CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

April 21, 2010

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Robert Garcia, Associate Planner

Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session with a review of the Agenda.

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, stated there were no changes or additions to the Agenda. There was a special guest, Howard Morris, joining the meeting.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular meeting of April 7, 2010 and noted corrections and changes.

Committee Member Woollett asked Mr. Morris, since he was in discussion with people who were writing up the Guidelines for Water Quality Management, were they aware of what occurred when water got under pavement, particularly asphalt?

Mr. Morris stated he would think that the civil engineers would be aware of that. The City's Water Quality representative was a civil engineer. It was a valid concern.

Committee Member Woollett stated it had been a problem when there was a planter out in the middle of a parking lot with a wood header on the asphalt and water would get under the asphalt and the asphalt would deteriorate. Sometimes in that situation a curb that went down as much as 12" was necessary to prevent that from occurring.

Mr. Morris stated it also depended on soil types.

Committee Member Woollett stated it seemed that the soil types were being ignored. It had been his experience with civil engineers that they took the City's rules as gospel and would not even review the soil reports. The only person who read the soil report was the structural engineer and the architect. He had not known how they could get through to them and it was occurring in cities all over.

Committee Member McCormack stated the moisture, especially on a hot day, creates condensation on the bottom side of the concrete slab and the roots of trees grow towards that to get the water. If there was no root barrier it could create a problem and it was not even factored in on the Water Quality requirements.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wanted to make a suggestion and he was not certain who it should be directed to; that they needed to have a coming together of engineers, architects, landscape architects, and the people dealing with the Water Quality Guidelines.

Mr. Morris stated he agreed with that suggestion.

Committee Member Woollett stated possibly the way to deal with that would be that the Chair could go to the City's engineer and suggest a meeting.

Mr. Morris stated the person to contact in the City was Gene Estrada; he was the storm water quality engineer.

Chair Cathcart stated for those that had done water quality management plans they had dealt with Mr. Estrada.

Committee Member Woollett stated no one wanted to come to the City and tell them that their regulations had not worked with soil conditions; he had done it once in another City and that City had backed off and not required it.

Mr. Morris stated much of the problem was that the civil engineers waited for the DRC to figure it out. He had relayed that it had not worked that way and that there needed to be guidelines to work it all out.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was his perception that what the City was attempting to do was to keep the State off of their back and not attempting to solve the whole problem.

Chair Cathcart stated he would speak with Mr. Estrada.

Committee Member Gladson asked if there was a prohibition for barbed wire in the City?

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated in portions of the code it was not allowed.

There was no further discussion.

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

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, 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.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There was none.

CONSENT ITEMS:

All matters that are announced as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff, or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action.

(1) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: April 7, 2010

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting on April 7, 2010 with the corrections and changes noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

CONSENT ITEMS (continued):

(2) DRC No. 4443-09 – CLEARWIRE WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to replace six panel antennas with three new 42" panel antennas and three new 2' microwave dishes to an existing co-located monopole. One equipment cabinet would be constructed inside the existing equipment building and one GPS antenna would be attached to the outside of the equipment building.
- 4725 E. Chapman Avenue (utility substation)
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Gladson asked that the item be removed from the consent calendar as she had questions on the proposed project.

Chair Cathcart removed the item from the consent calendar; the Staff overview was waived and the item was opened for discussion.

Committee Member Gladson stated the existing plans for the site showed barbed wire around the perimeter and asked if there was a way for that to be replaced? She understood the facility was an Edison Facility. The notes on page A2 called out existing chain link with barbed wire; it could be the appropriate time to have that removed. It was her only concern.

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated the barbed wire was an existing condition.

Committee Member Gladson stated she wondered if the applicant would be open to the removal of the barbed wire if it was conditioned to be removed?

Applicant, Celly Adamo, address on file, stated it was an existing condition on the Southern California Edison (SCE) substation and she was not certain, as they were just replacing existing antennae.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was not in a position to require it, but if her colleagues were agreeable it could be something they could suggest.

Chair Cathcart stated the applicant was placing their equipment in a SCE easement and the applicant would have no jurisdiction regarding the barbed wire.

Committee Member Gladson stated she understood that but wanted to suggest it. It was an aesthetic concern.

Ms. Adamo stated the facility was covered with landscape in the front and it was a substation.

Ms. Nguyen stated the barbed wire was an existing condition.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was certain there had probably been vandalism on the site.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was also for public safety as they would not want anyone entering the facility.

Ms. Adamo stated they would comply with Staff's request; however, the property was landscaped throughout and there were trees and SCE was aware of the aesthetic concerns.

Committee Member Gladson stated now they would be as a DRC Member had raised the concern just for consideration. It was just an observation.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the recommended Condition No. 3 "All exposed wires shall be completely concealed", and it went with a question on Sheet A3 which stated proposed exterior wire coax route. On the elevation it could be in the pole or on the pole and the plan had not shown that detail.

Ms. Nguyen stated on Sheet A2, detail 1, there was an existing cable bridge.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was not what he was speaking to; on Sheet A3 where the wire was on the pole.

Ms. Nguyen stated the wire would be inside the pole.

Committee Member McCormack stated details 2 and 3 had not shown that, either inside or out.

Ms. Adamo stated the wire would be inside the pole.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans needed to have that detail.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4443-09, Clearwire Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and specifically focusing on item No. 3, no exposed wire shall be visible, and to add the following to that condition:

1. Details 2 and 3 on Sheet A2 be revised to show the coax cable to be inside the metal pole.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

CONSENT ITEMS (continued):

(3) DRC No. 4465-09 – SPRINT WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to replace six panel antennas with three new 42" panel antennas and three new 2' microwave dishes to an existing monopole. One equipment cabinet would be constructed inside the existing equipment building and one GPS antenna would be attached to the outside of the equipment building.
- 1605 N. O'Donnell Way
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org

• DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4465-09, Sprint Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(4) DRC No. 4370-08 – THE BLOCK AT ORANGE

- A proposal to expand The Block, consisting of 105,000 sq. ft. of retail in two phases.
- 20 City Boulevard West
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Preliminary Review from DRC Meeting of February 17, 2010
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

The Applicants present were available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the architecture was a great improvement and he was pleased with what they had proposed as it fit in much better with The Block. He wanted to ensure that with any motion they currently made that the approval would be only to building N.

Applicant, Blake Windal, address on file, stated they were aware of that and they had a plan that was based on tenant leasing and once they knew what size the boxes would need to be they would return with those proposals.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on Item No. 1 of their finish schedule for building N there was a callout for cornice; however, it had not appeared that they were using a cornice and that it was just a flashing.

Applicant, Mark Malaby, address on file, stated it would be a flashing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a reference to finishes 4 and 9 but he could not find them on the drawings. On the light sconces he thought bronze might not be an appropriate color.

Mr. Malaby stated they could use stainless.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on Sheet A-05, the south elevation, on the previous submittal there had been areas for a sign and he asked if that was still the intention?

Mr. Malaby stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was a bit surprised they had not emphasized the entrance more and asked if a roof plan was available?

Mr. Windal presented him with the roof plan for his review.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the south and west elevations, he agreed with Committee Member Wheeler and there was a modernistic appeal to it; he asked why the sconces had not been repeated on the building?

Mr. Malaby stated that was part of the loading dock and they could add that element.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a huge statement made for the space between buildings B and N. When first reviewed, he asked if it was for storage as there were no windows.

Mr. Windal stated it had not been laid out completely as there was not an interior plan for that space.

Committee Member McCormack asked what building B looked like from the other side?

Mr. Malaby stated it was a loading dock; he referred to the landscape sheet to review that view. There were access doors not store front doors.

Committee Member McCormack asked how that elevation would fit in with the corridor?

Mr. Malaby stated it was an opportunity to do something more abstract.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a long corridor and probably would not be publicly used.

Mr. Malaby stated to continue the street theme of The Block, it was a back alley.

Committee Member Gladson asked how they would keep people from wandering in there since it was a non-customer area.

Mr. Malaby stated to down play it; there was no reason to go there.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could consider gating in the area.

Mr. Garcia stated it was not captured in the photos, but there was a gate into the loading area with trees.

The Committee reviewed the photos, plans, and discussed access to that area.

Committee Member McCormack suggested adding an iconic element with fencing.

Mr. Malaby stated he would want it to be fairly visible as an area that could be surveyed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could define the space with a sign.

Committee Member Woollett stated the Police Department would have input for that area.

Committee Member Wheeler, referencing the plans, stated on the roof plan he had interpreted an area on the plans to be different.

Mr. Malaby stated it was initially designed that way on that elevation and they had decided to box it out.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he thought it was a nice reference to a tower form that had been destructed a bit.

Mr. Malaby replied: "Like the tower in Berlin?"

Committee Member Wheeler stated, regarding the roof plan, there were parapets that were not returning the way they were depicted on the elevations. He reviewed those areas with the applicant.

Committee Member Woollett stated one of the things they had discussed previously was the future of The Block and they had concerns about compatibility and continuity. He agreed with Committee Member Wheeler that the design was much better and it also indicated a direction for the space. They had not come forward with specifics, as they had not known exactly what businesses would be placed in the space, but it gave them a direction.

Mr. Windal stated they had given the buildings some individuality and would also tie in other spaces for the future.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were large pylons that were currently in place and he suggested they keep those elements as a historic element. There were three smaller ones that he would also suggest remain, as part of the proposal. The proposed project had been simplified with some direction.

Mr. Malaby stated they had gone out to The Block and documented the existing conditions onsite and had continued the march of the Date Palm trees and had continued the light poles that existed. It became a bit syncopated; they had only shown one side of the light poles and both sides were visible on the master plan. There was a conflict between that and the Fire Department's requirements and they would be resolving that. They were attempting to continue with the same materials, scale, curb width, and scoring patterns.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were three existing Palm trees that were slightly off the grid; he had compared them with the grid and they were approximately 6' off and he was not certain if they were intended to be existing Palms to be moved. He reviewed the plans with the applicants.

Mr. Malaby stated that was a graphic issue with the aerial view and the location of the trees.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had been involved with The Block initially. They had been conditioned by the City to save as many trees as possible and he had noted that the Ficus and Magnolias were relocated from the old City project and it would be great to box those trees up and use them elsewhere on site as they had done that the first time around and they were such nice specimens and had survived one move already. He had not thought that they would need to keep the Crape Myrtles as it would be more of an economic headache for those. The Magnolias and Ficus would be great to re-use on site.

Applicant, Rick Mayer, stated the intent was to match the plant palette; they had continued with the Date Palms and the end islands had the Eucalyptus. The Date Palms marched through the roadway. There were the Australian Willows by the loading dock and as they had met the mitigation requirements for new trees the cost to box the trees was more than the budget would bear. The intent was not to save the trees. On the last page they had included a summary of what the cost and mitigation measures were. Due to the budget constraints and in attempting to remain consistent to the existing palette it would continue with what had been done in earlier phases.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wanted to share some history. When he had worked on the site, the City had conditioned that the trees be re-used and he wanted it understood what had occurred last time. He was only citing six trees and not 48, which was the number he had dealt with. He suggested using the three Magnolia trees to shield the loading dock. The other issue was the existing cadence of the original design and he pointed out the new vs. existing and he suggested maintaining the overall parking lot concept in tact. The existing Palm trees were a certain height and he would want the new trees to be the same height of what existed.

Mr. Mayer stated he could not promise that. The trees had been there a long time and generally horticulturally good specimens could not be found to match something that was 20 years old.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were Palm trees that existed on-site which they could re-use for those areas and they would match the height. He pointed out the areas on the plans. They could be taken out, "toe-nailed" on site, and replanted. They were already acclimated to the site. The other thing he noticed was that Palms do not like to sit in water and he applauded the effort of what they were attempting to do, but the infiltration basin was right where the Palms were planted.

Mr. Mayer stated the Date Palms loved to be in water. There would not be standing water in that area for a long period of time and the Date Palms could take a lot of water for a period of time and the water would go away and they would love it.

Committee Member McCormack stated the Palms would be planted in sand and he wanted to ensure that there would be a provision for excess water drainage. He suggested the re-use of seven of the Palm trees; match the heights and the re-use of the Magnolia and Ficus trees.

Chair Cathcart asked if Committee Member McCormack would add that as a suggestion or a condition?

Committee Member McCormack stated he was pretty strong on the parking lot and would want that portion to be a condition.

Mr. Windal stated the only problem with that was that they were not certain what would occur with the parking lot when additional buildings would be built and he asked for that to be taken into consideration.

Committee Member McCormack stated he understood that and he pointed out the area of his concern.

Mr. Garcia clarified it was the first three rows where the handicapped parking was and he reviewed the plans with the applicants.

Committee Member McCormack stated it made sense to keep the rhythm of the parking lot.

Mr. Mayer stated he agreed with maintaining the rhythm with the Date Palms, but he would not want to re-use the Magnolia trees.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt strongly regarding the re-use of trees, rather than removing and having them hauled off. He was not certain what the delta was between costs of re-use vs. removal.

Mr. Mayer stated he had the costs. For the tree removal based on their size it was approximately \$1,500.00 for removal. Boxing, storage, and maintenance would be another consideration and the total for each Magnolia would be approximately \$10,000.00.

Chair Cathcart asked what size box the trees would be?

Mr. Mayer stated 84" to 90"; the cost of new trees was approximately \$400.00 each.

Committee Member McCormack asked if that was for 48" box?

Mr. Mayer stated no, it was for 24" box; according to the landscape plan they would be using 24" Eucalyptus.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was not the same. What he was stating was that the value of the three trees that they had priced out was not equal to 84" box shipped to the site and planted, the costs would be a push. It would be a different look and when he had worked on the project previously they had been conditioned to re-use existing trees and he wanted to put it out there to be on record.

Mr. Mayer stated they were in a different economic situation currently.

Committee Member Gladson stated in the 1990's they were in a recession.

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for April 21, 2010 Page 12 of 20

Chair Cathcart stated if they got caught up in the economics of every project there would be onegallon trees everywhere. They had a responsibility and what they needed to get to was how to come up with a reasonable response to the situation.

Mr. Mayer stated he would want to balance it out and re-use the Date Palm trees, but not meet the request for the Magnolias. It would be the re-use of seven Date Palms and not the three Magnolias.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested replanting the Magnolias immediately on-site in another area.

Committee Member McCormack stated they were speaking of just three trees and he understood the applicant's concern with costs.

Committee Member Gladson stated she concurred with the comments from her colleagues and understood that Phase 2 was not currently within their purview. In reviewing the environmental document, she asked if the applicant was required to complete an additional addendum?

Mr. Garcia stated the document would cover both Phases 1 and 2.

Committee Member Gladson stated she felt there needed to be additional exhibits included in the document so it would cover both Phases and that aspect would not need to be covered again.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct and they would update the environmental document if necessary.

Committee Member Gladson stated that was a condition in the Staff Report that the DRC would review Phase 2 and also review the final landscape plan. She was also in support of re-use of the trees. The project was going in a direction and she was not certain if it was what they wanted it to be, and there were other elements that were out of their purview that the Planning Commission would wrestle with. She was sad to see the housing go, but that was a separate matter.

Committee Member Woollett stated in the EIR, Figure 7, he noticed an airplane in the parking lot?

Mr. Malaby stated that was Google art.

Committee Member Woollett stated on Page 221, third paragraph, there was reference to the southwest corner of the site and he believed it should read southeast corner.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, DRC No. 4370-08, The Block at Orange, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The roof plan dated April 6, 2010 shall be part of the final submittal.
- 2. Clarification that the approval by the DRC was only for building N.
- 3. Items No. 7 and No. 12 be noted that they are the same condition.

- 4. Re-use the existing Date Palm trees in the parking lot spines to match the height of the existing trees.
- 5. Add the Palm trees in the parking lot to be in line with the existing parking lot concept tree massing design.

And with the following suggestions:

- 6. Explore the possibility of re-using the Magnolia trees (#51, 52 & 53) in the spirit of tree preservation and re-use on site.
- 7. Explore maintaining the three smaller pylons at the main entry as historical elements.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

New Agenda Items:

(5) DRC No. 4481-10 – DRC LANDSCAPE CRITERIA

- A proposal to modify existing landscape guidelines in an effort to provide clearer provisions and reduce ambiguity.
- Citywide
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the City Council

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, introduced the item and stated that modification of the City's Landscape Design Standards and Specifications occurred when the new water saving criteria came into existence. The Community Services Department went to the City Council with an Ordinance to amend The Landscape Standards, the reliant document that Staff used to review development proposals. The amendment inadvertently deleted some provisions.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was due in part to the States deadline requirement. Parts of the specifications that were critical were removed.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the City had placed generic language into the standards with the water saving components. When Staff realized that landscape provisions were omitted, it had placed Staff in a lurch. The Municipal Code contains what was, in part, provided in the Landscape Standards. The Landscape Standards included more information. The Code incorporates the Landscape Specifications by reference. The Orange Municipal Code Section 16.50 references the Landscape Standards. When the standards were amended it was clear that Staff needed to revise them and could make them a little bit better; what they had not wanted to do was anything different or incredibly different from the Orange Municipal Code.

Committee Member Gladson commented that at least two of the DRC Members are likely disappointed that more revisions to the standards could not be conducted.

Mr. Ortlieb stated that the purpose of bringing the matter to the DRC is to make improvements where possible.

Committee Member McCormack stated the new law had no impact on the Zoning Ordinance and how it related to landscape.

Mr. Ortlieb stated yes, with the exception the Zoning Ordinance incorporated the standards by reference and the standards have changed.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it was AB 1886?

Mr. Ortlieb stated yes he thought it was.

Committee Member McCormack stated his printer was not working and he had printed that out and had it at his office.

Mr. Ortlieb stated he had the AB 1880 language in the comprehensive revised Landscape Standards and Specifications document; when there were revisions the AB language for water savings was added, but it also tweaked the other portions that dealt with design standards. They were now asking to keep the water savings aspects that were a legal requirement and to revert the removed Standards back to what they were, with a few changes. It was difficult to state what had existed vs. what is currently proposed; he could provide a general overview or what had been done to enhance the document. It was included in the Staff Report and asked if the DRC Members wanted him to review those portions?

Chair Cathcart asked for a brief overview of what had changed.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the objectives for changes fell under three areas: (1) guidelines for residential vs. non-residential projects, (2) physical considerations such as setbacks, parking lot, trash enclosures, etc., and (3) it was important to keep the municipal codes untouched. Criteria for residential projects was added, such as on multiple family sites, with the changes that were made through Community Services even duplexes and single family residences were not exempt from the provisions and the residential aspect was brought into it now. The tree counts and distancing requirements were added.

Chair Cathcart stated the tree formula still existed.

Mr. Ortlieb stated they wanted to have a formula remain.

Chair Cathcart stated there should be a tweak to that. The formula currently stated that all perimeter property lines needed to be added, divide by 36 and that had not taken into consideration situations where property lines were closer to 10'. From 0 to 10' it still counted and would produce an unrealistic number of trees. What should occur was the formula language should be changed to read that the formula only worked if the property lines were 10' or more.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was correct that those property lines less than 10' should not be counted and the formula did not work.

Chair Cathcart stated that area should not be counted, as trees could not be planted in that area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated previously they had made an exception and had deducted the property line that was not plantable.

Committee Member McCormack stated 8' was his magic number, if it was 10' or more it could be counted once. If it was 5' it could not be counted twice as a tree could not be planted there.

Chair Cathcart stated he believed the only disagreement was what the magic number should be and once they came up with that number they could revise the formula guidelines.

Mr. Ortlieb stated there was only one problem in attempting to revise the formula in that it existed in the Municipal Code and that was why the formula had been kept.

Committee Member Woollett asked how would they get the municipal code changed?

Mr. Ortlieb stated that was a huge undertaking and it was something they were looking at as a long term goal.

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, stated that a code update was something that the City was looking to do.

Chair Cathcart inquired if they could add language that the tree count guideline was currently out of commission.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could add language to provide the DRC or Planning Commission with authority to make changes to mitigate situations.

Chair Cathcart stated the problem was that by the time the applicant arrived at the DRC with their proposal they had already put in a lot of work based on the formula and guidelines they had been given. Somehow it needed to be relayed to applicants that the formula might or might not be adhered to.

Committee Member Woollett asked if it could be asterisked that the DRC might consider in special cases an alternative formula.

Committee Member Gladson stated the challenge was, and if she understood it correctly, was that there was an ordinance in place that defined the law of landscaping and there were guidelines that gave information on implementation of the ordinance; to change that was doable but very, very complex as it was not generally undertaken for a small change but for a mass change. She was not certain that they were being asked to make those changes.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the easiest response was that there was a gray area between the code and guidelines; and there had been in the past language in the guidelines that noted they were benchmarks that the City wanted applicants to attempt to achieve and gave the DRC flexibility. There are mandatory provisions in the code, such as landscape setbacks; then there is a departure from the code that reiterates the design guidelines and refers to the guidelines as benchmarks. Staff meets early on in the planning stages with applicants to advise them that the Standards are not a "one size fits all" and informs them that there is some flexibility.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt that the changes were not "City Council ready" as he had trouble with the document and it was also not "public ready". He needed diagrams; anytime there were landscape guidelines they needed diagrams to show what the intent was. The first thing he grappled with was that before they started on that, and he was not certain if the Landscape Standards determined it, but they needed to define "landscape". For most people landscape was a shrub and a tree; to Chair Cathcart and himself landscape was the exterior area 5' outside the building envelope and within the property lines - whatever was in there. It should be defined in that manner in the guidelines. It was hardscape, softscape, fences, stone, and everything within that. The reason that they stated 5' outside the building face as many projects had grade beams that went out 5' and was not plantable. That was not a typical landscape condition.

Chair Cathcart stated it was still part of the landscape, as it was traditionally defined as landscape.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want to define landscape so that any landscape architect reading the document would know what the purview was for their area. It all needed graphics and the other thing was that it referenced something else that should be explained and not just referenced, such as B.1.1, and section A.2. On parking areas, it stated trees located in required yard landscape setback areas that separated landscape areas from the street shall be disbursed at a minimum of 16' on center; he could not imagine what type of landscape they were asking applicants to plant if their site was 200' long and the requirement was for trees 16' on center that had a canopy radius of 8' at maturity; the landscape character would be so awkward and unnatural. The landscape character without any diagrams or exceptions was creating something he thought the City would not want. He displayed a plan that required one tree for every eight stalls, every four stalls had a tree 36' on center per the code and what was intended by the code was something entirely different and it was a prime example when that type of verbiage was used. They needed to ensure they would not create a landscape character that the City would not want.

Chair Cathcart stated he was able to get creative because he had room on that plan, with site restrictions that would not always be the case.

Committee Member McCormack stated he could not recommend the guidelines to the City Council; it was the first good step as they had a chance to review it. He wanted to go back to tree preservation and he would want the language to read "show trees to be removed for relocation". It referenced subjectivity to the Tree Preservation Ordinance but had not included the relocation language. The plan that they had reviewed for The Block was an example and it would tell the applicant that they were attempting to save the urban forest of Orange and not to cut everything down. They spoke of tree sizes and it was important to have that information be clear. He would not mind having grasses in 4" pots and liners as that was a landscape mentality that was gaining hold; it was drought tolerant, it required little maintenance, and would not require fossil fuels to move. It should be something that was presented to applicants, and allow applicants the option to plant meadows and call it a day.

Chair Cathcart stated Chapman Chapel was a good example of that.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a valid look and part of California landscape and that type of look should be promoted.

Committee Member Gladson stated the tricky part was attempting to give it order and have it clear so that the design concept was a City-wide issue and that it was not just landscape plant materials but also all the other elements such as paving; and that all those things were considered on the front side and not wanting to take away the designers ability to come up with their plan. She would not want to take the design process away from the applicant in achieving a well balanced project with architecture, landscaping, and open space. She wanted to provide guidance on a good rule of thumb in how to plant things.

Chair Cathcart stated they would not be able to cover every situation or come up with solutions and they would not want to restrict creativity.

Committee Member McCormack stated he believed it was written in there for 36' on center for creation of shade on paved areas and that was the intent. Irvine had an ordinance that required the canopy size to be considered as they had not wanted reflected heat gain in their parking lots. They had seen that with The Block where the guidelines were followed but what was obtained was a skyline approach, there was no shading of the parking lot.

Chair Cathcart stated the other problem was they were all dealing with water quality management plans and with underground filtering systems it was difficult to plant in those areas and there needed to be some melding of the filtera water quality issues and the landscape criteria.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was a very complex area and the DRC Members all had an interest in cleaning up a lot of stuff as they had wrestled with issues over the time she had been on the Committee. Projects that came forward and they had not wanted to follow the code as it would not fit or was not appropriate for a particular site; she personally thought that they should hold a detailed study session as it was difficult to get her head around all the information. She asked if there was an expediency of getting the item to City Council?

Mr. Ortlieb stated that was the problem as all the previous standards had been removed with the recent change to the guidelines and there could be a consistency issue. More or less what they wanted to do was return the Landscape Standards and Specifications to what had existed with just a couple of minor tweaks.

Committee Member Gladson commented that it was like pushing the undo button on a word document.

Mr. Ortlieb stated that was basically their intent of what they wanted to accomplish and he understood there were needed improvements.

Chair Cathcart stated he agreed with the recommendation for a study session and he asked what was the timeline?

Mr. Ortlieb stated as soon as possible.

Chair Cathcart inquired what the ramifications would be by delaying action on the Landscape Design Guidelines.

Mr. Ortlieb stated what that could do was to bring a lesser quality of landscape plans before the Committee as there was information currently missing.

Chair Cathcart stated they would just turn inadequate plans down.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt as a Committee they were not doing onerous things.

Chair Cathcart stated he believed they were being quite liberal with the way they made recommendations and they helped the applicants along the way as long as the applicants were willing to listen and discuss options. He was in concurrence with Committee Member McCormack that he could not make a recommendation to City Council.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was just recently in a meeting with a colleague who had returned from ULI in Boston and he showed him tree wells in a long line on a project and he had made a point with the Coca Cola project that they had this huge parking lot that was compacted to 98% with holes punched in, which basically was placing trees in pots. In working with the City of Buena Park he had convinced them to take a section where trees were to be planted, to take it all out and to put in pervious soil which created a growth area for tree roots and they had agreed to do it. Those were the principals that needed to be included in a landscape document.

Chair Cathcart stated at the new Home Depot in North Tustin that was the case in their parking lot and he believed there was not one living tree in that parking lot and that applicant had not listened to the recommendations.

Committee Member Gladson stated she understood where they were going with the larger landscape concerns and challenges. She could put that aside at this point to wrestle with that at a future date and to allow the restoration of the guidelines in order to have some protections in place; she would be okay with allowing the item to move forward with a few language clean-ups. They could also send a resounding message that the bigger problems needed to be fixed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not coming from a landscape architect it was just attempting to set minimums as he saw it. It was giving guidelines for minimums.

Chair Cathcart stated he and Committee Member McCormack were just two votes and it would send a message.

Committee Member McCormack stated his drawing had taken him 15 seconds and that was a prime example of what they needed.

Committee Member Gladson stated she appreciated Committee Member McCormack's need for design elements; however, since she lived in the world of code, attorneys, and the bigger powers that be had not appreciated those types of elements in the codes and guidelines and she imagined that would be the challenge for the ordinance and zoning updates. Now that a new General Plan was adopted the next step would be a clean up of ordinances and codes and that would be a monumental task.

Chair Cathcart stated they could beat the issue to death and asked for a motion.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to continue DRC No. 4481-10, DRC Landscape Criteria.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: Adrienne Gladson, Craig Wheeler

ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, May 5, 2010. The meeting adjourned @7:12 p.m.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None