

City of Orange

Design Review Committee Staff Report

AGENDA DATE: August 7, 2013

TO: Chair Fox and Members of the Design Review Committee

THRU: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

FROM: Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: RIO SANTIAGO SPECIFIC PLAN - DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

(DRC 4413-09) AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR

1818-09)

SUMMARY

The applicant proposes to change the General Plan and Zoning Designations for the 110 acre site and create a Specific Plan that would allow: a maximum of 130 single family homes; a maximum of 265 senior (age-restricted) housing units that could include up to a three story building; payfor-use private recreational facilities which could include up to an 81,000 square foot building; and, open space areas north of and including Santiago Creek. Publicly available trails, publicly available open space and private streets are also proposed as part of the project.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Recommendation to the City Council

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant/Owner: JMI Properties/Santiago Partners, LLC

Property Location: 6118 East Santiago Canyon Road

General Plan Designation: The project would result in changing the City's General Plan

Designation for the site from Resource Area (RA) to Low Density Residential (LDR 2.1-6 Du/Ac), Medium Density Residential (MDR 15-24 Du/Ac), Open Space Park (OS-P) and Open Space (OS); and from Low Density Residential (LDR 2.1-6 Du/Ac) to Open Space (OS). The project also proposes to change the City's General Plan to remove portions of the project site from the 1975

PAGE 2

East Orange General Plan (approximately 56.45 acres) and Orange Park Acres Plan (approximately 40.3 acres). Those plans designate the respective site areas as "Santiago Creek Greenbelt and Regional

Park" and "Santiago Creek Green Belt Plan."

Zoning Classification: The project would result in a Zone Change (ZC 1254-09) to re-

designate the site from Sand and Gravel (S-G) and Single-family

Residential 8,000 sf (R-1-8) to Planned Community (P-C).

Existing Development: The site is presently generally devoid of buildings or development

and is being utilized for a material recycling operation (i.e., asphalt

and concrete crushing) and backfilling operation.

Property Size: The site is approximately 110 acres on-site and 02.01 acres off-site.

Off-site property exists on County of Orange land at the east end of the project and is proposed to be utilized predominantly for fire fuel

modification of the project.

Associated Applications: General Plan Amendment (GPA 2009-002)

Zone Change (ZC 1254-09) Specific Plan (SP 001-09)

Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 2012-101) Tentative Tract Map 17344 (TTM 025-09) Major Site Plan Review (MJSP 0595-09) Development Agreement (DA 5825)

Environmental Impact Report (EIR 1818-09)

Previous DRC Project Review: None

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE PURVIEW

The role of the DRC is to provide a recommendation to the City Council on the project Specific Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Report (only as applies to any design/architectural discussions), and parcel and tract maps insofar as purview is permitted under Orange Municipal Code Section 17.10.070 A. which establishes the "Purpose and Intent" of the design review process. Section 17.10.070 A. states that "The design review process is established to provide a means of reviewing development projects to ensure that these projects are compatible with community aesthetics including architectural design, massing and scale, context, color palette, signage and landscaping. The design review process serves a primary role in the implementation of adopted design standards. The City's design objective is to enhance the community character and identity of the City by promoting diversity, creativity and cohesiveness in the development of property, building structures, site relationships and landscape through quality design." In addition, Orange Municipal Code Section 17.10.020D. states that "The Design Review Committee is established to uphold community aesthetics. Recognizing that the inclusion of specific aesthetic development

standards is impracticable due to the variable nature of architectural concepts, construction materials and aesthetic goals from one time period to another and from one neighborhood to another, it is in the public interest to establish an authority for project review." Therefore, since there is not a specific development with actual buildings for the Design Review Committee to review at this time, the focus of review for this project will be on determining if the proposed Design Criteria and Development Standards of the Specific Plan will ensure quality design of future developments and if those individual developments would enhance community character, uphold community aesthetics, and promote diversity, creativity and cohesiveness between the various developments within the project and the surrounding project site (site relationships). The Design Review Committee's recommendation will need to be based on forecasting the effectiveness of the Specific Plan guidelines and standards on future individual buildings, structures and landscaping, not based on any conceptual drawings provided. The Design Review Committee is not tasked with evaluating the proposed land uses, circulation patterns or proposed recreational amenities.

If the Design Review Committee finds that any part of the Specific Plan lacks sufficient Design Criteria or Development Standards, then it would be appropriate to make recommendations for added language or recommendations to change or delete existing language.

The Design Review Committee needs to focus on only those areas pertaining to future potential site design and aesthetics. In their review of the DEIR, it is anticipated that the DRC will only focus on the following sections:

- Project Description (for understanding of the project and verifying accuracy to the specific plan and tentative tract map)
- Aesthetics (for review of design and aesthetic impacts and associated project design features and mitigation measures)
- Land Use and Planning (for understanding project implications on overall site and greater area planning design and for reviewing General Plan consistency of associated project design features. Appropriateness of proposed land uses is not the Design Review Committee purview)

PUBLIC NOTICE

On or before May 16, 2013, Draft Environmental Impact Report No. 1818-09 was made available for public review in that the City sent a Public Hearing Notice/Notice of Availability (NOA)/Notice of Completion (NOC) to a total of 316 property owners/tenants within a 300-foot radius of the project site, and persons specifically requesting notice, including those persons that had previously mentioned the Rio Santiago Project in the course of the Ridgeline project. The notice was also mailed to a total of 69 public agencies on the same date. A notice was published in the Orange City News newspaper on May 16, 2013. On or before May 16, 2013, the project site was also posted in 4 locations. Notification was also posted at Salem Lutheran Church and Linda Vista Elementary School. Additionally, the NOA/NOC was filed with the State Clearinghouse and the Orange County Clerk on or before May 16, 2013.

At the request of the applicant, the DRC meeting for the project was continued from June 5, 2013 and subsequently from July 17, 2013 to the current meeting date. On or before July 25, 2013, a new public notice for the subject August 7, 2013 DRC meeting for the project was mailed and published in the same manner described for the prior NOA/NOC above.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The environmental impacts of the revised project and its project alternatives were evaluated by Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) No. 1818-09 (Exhibit C), which was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15070 et seq and in conformance with the Local CEQA Guidelines. DEIR No. 1818-09 was made available for public review and comment during a State-mandated 45-day public review period. The public review period began on May 16, 2013, and ended on July 1, 2013. Written comments were invited on the DEIR for submittal to the City by 5:00 PM on July 1, 2013.

Public and agency comments have been received on the DEIR. The DRC will not be receiving the comments since they do not relate to items under the purview of the DRC. The City will provide responses to comments received on DEIR No. 1818-09 to the commenting parties prior to Planning Commission and City Council consideration of the project. The Planning Commission and City Council will receive both the letters submitted on the DEIR and the responses as part of the Final Environmental Impact Report No. 1818-09 prior to consideration of the project. Subsequent public noticing will occur for Planning Commission and City Council meetings.

Copies of the DEIR are available for review on the City website, at all City libraries, at the City Clerk's office and, at the Community Development Department public service counter.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for DEIR No. 1818-09 was distributed to the public and public agencies via required noticing procedures on May 14, 2009. A public scoping meeting occurred on May 21, 2009. A second NOP was distributed to the public and public agencies via required noticing procedures on April 8, 2011, due to applicant initiated revisions to the project. A second public scoping meeting occurred on April 19, 2011. The NOP disclosed that the City intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The public was invited to provide comments on areas of concern for the project in association with the NOP and scoping meetings. Comments received at the scoping session and during the public comment period are contained in Appendix A-1 and A-2 of the DEIR.

The DEIR has been prepared to evaluate potential environmental effects attributable to the proposed Rio Santiago project. The DEIR analyzed the following topical environmental issue areas: Aesthetics, Agricultural/Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Minerals, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems.

SPECIFIC PLAN

What is a Specific Plan?

The project includes a Specific Plan. A specific plan is a tool for the systematic implementation of the General Plan. It effectively establishes a link between implementing policies of the General Plan and the individual development proposals in a defined area. If approved, the Specific Plan would implement zoning for the site in conformance with the amended General Plan designation proposed for the site.

To an extent, the range of issues that is contained in a Specific Plan is left to the discretion of the decision-making body. However, all specific plans must comply with Sections 65450 - 65457 of the Government Code. These provisions require that a Specific Plan be consistent with the adopted General Plan of the jurisdiction within which it is located. In turn, all subsequent subdivision and development must be consistent with the Specific Plan.

The initiation of the specific plan process may be motivated by any number of factors including development issues or the efforts of private property owners, elected officials, citizen groups, or the local planning agency. In this case, the developer has prepared and proposed the Rio Santiago Specific Plan. As with the General Plan, the authority for adoption of the Specific Plan is vested with the City Council.

Additional description of the purpose, intent, authority and, format of the project Specific Plan is on pages 1-1 to 1-2 of the Specific Plan.

Specific Plan Review Considerations

The Design Review Committee will focus on the Plan Elements of Section 3, Design Criteria of Section 4 and Development Standards of Section 6.

The Design Review Committee should note that many of the figures in the Specific Plan are conceptual and for illustration purposes only. The illustrative images include but are not limited to those that depict site layout, building images, site landscaping, character sketches, architectural imagery, photographic examples, gateway concepts and recreation amenity layouts. Therefore, the Design Review Committee is requested not to focus on any particular illustrative concept.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Full project descriptions are located in the project Specific Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (Exhibits C and D). It is important for the Design Review Committee to note that this project consists of conceptual plans within a tract map that may or may not be actualized. If approved, the project Specific Plan text would be the document that guides and regulates specific development within each individual planning area. Detailed plans for development in each planning area would require subsequent Design Review Committee review. For this project

before you, the Design Review Committee is urged to focus on the big picture of the Specific Plan and not to make its determination based only on any particular images of conceptual drawings. The project description section of this staff report begins with a brief orientation to the framework of the project. The orientation is necessary pursuant to Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Section 17.10.070A., which is the intent and purpose of the design review process. OMC 17.10.070A. states in part, that "The City's design objective is to enhance the community character and identity of the City by promoting diversity, creativity and cohesiveness in the development of property, building structures, site relationships and landscape through quality design." Therefore, the staff report project description framework orientation includes the following sections:

- I. Planning area overview
- II. Vehicular access, circulation, and parking
- III. Non-vehicular circulation (public trails and private paseos)
- IV. Passive and active open space areas/areas considered by the applicant as parks

After discussing sections I-IV above, the staff report project description continues with sections aligning with the specific topical areas mentioned in the design review intent and purpose of OMC Section 17.10.070A. which states in part that "The design review process is established to provide a means of reviewing development projects to ensure that these projects are compatible with community aesthetics including architectural design, massing and scale, context, color palette, signage and landscaping." Therefore, the additional topical sections align as follows:

- V. Architectural design
- VI. Massing and scale
- VII. Context
- VIII. Color palette
 - IX. Signage
 - X. Landscaping

PROJECT DESCRIPTION - FRAMEWORK:

I. Planning Area Overview

The project is divided into four distinct Planning Areas as shown in Specific Plan Figure 1.3 on page 1-16, all of which would be regulated comprehensively under the Specific Plan regardless of future ownership. The Planning Areas are as follows:

A. Planning Area A- Public Natural Open Space Area:

The proposed project would maintain natural open space on approximately 50 gross acres located on both sides of Santiago Creek. Planning Area A would be bordered on the north by Mabury Avenue, west by Cannon Street, south by Planning Areas B, C, and D and east by Santiago Oaks Regional Park. Planning Area A includes the Santiago Creek Greenway

Reserve, the flood channel including Santiago Creek, a multi-purpose trail next to the south side of the Reserve/Creek, and provides for potential future trail connections to Cannon Street and Santiago Oaks Regional Park. No structures are proposed for this area. A metal fence is proposed on the south side of the creek and trail fencing consistent with the Specific Plan would be alongside the creek-adjacent trail. Planning Area A would support fire fuel modification, buried rip rap, and biological buffer needs of the project.

B. Planning Area B - Private Recreation Area:

The proposed project would implement private recreational uses that are open to the public on approximately 10 gross acres on a fee basis. One of the highlighted potential buildings could be 81,000 square feet with a maximum two-story (38 foot tall maximum) height. All site development would be subject to the Development Standards of Section 6.5.3 of the Specific Plan.

C. Planning Area C - Age-Qualified Residential Community:

The proposed project would establish an age-qualified (55 and older) community of no more than 265 units on approximately 16 gross acres of the project site. Pursuant to the Development Standards identified in Section 6.5.1 of the Specific Plan, the community would be comprised of a combination of individual units composed of one and two-story flats (referred to as "villas" in the Specific Plan), independent living, and assisted living. Although no minimum lot size is established, unit sizes would range from 300 to 1,450 square feet in area depending on household size and care needs of occupants. There would be a height limit of two-stories (32 feet) along the perimeter of Planning Area C and three-stories (42 feet) in the center of the area. The proposed project includes a minimum 50 foot setback for three-story structures from all edges of Planning Area C. Accessory amenities for Area C residents could be housed in accessory structures or in exterior facilities. Site design would be subject specifically to Section 4.2.5 of the Specific Plan. Architectural design would be subject to the examples and standards shown in Section 4.3 of the Specific Plan. Amenities would be subject to Section 4.4.6c. and landscaping and associated features would be subject to Sections 4.4.7 and 4.4.17 of the Specific Plan.

D. Planning Area D - Single-Family Residential Community:

The proposed project would establish no more than 130 single-family residences on approximately 34 gross acres of the project site. This community would include residential lots with a minimum size of approximately 6,000 square feet, with some lots as large as 20,000 square feet. Unit size would be regulated by a 60% lot coverage restriction. Site design would be regulated specifically under Section 4.2.6 of the Specific Plan. Architectural design would be regulated by the examples and standards shown in Section 4.3 of the Specific Plan. Landscaping would be guided by Sections 4.4.1, 4.4.7c. and, 4.4.17.

Approximately 2.01 acres of grading activity will occur off-site just east of Planning Area D in the County of Orange owned property. The grading would support fire fuel modification, buried rip rap and biological buffer needs of the project.

E. Planning Areas B, C and, D:

Any future development on Planning Areas B, C and, D would require Design Review Committee approval and staff would first screen the proposal for compliance with the Design Criteria within the whole of Section 4 of the Specific Plan. Since no specific buildings or landscaping is proposed for any of the sites at this time, the Design Review Committee should focus on review of the potential development standards and design criteria that would regulate future buildings, landscaping, accessory features and site amenities.

II. Vehicular Access, Circulation, and Parking

All streets, drives and alleys on the project would be private. A full description of project circulation can be viewed in the Specific Plan in Section 3.3 and in the DEIR in Section 3.5.2. The Tentative Tract Map also shows proposed streets and sections.

1. Entry Points and Santiago Canyon Road

Four access points are proposed to the site off of East Santiago Canyon Road into the project. Two access points would be signalized and the other two would be emergency vehicle access points. Refer to Specific Plan Figure 3.4 Circulation Plan for exact street locations.

One new signalized access point off of East Santiago Canyon Road would serve Planning Area B at the western terminus of the project boundary and the other signalized access point off of East Santiago Canyon Road would occur in line with Nicky Way and would provide access to Planning Areas C and D. The new entry points into the project area would cut across an existing Class II Bikeway along Santiago Canyon Road.

One emergency vehicle access point would occur to Planning Area C at its westerly interface with East Santiago Canyon Road and the other emergency vehicle access point would occur to Planning Area D towards its easterly interface with East Santiago Canyon Road. Emergency vehicle access would comply with City standards.

In front of the project area along Santiago Canyon Road, the developer would construct a raised landscape median separating opposing traffic. The project sets aside a 10-foot wide easement on the north side of Santiago Canyon Road for potential future roadway expansions identified in the City's General Plan. The easement will be deeded to the City

PAGE 9

but will be maintained by the project HOA as a landscape area until future City expansion occurs.

2. Main Entry Roadway (Access to Planning Areas C and D)

The signalized Main Entry Roadway that aligns with Nicky Way and East Santiago Canyon Road extends northward into the site to a point where it would provide a "T" intersection to accommodate gated entry into Planning Areas C and D. The main entry would be four lanes (two lanes in each direction). The main entry terminus to the entry points of Planning Areas C and D is followed by a proposed Open Space Area that the applicant is calling a "Community Linear Park." Staff is calling it "Linear Open Space."

3. Planning Area B Entry and Parking

The signalized street into Planning Area B would consist of two vehicle lanes, would have no median, would terminate at a parking lot, and would exclusively serve the planned recreational uses. The cross-sections for the private drive could vary according to location so long as a minimum width is maintained. Perpendicular, angled and/or parallel parking would not be permitted alongside the drive entrance in Planning Area B due to potential roadway congestion during events.

Planning Area B uses would be supported by a traditional parking lot with City Code standard drive aisles and parking spaces. Underground parking may occur.

4. Planning Areas B and C Private Drives and Parking

For Planning Areas B and C the cross-sections for the private drives would vary according to location, but would have two vehicle lanes (one in each direction) and no median. Perpendicular, angled and/or parallel parking would be permitted along private drives in Area C, depending on the right-of-way width provided.

The Villas and Independent and Assisted Living housing products propose a combination of covered parking, parking lots, and on-street parking to fulfill required parking space needs. The Villas would be the only housing product requiring one covered parking space per unit. Underground parking may occur.

5. Planning Area D Private Drives and Parking

With the exception of the entry drive which conforms to City standards, the private streets within Planning Area D would be one lane in each direction and parallel parking would be allowed on one side of the street with a minimum width of 7 feet, for a total of 31 feet minimum of paving. The 31 foot street width is 1 foot under the City's minimum street standards of 32 feet. A minimum 6 foot landscape area would be provided on one side and

a minimum 5 foot sidewalk would be provided where applicable on one or both sides of the roadway.

The single-family residential products in Planning Area D would include Code required garage parking.

6. Other Parking and Private Drive Disclosures

Minimum 24 foot wide alleys may be permitted for residential products and may consist of no adjacent sidewalks where permissible by Building Code and accessibility standards. All parking areas will be provided in accordance with the Code in that they will be within 300 feet of the use they serve. All parking space dimensions will comply with the Code and Public Works street standards.

III. Non-Vehicular Circulation (Public Trails and Private Paseos)

A. Public Trails

The applicant proposes three new publicly available trails. The trails would be privately owned and publicly available to accommodate pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle circulation within the project site. Two trails consist of ten foot wide trail widths and the creek-adjacent trail would have a 20 foot width. Variable (and in some cases fixed) widths of landscaping would occur on each side of the trails. Trail fencing would occur outside of the trail treads. The trail sections are best viewed in Figures 4.15-4.21of the Specific Plan and in the tentative tract map which includes several cross sections. The publicly available trails are as follows:

- Santiago Canyon Road Trail An extension of the trail along Santiago Canyon Road is
 proposed within the project limits. This trail connects to the trail segment adjacent to
 the Reserve Community and dead-ends at the west terminus of the project. Potential
 continuance of the trail toward Cannon Street relies upon another entity to complete it.
 This trail would comply dimensionally with the City's Recreational Trails Master Plan
 Standards.
- Santiago Creek Trail A trail along Santiago Creek is proposed within the project limits. Both ends of the trail dead-end at the east and west terminus of the project boundaries. Potential continuance of the trail would rely upon other entities to complete a connection to Cannon Street and Santiago Oaks Regional Park. The applicant proposes to construct this trail to County of Orange trail standards. As a result, the trail does not exhibit planting area dimensions adjacent to it nor a divided trail per Detail 5 of the City's Recreational Trails Master Plan Standards (Attachment 2). Detail 5 shows a 10 foot wide bicycle trail and a 10 foot wide equestrian trail separated by a four foot median with four feet of landscaping on the edges. This trail area is also proposed for use as an "A" zone for fire fuel modification purposes.

• Main Entry Trail - A trail alongside the Main Entry road at the center of the project is proposed and would continue through a long narrow open space area termed a Community Linear Park in the Specific Plan and DEIR. The trail connects the Santiago Canyon Road-adjacent trail and the Santiago Creek-adjacent Trail. This trail is presumed to carry bicycle traffic from the existing continued Class II bike lane on Santiago Canyon Road to the proposed creek-adjacent bike trail. The trail tread is only 10 feet wide without a separate additional 10 feet of trail tread to separate bicyclist and equestrians. However, the General Plan has not identified this trail segment as a Class II bikeway. Therefore, this trail segment complies dimensionally with the City's Recreational Trails Master Plan Standards, Detail 3.

The project states that the above trails would have additional linkage to area trails and the Mara Brandman Arena via an equestrian equipped crossing at the Main Entry Roadway to Nicky Way.

The existing trail north of the project site that boarders the Mabury community is outside the project boundaries and would remain unchanged. This existing trail is not in conformance with Detail 5 of the City's Recreational Trails Master Plan Standards because it is not a divided trail to accommodate both bicycle and equestrian separation. Creating conformance with Detail 5 would require the additional trail improvements and expansion onto Planning Area A of the proposed project. The DEIR states that nothing in the proposed project precludes meeting these standards in the future. However, another entity would need to secure the land and construct the expanded trail to cause the full desired width identified in the City's General Plan.

Not all public trails identified on the site in the City's General Plan are proposed for construction on the site. The Specific Plan and DEIR note that nothing precludes some other entity from constructing the General Plan identified trails in the future. The General Plan Trails are shown in Attachment 3.

B. Private Interior Paths

Two types of private internal non-vehicular circulation are proposed:

- Greenbelt Paseo: A private greenbelt paseo is proposed in Planning Area D. The paseo would have a 5 foot wide walking path within an 18 foot wide easement. The paseo would connect to walking paths within the development.
- Walking Paths: Private walking paths (sidewalks) are proposed within and between Planning Areas B, C and D, mostly fronting and accommodating dwelling units in Areas C and D. The walking paths are planned to loop through the Planning Areas with connection points to the proposed regional multi-use trail along the south bank of Santiago Creek, as well as the regional recreation trail proposed along East Santiago Canyon Road.

IV. Passive and Active Open Space Areas/Areas Considered by the Applicant as Parks

The project offers the ability to provide passive and active open space areas as stated in section 4.4.6 of the Specific Plan. The applicant considers these areas as park amenities. Hence, the Specific Plan and DEIR include text portraying the areas as parks. However, DEIR Table 6.16-4 states staff's position that the areas do not meet code definitions for parks and/or do not meet the intent of traditional public parks in that they don't provide the amenities necessary to support public park needs such as a public parking lot, multiple recreational facilities/amenities and restrooms. The decision of park qualification will be determined by the City Council. The recreation and open space area components of the project are as follows:

A. Natural Open Space and Creek Adjacent Trail (Planning Area A)

Planning Area A will be maintained in a natural condition as public open space. Planning Area A includes the creek-adjacent trail on-site with the opportunity for potential connections to Cannon Street and Santiago Oaks Regional Park. The connections are not proposed as part of the project and would need to be completed by other entities.

B. Active Recreation Open Space (Planning Area B)

Planning Area B offers active recreation uses such as the community building and sports fields and courts. The staff report section describing Area B discloses this use in greater detail.

C. Age-Qualified (Senior) Amenities (Planning Area C)

Planning Area C proposes potential on-site amenities for the age-qualified community such as water features, outdoor fire pits, outdoor kitchen/dining with shade nodes, pool and spa area, bocce ball and open turf areas.

D. Greenbelt Paseo (Planning Area D)

A greenbelt paseo is proposed in Planning Area D for private use by residents of this Planning Area. The paseo would have a 5-foot wide walking path within an 18-foot wide easement. The paseo would connect to walking paths within the development. The western portion of the greenbelt paseo will be anchored by two small open space areas enhanced with small shade structures, low stone walls, enhanced paving and a seating area.

E. <u>Linear Open Space (Linear Park Area)/Residential Park (Planning Area D)</u>

This area of the site is designed with the purpose of connecting Santiago Creek and Santiago Canyon Road-adjacent public trails. This area proposes a privately owned but

publicly available trail, open turf areas for active or passive recreation and shade structures. No traditional public park amenities such as restrooms or public parking are proposed to support this trail linkage area. This area exists over the underground Handy Creek culvert and associated easement.

F. Santiago Canyon Road-Adjacent Trail (Planning Areas B, C and D)

The Santiago Canyon Road-adjacent trail transects over Planning Areas B, C, and, D. The trail connects to the existing trail to the east adjacent to the reserve. An equestrian signalized crossing would be provided at Nicky Way to connect the trail to the Mara Brandman Arena.

<u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION - SPECIFIC TOPICAL AREAS (Correlates to the Design Review Committee Purpose and Intent - O.M.C. Section 17.10.070A.):</u>

V. Architectural Design

Project architecture would be provided on interpretations of historic styles including Craftsman, Monterey, Andalusian, Spanish, Cottage, American Revival and Ranch. Specific Plan Page 4-12 begins a description of each architectural style followed by photographic examples of the applicant's vision. The architectural styles would apply to any buildings in all Planning Areas.

"General Architectural Standards" are contained in Section 4.3.2 (page 4-29) of the Specific Plan and many other areas dispersed throughout Chapter 3, Plan Elements; Chapter 4, Design Criteria; and, Chapter 6, Development Standards. In addition to the massing, color and, material concepts discussed in discussion Sections II and IV, typical architectural concepts implemented in Specific Plan Section 4.3.2 include the following:

- Roofs: concepts discuss consistency, form, combinations of types, limits on repetition, use of multiple plate heights, pitch, overhangs, materials, colors, fascia treatment and solar panels.
- Garages: concepts discuss door types, recessing and overhead projections.
- Architectural Features and Accents: concepts discuss window articulation, entries, courtyards, balconies, decks, patio covers, porches, columns and archways, chimneys, walls and fences, living space lighting, stairs, awnings and other architectural detail elements.
- Fences and Walls: In addition to brief mention in Specific Plan Section 4.3.2, site fences and walls are depicted in Section 4.4.8 and on Figure 4.33 of the Specific Plan. Fences and walls would consist of the following:

- Community Sound Wall
- Community View Fence
- Equestrian Fence
- Vehicular and Pedestrian Gates
- Residential Lot Fence
- Creek Separation Fence
- Mabury Adjacent Fence
- Accessory Structures: In addition to brief mention in Specific Plan Section 4.3.2, detached accessory structures are discussed in the Development Standards (page 6-10 and 6-11 of the Specific Plan). Accessory structures must be compatible to the main building.
- Non-Architectural Elements: In Section 4.3.2, these elements include design criteria for mechanical equipment including air conditioning units, meters and screen walls.
- Lighting: The overall intent of the Specific Plan (Section 4.4.15 Community Landscape Lighting) is to minimize the amount of sky glow, glare and spill light to preserve the night sky. A brief discussion of residential structural lighting occurs in Section 4.3.2. Concepts discussed include security lighting, minimized glare and highlighting of architectural elements.

VI. Massing and Scale

The single-family residential products for the project, including the Villas would be limited to two stories not higher than 32 feet. All single-family residential products would be separated from each other by at least ten feet. The Villas would be limited to 1,450 square feet and the single-family residences in Planning Area D would be limited to 60% lot coverage which, with a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet would be 3,600 square feet of lot coverage. Since Floor Area Ratio is not proposed as a development standard in the Specific Plan like it is in the City's zoning ordinance, home sizes could conceivably be 7,200 square feet (subject to Design Review criteria). Larger lot sizes could occur for the single family dwellings which would result in larger parcel coverage and could result in homes of larger square footage.

The independent living building(s) would be limited to three stories no higher than 42 feet. The Assisted Living/Skilled Nursing building(s) would be limited to two stories no higher than 32 feet. No lot coverage or Floor Area Ratio limits are proposed, hence the size of the independent and assisted living/skilled nursing buildings would be limited based on number of units and maximum unit size. The size of independent living units ranges from 550 to 1,250 square feet and the size of assisted living/skilled nursing units ranges from 300 to 1,050 square feet. The independent and assisted living/skilled nursing units would be located exclusively in Area C along with the Villas on 16 acres.

Planning Area B buildings would be limited to a maximum of 81,000 square feet and 30 percent of lot coverage. The maximum building height would be 38 feet.

Section 4.3.2 of the Specific Plan proposes design criteria related to building form and mass for all buildings. Criteria includes concepts of articulation of planes/off-sets, accented elements, projections, stepbacks to height, staggered walls, detailed articulation to visible sides, pedestrian scale, material changes and height restrictions. The Development Standards of Chapter 6 of the Specific Plan state the specific standards addressing height, setbacks and lot coverage.

VII. Context

Existing Site

The existing site is vacant and devoid of any structures except for rock and concrete crushing equipment at the easterly portion of the site. Backfilling operations are currently occurring at the site south of Santiago Creek to remediate silt pond soil conditions from former sand and gravel mining operations that occurred at the site. The backfilling may also be accommodating commercial dumping of fill material in furtherance of payment by the operator to the property owner.

In general, the area south of the creek is denutered due to backfilling, crushing operations, and annual weed abatement. The creek is intermixed with native and non-native plant species. The area north of the creek is heavily disturbed with some pockets of native vegetation.

The site is generally flat with the exception of sharp cliff-like declines at the creek edge. An inactive well exists on the easterly portion of the site on the private street south of lot 18.

Existing Area Context

The site is currently nestled between the Reserve tract to the east, Orange Park Acres to the east and partially to the south, the Mabury tract to the north, the Jamestown tract to the south, and Cannon Street and a vacant parcel owned by the County that was a former non-government sanctioned landfill to the west. The overall area is generally characterized by single family residential lots with dwellings of varying architectural styles. Lots in the Reserve and Orange Park Acres are typically around an acre in size with many homes having square footages well in excess of 4,000 square feet. Lots in Mabury and Jamestown tracts are in the 8,000 square foot range with homes in the 3,000 square foot range. The general area where the project is located is considered rural-suburban but divided by Santiago Canyon Road, a major arterial. A significant number of lots in Orange Park Acres have facilities which board horses and the area is intertwined with an extensive trail network.

Part of the easterly section of the site is currently in the Orange Park Acres Plan and part of the westerly section of the site is currently in the East Orange General Plan. The project proposes removal of the site from both plans and replacement with the subject Specific Plan (DEIR, Figures 3-8 and 3-9). The East Orange General Plan designates its respective project portions as "Santiago Creek Greenbelt and Regional Park." The Orange Park Acres Plan designates its respective project portions as "Santiago Creek Green Belt Plan." This information is provided for establishing site background only. The matter of the proposed replacement of existing land use designations in the existing plans is not for consideration by the Design Review Committee. The matter will be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council.

VIII. Color Palette

- Color As stated in Specific Plan Section 4.3.2 residential buildings would use natural tones and colors and contrasting trim colors. Non-residential buildings would use neutral colors and limit the number of colors (except for materials such as brick).
- Building Materials As stated in Specific Plan Section 4.3.2 internal consistency is sought by use of earthen materials such as brick, stone, wood, and simiulated materials. Limits are proposed on material use to prevent surface domination. Nonapplied appearances of materials would be required. Materials would need to wrap around elements and material changes would occur at inside corners.

IX. Signage

No specific signage is proposed for the project at this time. Any future signage would require Design Review Committee approval in accord with the provisions of a future master sign program, the requirements of the Orange Municipal Code and Specific Plan Section 6.6.7 which includes requirements for signs to have context to architecture, illumination at entries, muted appearance, consistency with landscaping and community character, direction to facilities, clearance for vehicular sight lines, appropriate scale, gateway identity, trail signage and prohibition of accessory use signage visibility from the exterior of the site.

X. Landscaping

The Specific Plan sets the framework for project landscaping, hardscape and associated features. Thematic landscaping would be provided throughout the project site that includes a mix of trees, shrubs and groundcover. Specific Plan Section 6.6 specifies "Landscape Standards for All Planning Areas" and includes requirements for plant spacing, size, height and conflict avoidance. Prior to specific development in any Planning Area, detailed landscape plans would first require Design Review Committee approval. There are no specific landscape plans for any Planning Area or development at this time.

Pursuant to Figure 4.37 of the Specific Plan, landscaping is proposed in four plant zones for the project and sub-level criteria exists for landscaping in three of those zones. A plant palette exists for each plant zone beginning on Page 4-98 of the Specific Plan. The zones and their associated sub-level Criteria are as follows:

A. Zone 1 – Santiago Creek Edge

This zone proposes to leave existing creek vegetation as it exists except for vegetation thinning required due to fire fuel modification needs of the project and replacement of vegetation caused by creek disturbances in small areas where drainage discharge for the project would occur. Any replacement plant material required for this area would be according to the proposed Zone 1 plant pallet which is guided by anticipated subsequent California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Army Corps of Engineers requirements and the City Fire Department fuel modification plant list. Specific Plan Section 4.4.19 discusses the fuel modification purpose, needs and process for the project.

B. Zone 2 – Community Streetscape/Trails/Edges

A mix of community-identifying and native plant species would be provided next to trails, streetscapes and project edges. A list of permissible planting is listed in the plant pallet for Zone 2 on page 4-100 of the Specific Plan. In addition, Specific Plan Section 4.4.18 discusses landscape criteria for parking areas and includes parameters for planting size, spacing, maintenance considerations and area coverage. The trail sections (Figures 4.16-4.21) for the Specific Plan also show landscape areas next to and/or between trails. Specific Plan Figures 4.29, 4.30, 4.31 further show the overall landscape intent for landscape treatment next to trails. Figures 4.12 - 4.14 show the gateway and street-adjacent landscape intent for the project.

C. Zone 3- Community Landscape (Planning Areas B, C and, D)

In addition to the Zone 3 plant pallet, Specific Plan Section 4.4.7 (Residential Landscape Criteria) provides specific criteria for planting in the villas, age-qualified living and assisted/skilled nursing component and single-family residential components of the project. Section 4.4.18 provides specific criteria for parking area landscaping. The planting design criteria of Sections 4.4.7 and 4.4.18 regulate planting pockets, accent trees, lowered planting grades, soil depth and in some cases tree planting size. No specific planting design criteria exist for Planning Area B. Specific Plan Section 4.4.17 provides specific criteria for Community Landscape including requirements for complimentary planting design, use of evergreen trees to frame architectural fenestrations and accents, use of flowering perennials, discouragement of annual plantings, consideration of ultimate planting size and water usage/drought tolerance, consideration of planting maintenance, tree avoidance of pipeline areas, adherence to City street tree requirements, reference to the Specific Plan plant pallet and DRC authorization for substitution of the plant pallet.

D. Zone 4 – Natural Area (Planning Area A)

This area is entirely in Planning Area A but does not include the whole of the creek area which is also in Planning Area A. No changes to Zone 4 are proposed.

A total of 224 trees will be removed to accommodate the project. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM BIO-5, tree replacement shall occur at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Section 17.10.070 establishes the general criteria the DRC should use when reviewing the project. This section states the following:

The project shall have an internally consistent, integrated design theme, which is reflected in the following elements:

1. **Architectural Features**.

- a. The architectural features shall reflect a similar design style or period.
- b. Creative building elements and identifying features should be used to create a high quality project with visual interest and an architectural style.

2. Landscape.

- a. The type, size and location of landscape materials shall support the project's overall design concept.
- b. Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of required addressing, nor shall it obstruct the vision of motorists or pedestrians in proximity to the site.
- c. Landscape areas shall be provided in and around parking lots to break up the appearance of large expanses of hardscape.
- 3. **Signage**. All signage shall be compatible with the building(s) design, scale, colors, materials and lighting.
- 4. **Secondary Functional and Accessory Features**. Trash receptacles, storage and loading areas, transformers and mechanical equipment shall be screened in a manner which is architecturally compatible with the principal building(s).

ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

The staff report identifies the following issue items:

- Issue 1 Architectural Design
- Issue 2 Massing and Scale
- Issue 3 Context

- Issue 4 Color Palette
- Issue 5 Signage
- Issue 6 Landscaping
- Issue 7 Upholding Community Aesthetics/Enhancement of Community Character and Identity of the City:
 - (1) Diversity
 - (2) Creativity and Cohesiveness in the Development of Property
 - (3) Building Structures
 - (4) Site Relationships
 - (5) Landscape Through Quality Design

Issue 8 - Overall Specific Plan Adequacy

<u>Issue 1 - Architectural Design</u>

The Design Review Committee is tasked with determining if the proposed architectural styles would be both compatible internally within the project and also to the surrounding neighborhoods. Seven different architectural styles are proposed for the project area as identified in Section V. of the staff report project description and as identified in Section 4.3 (page 4-12) of the Specific Plan. The variety of architectural styles and variations permitted on the themes of each style lend the ability of future site specific proposals to consist of numerous themes and combinations. Therefore, staff does not believe that several of the architectural styles listed are necessarily compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. The Design Review Committee could seek fewer architectural styles for the Specific Plan, could request other styles more complimentary to surrounding neighborhoods, or could find that the variety of options allowed under the Specific Plan are merited because they give the developer more flexibility on a site that is relatively separated and distinct from surrounding neighborhoods. The Design Review Committee may find that the variety of architectural styles and associated interpretations would be managed for compatibility internally and with surrounding neighborhoods by subsequent required review by the Design Review Committee for specific developments that would occur within the project area. Those subsequent development proposals would be accompanied by detailed architectural plans.

Issue 2 - Massing and Scale

The DRC is tasked to review if the project massing is appropriate or compatible with the surrounding area that typically consists of 1-2 story single-family residences, many of which are on large lots. Although the project is able to average the density of the entire site such that the open space balances out the project density in a cluster type scenario, buildings in Planning Areas B and C may be viewed as being much larger than other buildings in the area, especially if a 81,000 square foot community building is built in Planning Area B near Santiago Canyon Road and a three story building is built in Planning Area C for age-restricted (senior) living. View simulations begin on Figure 5.1-4 of the DEIR.

The DEIR provides Mitigation Measure MM AES-3 (page 5.1-31) to require the individual planning area developments to receive Design Review Committee approval prior to building each site. MM AES-3 seeks to render any aesthetic issues from building massing as insignificant by future Design Review Committee screening. The Design Review Committee must determine if they believe that future detailed review of a proposed building could curtail massing incompatibility of on-site buildings with the community. The Design Review Committee may disagree with the MM AES-3 and find that no amount of Committee review will lessen the impact of the massing and building heights the community facility and age-restricted buildings could propose.

As stated in the project description, only parcel coverage and not floor area ratio is proposed to regulate the single-family residences in Planning Area D. As a result, when two-story dwellings are considered, the amount of building area on a lot could exceed the lot area itself. However, any subsequent developments would be subject to Design Review Committee consideration.

Issue 3 – Context

There are no contextual issues pertaining to the Design Review Committee purview. Any contextual issues of the project will be relayed to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Issue 4 - Color Palette

The colors and materials proposed for the project are as stated in section VIII of the project description in this staff report and as stated beginning on page 4-29 of the proposed Specific Plan. The Design Review Committee will need to determine if the proposed colors and materials identified in the proposed Specific Plan will be adequate to guide the architectural schemes of future specific development proposals.

Issue 5 - Signage

No specific signs are proposed at this time. The sign guidelines proposed for the project are as stated in section IX of the project description in this staff report and as stated beginning on page 6-18 of the proposed Specific Plan. The Design Review Committee will need to determine if the proposed sign guidelines identified in the proposed Specific Plan will be adequate for future specific development proposals.

Issue 6 - Landscaping

Although a wide array of landscape material possibilities and planting standards are proposed, no specific landscape plan is proposed at this time. The plant pallet and landscape standards for the project are discussed in Section X of the project description in this staff report with references to the locations of landscaping related text in the Specific Plan. Landscaping is an issue item in that the Design Review Committee must determine if the landscape pallet, landscape theme, and

planting standards for the proposed project are compatible internally and within the area context as they would be applied to future specific development proposals.

<u>Issue 7 – Upholding Community Aesthetics/Enhancement of Community Character and Identity</u> of the City (Five topics are related to this issue per O.M.C. Section 17.10.070A.)

- (1) Diversity: Diversity for the project may not be an issue in that a variety of architectural styles, massing, and density is proposed amongst an array of amenities and landscaping options. However, the levity of architectural styles, massing and density may be too open ended.
- (2) Creativity and Cohesiveness in the Development of Property: Creativity of development of the property does not appear to be an issue in that a variety of architectural styles, massing, and density is proposed amongst an array of amenities and landscaping options.

(3) Building Structures

Absent any actual building structures to review at this time and apart from the massing and scale discussed in Issue Item 2, the Design Review Committee will need to determine if the Design Criteria and Development Standards of the Specific Plan will be an adequate framework for future specific development proposals.

(4) Site Relationships

There are no site relationship issues pertaining to the Design Review Committee purview. Any site relationship issues of the project will be relayed to the Planning Commission and City Council.

(5) Landscape Through Quality Design

See Issue Item No. 6.

<u>Issue 8 - Overall Specific Plan Adequacy</u>

Staff recommends that the Design Review Committee answer the following questions as a group in order to make a recommendation about the proposal before them:

- a. Does the Specific Plan adequately describe the project for purpose of understanding the project design?
- b. Are the proposed Specific Plan Design Criteria appropriate, sufficient and adequate to establish a design framework for all future projects in the plan area that would be developed under the Specific Plan?

- c. Do the proposed Specific Plan Development Standards justify superseding the standards of the Zoning Code with regard to design? The zoning code is Title 17 of the Orange Municipal Code and is located online at: http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=16539
- d. Are the proposed Specific Plan Development Standards appropriate, sufficient and, adequate to cause appropriate design and regulation of all future developments on the property?
- e. Is the landscape pallet adequate?
- f. Are the architectural styles compatible with one another?
- g. Are the architectural styles compatible with the surroundings?

Required Findings

The courts define a "Finding" as a conclusion which describes the method of analysis decision makers utilize to make the final decision. A decision making body "makes a Finding," or draws a conclusion, through identifying evidence in the record (i.e., testimony, reports, environmental documents, etc.) and should not contain unsupported statements. The statements which support the Findings bridge the gap between the raw data and the ultimate decision, thereby showing the rational decision making process that took place. The "Findings" are, in essence, the ultimate conclusions which must be reached in order to approve (or recommend approval of) a project. The same holds true if denying a project; the decision making body must detail why it cannot make the Findings.

- 1. In the Old Towne Historic District, the proposed work conforms to the prescriptive standards and design criteria referenced and/or recommended by the DRC or other reviewing body for the project (OMC 17.10.070.F.1).
 - The project meets this finding in that the project is not in the Old Towne Historic District.
- 2. In any National Register Historic District, the proposed work complies with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines (OMC 17.10.07.F.2).
 - The project meets this finding in that the project is not in a National Register Historic District.
- 3. The project design upholds community aesthetics through the use of an internally consistent, integrated design theme and is consistent with all adopted specific plans, applicable design standards, and their required findings (OMC 17.10.07.F.3).
 - The Design Review Committee will need to determine if they find that the overall project, as submitted in the Specific Plan and Tentative Tract Map, meets this finding and, if so, the Design Review Committee will need to verbalize why.
- 4. For infill residential development, as specified in the City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines, the new structure(s) or addition are compatible with the scale, massing, orientation, and articulation of the surrounding development and will preserve or enhance existing neighborhood character (OMC 17.10.07.F.4).

The project meets this finding in that the project is not infill residential development, as specified in the City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines.

CONDITIONS

Conditions are not provided for Design Review Committee consideration because this project is a Specific Plan with Design Criteria and Development Standards which will regulate the project development and hence act in similar manner to what would normally be project conditions. If the Design Review Committee feels that the Specific Plan Criteria and/or Standards should be revised, the Committee may note such in their recommendation to the City Council. If the project is approved, the Design Review Committee would review any future site specific developments and staff recommended conditions at that time.

Attachments:

- 1. Vicinity Map
- 2. Detail 5 of the City's Recreational Trails Master Plan Standards
- 3. General Plan Figure CM-3 Plan for Recreational Trails and Bikeways
- 4. Detail 4 of the City's Recreational Trails Master Plan Standards

Exhibits:

- A. Tentative Tract Map 17344
- B. Tentative Parcel Map
- C. Draft Environmental Impact Report (provided separately on May 30, 2013)
- D. Specific Plan (provided separately on May 30, 2013)
- cc: Bret B. Bernard, AICP
 Director of Planning and Development
 JMI Properties/Santiago Partners, LLC
 888 South Disneyland Drive, Suite 101
 Anaheim, CA. 92802

Megan Penn KTGY Group, Inc. 17922 Fitch Irvine, CA 92614

Jakki Tonkovich Vista Community Planners 1278 Glenneyre Street, Suite 110 Laguna Beach, CA 92651