railing and the landscape architect had done the entry pilasters. It was an opportunity to have it all appear more crafted together. At the library it could have been a simple railing painted blue, but they had not done that. It was an opportunity to do something different and anything that was touched by hand should be well crafted.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the project was very simple. If it was a bigger project he would have insisted that the Committee Members have more time to study the drawings. They were going through something that they had not had time to analyze if the notes were correctly stated, and all the picky things he liked to look at. If it was not such a simple project he would be objecting very strongly. Since it was more landscape issues than anything else, he felt Committee Member McCormack could make the call whether the Committee had been provided with enough information to make a recommendation.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt the applicant had done a great job to the point they were at and he had not yet spoken about the plant materials. It was an opportunity before them now to capitalize on some of the suggestions made and make for a better project. The applicant had gone so far and he had not had a problem with the plantings. He agreed with Committee Member Wheeler that the DRC Members had not had time to study the plans. Normally he would have looked at the spacing and all of that and comment on all of that, as it was tough to change the landscaping.

Mr. Masielio stated to be completely honest when they had spoken about the re-design, in changing the concept he had to go back and from a practicality standpoint, go back and have a demo plan, lighting and irrigation plan, drainage, and details, and such. The particular rail detail was a generic detail used as a time-saving measure. They wanted to use that and then add some fun details to tie into that. He definitely wanted to use more decorative details, such as those in the gate and to match the other elements. He agreed with the suggestions that had been provided.

Committee Member Fox asked if the Members felt there could be some recommendations and conditions or had they thought the item would require a continuance?

Committee Member McCormack stated it sounded as if the applicant was going to change things and he understood what was being stated, but it was the front entry and it was the bookend of the gate with a relationship to the gate. It would be remiss not to allow the "off-the-shelf" railing to be changed. He had done the same thing in his own work, and understood why some of those details were presented; he felt the DRC should allow the applicant to change the rail.

Mr. Masielio stated the other hat that he had to wear was that of project manager and keeping things within a respectable time line. Unfortunately, Mr. Ryan had gotten the blunt force trauma of his client when he realized the project was going to have to wait another two weeks and he would not want to carry the news of a continuance to his client. He would appreciate the trust of the DRC Members to take the project into completion. The rail was such a small aspect of the project. He would love for the project to move forward with conditions, knowing he could do something great with the project.

Chair Woollett asked the Committee Members if the project could move forward with conditions.

Mr. Ryan stated normally there would not have been a two week turn-around time and that was what happened with the "off-the-shelf" presentation for the handrail. Typically it would have been a four week turn-around time, and in pushing it through, his personal feeling was that they

would be hearing it two weeks from now and would not have placed the project further out than it typically would have been. There were some minor details that needed to be corrected. The landscape plan was fine and they could condition the project to move forward and to have that one detail return to the DRC for review.

Chair Woollett asked if the project would go to the Building Department?

Mr. Ryan stated yes. If the DRC approved the project it could move forward to plan check.

Chair Woollett stated if it went to the Building Department it would then go back to Mr. Ryan to ensure the plans agreed with what was approved.

Mr. Ryan stated the Building Department would not approve it until he signed off on it.

Committee Member Fox asked what if the Committee approved the plan with the railing returning to the DRC; or to condition the project enough to allow the proposal to move forward?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had suggested previously that the stucco not be carried below grade, but it appeared that it had not been changed.

Committee Member Imboden stated the applicant needed to understand that he was asking for approval on a plan that they had not seen. He asked for further information on the wall and other aspects of the project.

Mr. Ryan stated the wall was supposed to come in from the building line.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not known what the wall looked like.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the building was stucco or plaster?

Chair Woollett stated stucco and plaster were the same thing.

Committee Member McCormack stated stucco would be the finish.

Committee Member Fox stated no, it was the material. Portland cement plaster was stucco.

Committee Member McCormack stated when he specified a plaster wall it was not stucco.

Committee Member Fox stated if he was speaking of a troweled wall vs. a sprayed-on finish, which was a finish. Stucco was the same; it was Portland cement which was different from interior plaster which was not Portland cement. Exterior cement plaster was stucco. Finishes were different.

Committee Member Imboden stated technically stucco was a finish.

Committee Member McCormack stated stucco was a finish.

Committee Member Fox stated no, it was not; trust her, she had taught classes about it.

Committee Member McCormack stated his father was a plasterer and a brown coat was put on, then it could be plastered with a trowel or a product with the grains in it that were much bigger and that was called stucco.

Committee Member Fox stated if they spoke to Omega and Merlax, that was a sprayed on finish or flow finish; all of those were just finishes and the material was material. Plaster used to not be Portland cement plaster and stucco was Portland cement plaster. In the old days it could not be sprayed on as there was not that technology. Old plaster was always troweled on, and it may not have been Portland cement plaster.

Committee Member McCormack stated "and it was a smooth finish."

Committee Member Fox stated yes, because it had been troweled.

Committee Member McCormack stated the other material was grainy and pebbly.

Chair Woollett stated not necessarily.

Committee Member Fox stated it could be a hard trowel stucco finish; she could bring in a book next week.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was not specified on the plans what it was.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the notation was for the finish to match the house.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not believed they needed to argue that point, as long as the finish was what they were looking for.

Mr. Masielio stated it was a pretty coarse stucco finish.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans noted "poured-in-place" concrete cap, color TBS, and in the elevation there was a joint. Typically the "poured-in-place" was not precast as the wood frame was created on top of the wall. Typically the architect noted where the joints happened and it would occur at logical places, or there could be no joint or to have just one. It was a detail element.

Mr. Masielio stated he had seen it done different ways. There could be a joint every 18" or no joint or just one.

Committee Member Fox asked if that was the edge band in the concrete or was it the top of the wall. She realized the joints she was looking at were on the paving pattern and not on the wall.

Chair Woollett asked if they really cared about that joint?

Committee Member McCormack stated that if it were left up to the contractor, if he had a bad day he could put two joints in one area and not anywhere else.

Chair Woollett stated he understood his point, but was that really an important issue for the project before them. He could not ever remember that they had discussed joints and the project before them was very small.

Mr. Ryan stated generally there were precast caps that already had joints set.

Committee Member McCormack stated the noted treatment was "poured-in-place."

Committee Member Imboden asked if there could be a condition that would resolve the issue?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes, a condition that asked for joints to be evenly spaced.

Mr. Masielio stated obviously the joint would not be placed every 10".

Chair Woollett stated the concern was to not have an arbitrary measurement.

Committee Member McCormack stated if a joint had not been drawn on the plans the issue would not have come up.

Committee Member Fox asked if he wanted joints, or cast in place without joints?

Mr. Masielio stated what he had noted were wall caps without joints and he was open to the Committee Member's suggestions.

Committee Member Wheeler stated was it a small enough project that joints were not needed to prevent cracks.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had done it either way. Sometimes he would match up the joint to another piece of architecture, such as a window.

Committee Member Imboden suggested a condition that the cap would be mitered at the corners and that the running length of the cap shall have equally spaced control joints, no less than 48" on center, and asked if a condition such as that would work with a predictable outcome that would allow the project to move forward?

Chair Woollett stated that would work and it had not seemed that the applicant had a preference either way.

Committee Member McCormack stated since he had not had an opportunity to review the new plans, he asked the applicant what had been done?

Mr. Masielio stated it was a complete revamp of the planter lay out. He reviewed the plans with the Committee Members and pointed out the changes to the placement and species of plants. He had taken the sketch that Committee Member McCormack had provided at the last meeting and used those ideas. The lawn space might grow a bit. Some of the plant material was moved back.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there were any changes proposed for the driveway?

Mr. Masielio stated currently there was a sliver of concrete and they had spoken about leaving that in place. He had re-visited the site and it was such an ugly sliver of concrete, it was raised and visually it would be better to take that section out.

Committee Member Imboden asked where the curb cut was located?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the curb cut was a little offset.

Committee Member Imboden stated his concern was with someone making a left hand turn and not looking too closely they could drive into the sign. It was a narrow drive. The apron was much wider than the driveway.

The Committee Members reviewed the details of the driveway with the applicant and Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Masielio stated what if he took the concrete out and re-poured it?

Committee Member Imboden stated sure, he had not wanted that portion to be removed.

Committee Member McCormack stated he reviewed the plant material and it all looked okay. There was a grass, Miscanthus morning light, noted that would grow 4' wide and 7'tall. It was huge and that plant was shown on the plans as 2 ½' wide and it would be better as a background plant and not a foreground plant as it would not take well to shearing.

Mr. Masielio stated he appreciated the input. He could swap that out for a smaller foreground shrub.

Committee Member McCormack suggested he look at the plant materials to ensure with the size of the plantings that they would not become a nuisance to any of the design elements on the project.

Committee Member Fox stated it appeared that the approach they wanted to take was to approve the project with conditions and to have the handrail detail come back before them. She wanted to form a motion, but she was not certain if the grass species change would be a condition or a recommendation?

Committee Member McCormack stated he had not wanted to change the design of the project; it would be a recommendation.

Committee Member Imboden stated before they went forward with a motion; he just wanted to commend the applicant with the manner in which the sidewalk was handled. The applicant had made an effort to accommodate the recommendation that had been provided. It was tough enough with architecture and more difficult with landscape. He understood the applicant had completed a quick turn-around, however, it was just a bit more difficult and cumbersome for the Committee Members.

Mr. Masielio stated he appreciated that information.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4644-12, NV Properties, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the staff report and with the following additional conditions:

- The handrail detail at the step shall return to the DRC for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
- Remove and replace the triangle of concrete at the intersection of the driveway and sidewalk.
- The wall cap shall have joints mitered at the corners and joints along the wall spaced evenly 48" on center maximum.

And with the following recommendations:

• Judicious use of Miscanthus morning light and Salvia clevelandii.

SECOND: Robert Imboden

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

New Agenda Item:

(3) DRC No. 4654-12 – SPRINT PCS-ELKS LODGE

- A proposal to replace three (3) existing stealth panel antennas, one (1) GPS antenna with new stealth antennas on the roof of the Elk's Lodge, including replacement of existing equipment cabinet and new raceways. No visual changes to the installation and/or building.
- 211 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan 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.

Chair Woollett asked why the application was before the DRC if there were no visual changes to the site?

Mr. Ryan stated there was not a way to approve it over the counter. There were not that many stealth elevator towers or vents or things like that and the project before them was the exception.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a change to Condition No. 7, to add that the replacement materials shall match the original in size, material, color, and design. It was the only comment he had.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to ensure the proposal was very clear as he was not pleased with photos that placed a tree in front of the project site, as they all knew that was not the reality at the site.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he was referring to the view from the north?

Committee Member Imboden stated it was virtually all of the views, that a tree was placed in front of them and stated the cell site was not visible. Clearly it was visible from all over Old Towne.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he believed the arrow was wrong on the view from the north as it was pointing to the wrong object.

Applicant, Alexander Lew, address on file, stated the object that was further to the building corner was another existing antennae structure that was not the Sprint project.

Committee Member Imboden stated it would have been very easy to photograph what was there; but that had not been done. He understood there were no visual changes, but he had wanted to point out that situation. The reason he questioned the visibility was that on Sheet A4 there was a notation for new Sprint equipment to match new screen frame. He wanted to understand what

that meant, as it was speaking to new screen framing, and since he could not see what that was, he wanted some clarification.

Mr. Lew stated on Sheet A3, the final antennae plan, three units were centered up and those would be mounted to the framing. There needed to be a small portion of backer board and that was what was referred to as new screen framing. Nothing would be replaced or demolished; it was somewhat of a minor retrofit to accommodate the replacement units. It would all be enclosed with the existing screen.

Committee Member Imboden stated he thought it was a straight line top to bottom and had not had the profile as shown on the plans. The photos were not correct.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he believed it had stepped down.

Mr. Lew stated the jogging in from the street view was not visible.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was visible from Chapman University.

Committee Member Imboden stated from Almond it was very visible, as well as from the Plaza, and that was the reason he was a bit sensitive to the proposal. He believed it was a harmless application, however, when the presentation was not up front about the reality of the situation on-site he became a bit suspicious. His question would be were there changes to the size or form of the equipment?

Mr. Lew stated the intent was for no modification to what existed.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4654-12, Sprint PCS-Elks Lodge, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the staff report and with a change to Condition No. 7 to read:

• If the existing stealth screening on the chimney is removed and/or replaced, the replacement material shall match the original in size, color, texture, design, and finish.

SECOND: Carol Fox

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Fox made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, November 7, 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 6:41 p.m.