# CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

September 1, 2010

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Ed Knight, Assistant Community Development Director

Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

## Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:06 p.m.

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated there were no changes to the Agenda.

Chair Cathcart reminded the Committee Members that they could approve an item without discussion.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee meeting of August 18, 2010. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member Woollett 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 5:21 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

## **ROLL CALL:**

All Committee Members were present.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

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

There was none.

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

## **CONSENT ITEMS:**

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 18, 2010

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee meeting on August 18, 2010, with changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

#### AGENDA ITEMS:

## Continued Items:

## (2) DRC No. 4478-10 - RUBY'S RESTAURANT - SIGN PROGRAM

- A proposal to change existing signage for a new restaurant located in the Santa Fe Depot Station.
- 186 N. Atchison Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of April 7, 2010
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Zoning Administrator

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

Chair Cathcart stated the variance was outside of the purview of the DRC.

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct and generally the item would go before the Zoning Administrator first, however, as the item had been continued by the DRC it had returned to the DRC.

Applicant, Tim Pitts, address on file, stated he appreciated the efforts by the City's Staff in working with them. He also thanked the DRC for their input. They were finally moving forward and all the comments and input from the DRC had helped them arrive at what was being presented before them. He appreciated that, as it was not often a City worked in that manner. All of the engineering components would be provided for the projecting elements of the signage. He discussed the placement of the address and they wanted to advertise breakfast as many people had not known that Ruby's served breakfast. He felt the address should be a specific size in order to be read easily by the Fire Department.

Mr. Ryan stated Staff had no issues with the address number on the small end of the monument sign; it was the applicant's call as long as it was visible.

#### **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had just one clarification question. She asked if the Ruby's "lady" was double-faced and if the back side would replicate the front? She concurred with the recommendation by Staff and appreciated the applicant taking the feedback from the DRC to heart. It was a much improved sign package.

Mr. Pitts stated yes, the Ruby's "lady" would be double-faced.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had a copy of the previous submittal in case anyone needed to review it. He stated his only issue was that the Staff Report read that there shall be no internally illuminated signs permitted. He read the proposal as having the Ruby's "lady" internally illuminated.

Mr. Pitts stated that was correct. At night they had wanted visibility.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it might be more appropriate to have a painted metal sign with exterior illumination.

Mr. Pitts stated they had discussed that at the previous presentation and they had agreed with the illuminated sign. It would not be blazing illumination.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had not recalled what their discussion was on the illuminated sign issue.

Mr. Pitts stated they would use LED's on that sign. He reviewed the plans with the Committee Members.

Mr. Ryan stated they could add that to the Zoning Administrator's review to allow illumination due to the distance of the sign from Chapman Avenue.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the existing monument sign was internally illuminated. He liked the sign on the south and it was balanced. Other than the internal illumination he was supportive of the proposal.

Committee Member McCormack stated he thought the proposal was great and he only had three issues about the breakfast, lunch, and dinner signage. He had mentioned that spreading the words out would work better. In viewing that area of signage from further away it would appear as one word and he suggested that the words be spread out more, so they appeared as three distinct words.

Mr. Pitts stated he agreed. He had a Ruby's Diner out at the Citadel Outlet Center and the letters were too far apart. In reviewing it, the letters appeared 1 ½ apart and he would not mind having the letters 2 ½ apart, but not 3 or 4 apart. He asked if the DRC could be specific about the spacing.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would be up to the applicant to figure that out. He had brought it up as the T and L spacing appeared different than the spacing between the H and D.

Mr. Pitts stated in terms of expediency, if they would increase the distance to 15%, could they add that as an agreed-upon spacing. He had not wanted to return to the DRC. He wanted to start cooking hamburgers.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested increasing the length by 2' with 1' added between each word. He discussed the spacing with the applicants.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was any way to place the address on the top of the monument sign without a street name? If the Fire Department was coming down Chapman, they would take it as a Chapman address and not an Atchison address. He thought it was important to keep the breakfast, lunch, and dinner on the sign; and to add the address in an area that he pointed to on the plans. It was an important thing to have the breakfast advertisement out there. He asked why there was no signage off of Maple?

Mr. Ryan stated there was less traffic from that area.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had not felt the need for a sign on Maple.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4478-10, Ruby's Restaurant Sign Program, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. That the Zoning Administrator review the illuminated sign.
- 2. The spacing for the sign's words "breakfast, lunch, and dinner" be expanded by 2'.

And with the following recommendation:

1. To explore the address placement on the monument sign to be placed on the pilaster and to maintain the words "breakfast, lunch, and dinner" on that sign.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Committee Member Gladson stated just for clarification, when the sign was being considered by the Zoning Administrator, she asked had the DRC Members wanted to add the language that they had not found the illumination particularly troubling?

Applicant, Joe Campbell, address on file, stated if the sign was not illuminated there would need to be some hoop lamps installed and he thought that was a design issue.

Mr. Ryan stated he had not known if external illumination would be appropriate and that could be a part of the discussion when the item went before the Zoning Administrator.

## New Agenda Items:

# (3) DRC No. 4475-10 – CHUCK YAGHI–ACCESSORY 2<sup>ND</sup> UNIT

- A proposal for a new detached accessory second-unit and rehabilitation of an existing single-family residence.
- 812 E. Washington Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Postponed due to lack of DRC quorum from August 18, 2010 meeting
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from this item's presentation as he was the architect on record for the project.

Committee Member Woollett recused himself from the item's presentation as the project's owner was a consultant of his.

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

Applicant, Shueri Yaghi, stated the information being presented regarding the age of the building was all new to him.

Mr. Ryan stated he wanted to take a closer look at the building and how it was constructed and that would provide some clues as to when it was constructed.

Chair Cathcart stated the DRC had received correspondence from the Old Towne Preservation Association (OTPA) regarding the proposed project and one of the requests that was being made by Staff for further investigation could provide some answers to the various concerns.

#### **Public Comment**

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated his comments were under the assumption that the property was a contributing structure, and until proven otherwise and there was solid evidence provided that the property was not a contributing structure, the OTPA would assume it was. On the surface, in looking at the structure, it appeared that it was a period structure and from the period that the inventory stated. The OTPA was not opposed to accessory structures, but in Old Towne contributing structures had been built in the rear, behind the contributing structures. The argument regarding the setback was not relevant as the structure was originally built and assuming it was built with the current setback on the site creating a larger front yard and understanding that every property in the district was unique regarding setbacks as the homes were not tract homes. The setback was not unusual as there were other homes in the Old Towne Historic District that were built in the rear of their lots. The proposed project had not met the Secretary of Interior's Standards; the Standards stated that the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The alteration of spaces and spatial relationships would be avoided. The existing spatial relationships that existed on the property

may be unique to the block, however, the existing layout and spatial makeup of the site and its alteration must be considered as part of the project. The Standards stated that particular care shall be taken not to obscure, radically change, damage, or destroy the character-defining features in the process of rehabilitation work. The proposed design would completely obscure not only the character-defining features but the entire historic resource. With all past projects, additions and accessory projects, the applicants had been required to build to the rear of the main structure and out of public view, with the concern being visibility from the street. The Old Towne Design Standards stated in order to preserve the facades of existing buildings, additions were discouraged in yards and adjoining public streets and should be confined to rear and side yards, which were out of public view. The project had not met the Old Towne Design Standards. Mr. Frankel stated the Staff Report showed the project was categorically exempt from CEQA, under the assumption that it met the Secretary of Interior's Standards. The project was inconsistent with those standards and would require an Environmental Review under CEQA relating to historic resources. CEQA stated that a categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which might cause a substantial adverse change to a historic resource. There was no doubt that the project created a substantial adverse impact by completely obscuring the entire resource. The categorical exemption applied in the Staff Report could only be utilized when a project complied with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the Old Towne Design Standards. The project was inconsistent with the DRC's required findings that the project must meet the Standards. The OTPA requests that the DRC discuss and explain how the project complied with the Standards as well as what Standards supported the proposed project and the justification to those findings. The Staff Report applied Standards of an in-fill structure only and had not defined impact to the contributing structure. The additions and changes proposed to the main structure were also non-compliant with the Standards. The Secretary of Interior's Standards recommended preserving original entrances and porches, and not removing or radically changing entrances or porches or cutting new entrances or porches on an entry elevation. The standards also discouraged having façade elements not original to the structure. In addition, the OTPA was not comfortable with the FAR of the project as it was out of context with the rest of the block. The proposed project possibly could set a very dangerous precedent, if in fact it was a contributing structure. The OTPA asked that the project be continued, especially in light of Mr. Ryan's comments regarding the Sanborn maps in order to allow Staff to explore other options to bring the proposed project in compliance with the Standards and CEQA.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion and stated he agreed with Mr. Frankel and Staff that he would be willing to entertain a motion to continue the item to allow Staff to further investigate the Sanborn maps and determine whether or not the property was a contributing or an in-fill project. It was of utmost importance to the outcome of the project.

Committee Member Gladson stated it would be the lynch pin on their decision that was before them.

Mr. Ryan stated besides physically inspecting the building closely there were aerials that could be reviewed.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to continue DRC No. 4475-10, Chuck Yaghi Accessory 2<sup>nd</sup> Unit.

Chair Cathcart asked the applicant if he was agreeable to a continuation?

Mr. Yaghi stated he guessed it was okay.

Committee Member Gladson stated she would second the motion, but asked for clarification from Staff. She believed she had heard that Staff felt that they had not had enough time to evaluate the project and was she hearing that the item had been a little bit rushed to get to the DRC. It was disappointing to her personally. They needed to have time to allow Staff to do what they needed to do with the project.

Mr. Ryan stated when he began looking closely at the project and associated information he realized that from the manner the building had been constructed with different materials and no continuity of design that there might be a chance that the structure was non-contributing; when he had reviewed the maps initially it had not occurred to him that there might have been three distinct periods of construction, especially when the gable roof ran in one direction and it would have been the original building. He always reviewed the Sanborn maps on projects and he had reviewed those much later than he had generally done. He apologized for that.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had not wanted to put Mr. Ryan on the spot, however, she felt that maybe the process had been a bit rushed and they needed to stop and complete a thorough evaluation of the proposed project.

Mr. Ryan stated his experience had been that the Sanborn maps and especially during the 1920's and 1950's that there were some changes from one to the other, but there were generally not mistakes on both maps. After reviewing the building alignment and the roof forms it had appeared that the original building had already been obscured by additions to the property that had been completed after 1950.

Committee Member Gladson stated if they found, and it was just speculation at this point, the building was not contributing, could they go through the process to define it as a contributing structure?

Mr. Ryan stated based on the maps, he was assuming that the structure had been built after 1950 and that would not be a structure that would be defined as contributing. The City Council had not made a determination on buildings built after 1940. In addition, the aerial maps might assist him in determining when the other additions were completed. They needed to review the extent of the sites historic classification as it would change the entire project.

Committee Member McCormack stated it had been suggested to move a property in front of the existing property and had there been any thought to move the existing property further up on the lot?

Mr. Ryan stated one of the thoughts was that rather than adding on to the building, and a new foundation would have been needed, if the building would have been moved approximately 20' there would still be a 50' setback allowing the same spatial relationship and there would still be enough room for an addition in the back and that had been a preferred situation. The second thought was to move another historic property onto the site; which was not typical. The third option was to demo the building, which if historic was not an option; and lastly they explored

new construction and how could that fit. At this point until further research was completed the manner in which they proceeded could not be determined.

Mr. Yaghi stated even if the property was contributing, if they kept the same character. In the back it was very low, it was 6' and they could not even walk back there. They would not alter the building, but maintain the same character with the flat roof and raise the back roof.

Committee Member McCormack stated the thing that was ringing in his ears was the large setback and the precedent-setting decision that could have everything lined up like in the City of Irvine. It was a real big issue and he wanted to insure that they addressed that. If it was non-contributing it changed everything and they could just replace everything.

Committee Member Gladson stated there were options based on whether the property was contributing or non-contributing, and different rules to work with when a site was contributing.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

MOTION CARRIED.

## (4) DRC No. 4452-09 – HENRY'S GRILL – SIGNS & AC SCREENING

- A proposal for a new sign program and screening of roof-top equipment for a new restaurant.
- 149 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Final Determination

When the item was called, the applicant was not present and the item was moved to the end of the Agenda. The applicant had not arrived by the end of the meeting and Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, stated he had attempted to contact the applicant and suggested the item be continued to the next meeting.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to continue DRC No. 4452-09, Henry's Grill Signs and AC Screening, due to the applicant's absence at the meeting.

SECOND: Bill Cathcart

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Craig Wheeler

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

## (5) DRC No. 4471-10 – LA VETA SERVICE STATION

- A proposal to remodel an idle gas station, which includes the installation of new pump island canopies, monument sign and wall signage, conversion of an auto repair bay into a convenience store, new light standards, and landscaping.
- 1650 W. La Veta Avenue
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Fred Cohen, address on file, stated he was the architect on the project and he wanted to thank Ms. Thakur. They had been working together for the past six months and they had many revisions to the plan and it was finally before them. As far as the photometric plan, the manufacturer was still in the process of preparing a revised photometric plan that would account for shielding of the new light standards. All the lights would be shielded and pointed downward. They had promised to have it completed by September 1, but he had not received it. The amount of light would be reduced to ½ foot-candle spillage to the site. As far as the landscaping, he was looking for a recommendation from the DRC to incorporate into their plan.

## **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the Staff Report, page 6, he thought it should read: "photoelectric photometer having a spectral", instead of "special".

Ms. Thakur stated that correction would be noted.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the irrigation plan should be returned to the DRC for review and approval; it was something to keep in mind as they discussed it.

Committee Member Gladson stated, regarding the conditions, there appeared to be some that might not need to be in there. Condition No. 16, in her view, was not a condition but a comment from Public Works and might need to be cleaned up for the record.

Ms. Thakur stated the reason that Condition No. 16 was included was due to Public Works' request to have that condition included.

Committee Member Gladson stated she understood why they would have wanted that, but they were not physically changing any square footage of the building as it was just a reface. In her view it had not needed to be in the Staff Report. Her concern was with the issue of lighting, and to ensure that there would not be an excessive amount of glare. She stated she would leave the

architecture to the experts. She was pleased that there would be landscaping coming back to the site.

Chair Cathcart stated he would want to see the irrigation and landscape plans return to the DRC. On the irrigation plan there was no pressure calculation included; with the information that the spray would be 30' he had no means to measure that it would work or not. He wanted to review the pressure calculations. On the corner of Bedford and LaVeta with the large planter the irrigation system was run along the outside and they needed to look at the use of some bubblers and the addition of another row of sprinkler heads in the middle. On the landscape plan one of the things that occurred on commercial properties was that there was so much more to take care of than the landscaping; they should have the landscape be as bulletproof as possible. He suggested reducing the plant material varieties that would be used. In looking along the backside, the Police Department might have a problem with the Tristania conflicting with the lighting; he believed there needed to be a separation of lighting, particularly with the trees. He wanted to have the spelling of the plant materials corrected on the plans. They might want to rethink the Camphor trees; there were Palm and Pygmy trees and then all of a sudden there was a Camphor tree or two and it had not appeared to fit.

Mr. Cohen asked if he preferred the use of Palm trees?

Chair Cathcart stated he liked them all; it was up to the applicant and he was just providing some suggestions.

Committee Member Gladson stated what she was hearing from the Committee was to use a plant palette that was self-maintained.

Chair Cathcart stated in a commercial area when he saw Agapanthus, he saw plants that would not be clipped when they fell down and it would appear ragged, as those plants require attention and additional maintenance. He suggested more leafy plants and plants that were low maintenance plantings.

Committee Member McCormack suggested simplification of the landscape. He asked if the City of Orange needed to come in compliance with the ABA 1881 guidelines?

Ms. Thakur stated yes.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had just completed a project that had complied with the ABA 1881 guidelines and it was 8 sheets; the calculations were enormous. It would be a problem as the compliance was strict. There needed to be the proper sprinkler heads and to understand hydro-zoning. It would be for the better as they were weeding out the Landscape Architects who had not known how to use plants; it was all about conserving water. Part of what he and Chair Cathcart would suggest was to simplify; to have the palette be too fussy required some plants that drank more water and others that had not needed to drink at all. In terms of simplifying, he would want the plans to come back to the DRC for review and have the irrigation plan be developed per the hydro-zones that the planting plans would show. The way he looked at it, three of the planting areas could be a bit fussier, and he agreed that the Camphors would be the odd man out in the poker game; there were Queen Palms and then the Camphors. The whole back end of the property could be turned into ground cover, and vines could be added on the ugly

wall and Tristania planted to work with the lights. Place them 20-25' apart and keep them 10' away from the lights and allow the lights to do what they would do. If it was reversed with pavement and a hot wall they would choose a different plant. It was simplified. Let the Palms do the work and it would make the hydro-zones easier to define and the irrigation systems more efficient. The maintenance would be low and there would be water savings.

Committee Member Woollett stated Camphor trees have large roots and asked if they should be there at all?

Chair Cathcart stated the planter was 12' wide.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were only two Camphor trees. He would lay the lights out first and ensure the lights would not be blocked and then to plant the trees at 18' to 24' apart; depending on how far apart the lights were.

The Committee Members and applicants reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Woollett asked Staff to explain, as referenced in item #15 of Staff's recommended conditions, where the landscape cut back was going to be,.

Ms. Thakur stated currently on the site there was 3 feet of landscaping in addition to what was shown on the plans before the Committee. The applicant had already cut back three additional feet on the site plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated his only comments were on the drawings that appeared to have a lack of information about the materials that would be used. He asked if there would be metal siding?

Ms. Thakur stated the architect had indicated to her that they would be using metal for the façade for the entry.

Mr. Cohen stated they would be using metal on the canopy over the fueling area, the type that was used on many of the Chevron stations, such as the one on Main and Chapman and the other one on Chapman and Lewis. They used the ACM material on the canopy and the buildings would be stucco, in a sandstone finish. The only metal would be on the canopy.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the material would be for the enclosure around the vapor recovery unit?

Mr. Cohen stated it would be a metal enclosure, the same type that was used at the other Chevron stations. It would match the building and they could texture coat or stucco it to match the building and the gates would be metal and they could be texture coated as well.

Ms. Thakur stated since the plans would be returning for the irrigation and landscape components, they could include a condition that the elevation drawings return to the Committee with detailed material call-outs.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they should just suggest leaving the metal uncoated?

Applicant, Michael Nazari, address on file, asked if they wanted pictures or actual samples?

Committee Member Wheeler stated a sample board would be nice. He was not opposed to that and he would want to see samples of what the intended material was. On the fueling canopy there was a notation for the posts to be straight posts, however, the existing posts were curved and he was not certain which posts would be used.

Mr. Cohen stated they would use the existing posts.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the proposed material use needed to be on the drawings.

Mr. Cohen asked if the Committee was generally pleased with the elevations, as he wanted to move forward with the structural drawings: electrical, mechanical, plumbing, etc.; with the DRC approval, and 15 days after the appeal process, they could move on to the Building Division.

Committee Member Wheeler stated once they saw what the materials were there was a possibility that someone on the Committee might not agree with the materials proposed. It was the applicant's call.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4471-10, La Veta Service Station, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the editorial changes discussed for Condition No. 6, and with a change to Condition No. 14 that the landscape and irrigation plans return to the DRC for review and approval; and with the additional conditions:

1. The drawings for the exterior building and pump canopy shall be returned to the DRC for review and approval.

And with the following suggestion:

1. That Condition No. 15 and 16 be removed.

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, stated there was a part of Condition No. 16 which read that the only requirement from Public Works Department was to remove the abandoned driveway apron and restore it to full height, and that portion may need to remain.

Committee Member Gladson stated she considered those items to be Public Works.

Ms. Thakur stated she could modify Condition No. 16 and remove Condition No. 15. In a motion it had been moved to approve the project with the landscape and irrigation plans returning for DRC review; and as the elevations would also be coming back would the Committee Members prefer to continue the item in its entirety?

Committee Member Woollett stated in bifurcating the item it would provide information to the applicant that the DRC had approved parts of the project.

Committee Member Wheeler stated generally he was happy with the design of the building and he just needed to know what the materials were.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

#### (6) DRC No. 4490-10 – CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY ARGYROS FORUM

- A proposal to enclose 13,954 square feet of exterior seating area and renovate 24,968 square feet of interior building space to allow for additional program space, student activities area, dining, admissions area, offices, board room, faculty lounge, and of 8,204 square feet of outdoor roof deck, gardens, and trellises on the third floor. Minimal landscape will be replaced as a result of the construction.
- 386 N. Center Street
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, <a href="mailto:dnguyen@cityoforange.org">dnguyen@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Community Development Director

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Kris Olsen, address on file, stated Ms. Nguyen summed up the project pretty well. One of the things that drove the project, that had been originally designed in 1991, and Bob Murrin was on the original design team that had designed it and they were glad to have him back; but it had been designed as a student union. When it was first occupied by the University the space became administrative and almost everything but a student union, with the exception of the dining commons area. They had been hearing from the students that they had a nice University, but where was the student union? The proposal was an effort to rectify that and without enlarging the footprint of the building they were able to in-fill the outdoor dining area and elevating it to the third-floor roof, with programming space on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The University President had given A.C. Martin a big challenge at the beginning of the project that he wanted to integrate the architectural direction of the campus, and it was more of an Ivy League feel in using brick which was on the library, the chapel, and other buildings which were A.C. Martin projects.

Applicant, Bob Murrin, address on file, stated the architectural blend had come from the old law school and they had taken that and populated it around campus.

Mr. Olsen stated the University President had wanted Argyros to have the feel that it was a part of the campus and it had been a challenge for the design team to figure out a balance where it complimented the campus and the building itself. He was pleased with what they had come up with.

Mr. Murrin stated they had taken the Chapman blend and the limestone that had been used on the library and used it with colors that related to the neighbors across the way along with the use of mullion colors from the Library, which were more in the green/gray tones and a lighter gray rather than some of the darker greens and grays used in other areas of the campus. The colors were compatible. They were not hiding the Argyros architecture which was apparent in the exposed column grid that was part of the original design and they would maintain that same rhythm and the punched windows were the same. When they were finished the intent was that the new components had not appeared as additions, but had always been that way. They were pleased with the sustainable components, the trellis was not industrial looking, but had rather nice photovoltaics that were flat and integrated into the horizontal feel that would provide a shade structure. They were not opaque, but had electronic items spaced out that allowed light to filter through. It would be a green building and a very comfortable environment. They had a

green roof at the top, with a variety of plants and it would also be a sustainable area that helped to insulate the floor below and the students asked for things to be green. Most of the materials they used were recycled or sustainable in nature and they wanted to put a nice green face on the project. Landscape would be left as is; there was a new walkway being introduced, but other than that it would be in the same palette as what had existed.

Mr. Olsen stated any plants that would not survive through construction would be replaced.

## Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion and asked if there was anything being done to the interior of the building?

Mr. Murrin stated yes; there would be renovations to the ground floor and the addition of a great room and student center with a fireplace and lounge areas. Jamba Juice and Einstein Bagels would be located inside.

Committee Member Gladson asked what had been the student feedback on the proposed project?

Mr. Murrin stated they conducted some focus sessions and one of the things they had heard was that students wanted the project to be green, they wanted Jamba Juice, and they wanted a student room. On the 3rd floor there would be a faculty club that would spill outdoors and it would be more of a dining hall.

Mr. Olsen stated the space was currently used for admissions and that would be relocated to the  $2^{nd}$  floor.

Committee Member Woollett asked if Chapman University had given any consideration to the use of a ground water loop on campus?

Mr. Olsen stated, regarding a central plant, it seemed that every few years that came up as a topic of discussion with the real estate committee. Because the campus had been pieced together and not master-planned, they found from first-hand experience in excavating throughout the campus that there was so much undocumented construction and no one had the appetite to go back in and attempt any additional excavation anytime soon. It was so challenging and the cost was twice as much as anticipated. They had photos of a section between Wilkinson and Memorial Halls where they had counted 36 undocumented pipes that went back and forth, and no one knew if they were live or not. One at a time they had to be tested. Every time they completed a project they gained better documentation.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had mentioned cooling towers and his thought was that they would continue to proliferate those things, which were inefficient and created problems on the roof to hide them. The ground systems would use natural ground cooling with a loop that would be around 62 degrees and that would absorb the cool water from the heating equipment.

Mr. Murrin stated there was a lot of cobble stone around the areas on campus and he was not certain how that would impact thermally cooling the rocks. There seemed to be a trend to do that.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they could provide information on the solar panels and what would the underside of the panels look like?

Mr. Murrin stated they were still obtaining bids, but the one panel they liked was a laminated glass panel, 4' x 8' laminated glass, and they had modules of photovoltaic materials and were spaced with a visual gap which allowed natural light to filter through. They had not wanted an industrial look, but more of a horizontal look which they could obtain from the flat glass panels and provide a bit of shelter from the rain.

Mr. Olsen stated it was the only panel that he had seen that took aesthetics into consideration and could be used as a design element.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the detail drawings the solar panels would cantilever over the last support by 4-to-5 feet; he asked if that was possible?

Mr. Murrin stated yes they could do that as they were fairly lightweight.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he disagreed with the comment that the new construction would not appear as an addition; he felt it would look like an addition and that was not necessarily bad. He felt it would read as something done in a different time.

Mr. Murrin stated they had gone through many options for the proposed project, many of which were true to the building itself. They attempted to replicate what was there, so it was more of the same. But as a neighbor to the campus, it finally lost out and so they thought it was better to bring in some of the new and try to integrate it best they could.

Chair Cathcart stated for those of us who had been around a long time they would know that it was an addition, but to someone new they might not realize that. It would be the context of the visitor that would view it as being old or new construction.

Mr. Olsen stated they had a whole new population every four to five years.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the planting would be on the top deck?

Mr. Murrin stated they would use a pan system with 6" of soil; the deck would be on pedestals. It would be on a drip system and they would build a steal frame that would allow the pan, at different heights, to appear deeper. They would use herbs and smaller plantings that could be easily replaced.

Chair Cathcart stated they had worked with CHOC in doing the same type of system. It was on every floor and it worked fine and had not leaked.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was a theme with the landscape.

Mr. Murrin stated they had spoke about using herbs, but the final planting palette had not been defined.

Mr. Olsen stated what would ultimately drive a landscape theme would be the Science Department's involvement; he could envision them providing a theme.

Mr. Murrin stated it could be drought tolerant.

Committee Member McCormack stated at Disneyland they had made everything in Tomorrow Land edible; that was a prime example. There were many opportunities and personally, he suggested making a story with the plantings that would be a learning environment; an area that the students took care of on their own.

Committee Member Gladson stated with the cool roof would it be painted white or just cooled with plant material?

Mr. Murrin stated the roof was existing and it was white with a rock ballast on it.

Committee Member McCormack stated it went back to teaching the students about green and not constantly having to replace the plants but having something that was truly sustainable. He would like to see something that was a lifelong learning situation. He thought it was great and agreed with Committee Member Wheeler it had looked different but was going in the right direction. The other thing that was bugging him was, in the northwest corner of the building in Panther Plaza, it was the main axis coming from the quad; people would go right over that edge and he wondered if they could explore adding more seating to that area as it was a nice gathering area. If the landscape was thick enough the guys might not jump over it.

Mr. Murrin stated there was an elevation change there of approximately 3'.

Mr. Olsen stated they were always dealing with that situation on campus with students creating goat paths, and instead of fighting it they normally formalize the area with a DG path or hardscape. In the area Committee Member McCormack spoke about, they would want to address that since the area was steep and there would be no way to formalize it into a pathway.

Committee Member McCormack stated the area would be used a lot and possibly they could pull the wall back and widen the stairs. He felt it would become a goat path.

Mr. Olsen stated they had challenges with defeating a goat path and they would go with something such as the white roses, the really nice thorny ones that would stop access. The landscape area was as wide as they could get it in that area because of the 20-foot fire lane. The stairs of the paths coincided with the entrances into the interior space and that would be the most likely access points.

Mr. Murrin stated all the residence halls were down below and students would be coming up and penetrating the building before they got to that corner. That was one big open space and there were other logical points of access. There was a grading issue at the corner.

Ms. Nguyen asked if there was any input in the use of the "Clara" plant species vs. the "Ballerina" species?

Committee Member McCormack stated the "Ballerina" was too small.

Mr. Olsen stated it was not consistent with what they had in their master plan; the "Clara" was part of their campus palette.

The Committee Members agreed with the use of the "Clara".

Ms. Nguyen asked if there were any comments regarding the mechanical screening?

Chair Cathcart stated it was screened.

Ms. Nguyen asked if it matched the architecture of the building since it would be visible from the building across it?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had no issues with it.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to recommend approval to the Community Development Director, DRC No. 4490-10, Chapman University Argyros Forum, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following condition:

1. The Rhaphiolepis indica "Ballerina" be changed to Rhaphiolepis indica "Clara".

And with the following recommendations:

- 1. That the roof planting have an educational theme or use.
- 2. Widen the planting area at the northwest corner of the building so students will not jump between the patio and sidewalk.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

## (7) DRC No. 4502-10 – VASQUEZ RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a new two-story single family residence and two-story accessory second housing unit on a vacant parcel.
- Easterly adjacent lot to 503 South Prospect
- Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Comments

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Aaron Johannsen, address on file, stated with regard to the roof pitch he agreed with a reduction of the roof pitch to 4 and 12, which would reduce the massing. He presented a handout to the Committee Members.

#### **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Mr. Johannsen stated some of the elements that were included in his design were taken from a neighboring property and he understood it was a residence with some significance. They were attempting to tie in their project with that residence and attempting to bring it into a more contemporary look. They had found those elements in some of the residences across the street.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as far as the In-Fill Guidelines were concerned, he felt they could take the approach of trying to match the other 1960-1970 period homes in the neighborhood or to be complimentary to the Irving Gill home. If Mr. Johannsen was attempting to be compatible or complimentary to the Gill home, he thought he should review some of the other projects and designs that were done in that period. The overriding theme in that period and style of architecture was simplicity. They were beautiful homes and they had decorative elements. Committee Member Wheeler presented the applicant with some photos of the homes he was speaking to. They were similar to the Gill home in style and there were elements in the proposal that seemed to be in conflict with that style. He agreed that with a tile roof it worked much better with a 4 and 12, or even a 3 and 12. He would strongly urge that they get rid of the brick as he had not seen brick on anything of that period and there was not brick used in any of the Haciendas or Ranchos. In one of the photos a painted band had been used, rather than brick. He would strongly suggest removing the head trim on the windows and to use a sill trim. If in that period they wanted trim it would be either nothing at all or much more elaborate with a churrigueresque or more creative form. There would be a beautiful home, very plain, but the front door would contain a very elaborate form that would stand out nicely against the front door. Years ago when he was doing custom homes in that style, clients would state it was such a big blank wall and asked if they could add something to break it up. His reply would be no; in keeping with the style, they would have small openings and to secure the homes both in Spain and then in California they had limited windows and to protect from the heat they would often have shutters. There might be a way to add something to the design without adding elements

that seemed to come from a different time and place. Committee Member Wheeler suggested reducing the amount of hip roofs as that was unlike anything that was built in that time; a gable was more in keeping with the Gill house. Another thing was that on the north side of the Gill house there was a cantilevered portion that projected out, he attempted to show a picture of the house from his cell phone. There was a fascinating stair form on the outside of the building. Another thought was that on the circular drive it took up a lot of the front area and it was a fairly narrow lot. A circular drive was very impressive, but it ate up a lot of yard.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was impressive when there was a lot of land, but on a smaller site it was almost taking away too much. A circular drive would be supported by some pretty strong landscape and if there was not a strong landscape it would appear as just concrete. They needed both of those to make the circular driveway statement.

Mr. Johannsen stated there was a property at 333 E. La Veta that had the same design with a shorter lot.

Mr. Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner, commented that the inside radius for a curved driveway needed to have a 20-foot setback.

Mr. Johannsen stated if that was the case it would not work at all.

Committee Member Woollett stated in regard to relating to the rest of the neighborhood he felt they could not pick out elements from the other homes on La Veta that the applicant liked and then attempt to match the style of the home on the corner; it would not work. He understood why the applicant wanted to relate to the home on the corner as it was a lovely house. That house had a magnificent setting as it was a corner home on a large lot, but to attempt to compete with that home had not made any sense. He suggested developing the lot and share in the grandeur and loveliness of it, but to compete with that home would fail. There was not enough frontage, there was not enough land. He was not as concerned with what happened in the back as what would occur on the street. He agreed with Committee Member Wheeler's suggestions and in many respects the project should be understated.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the key was simplicity and to think in terms that the property might have been an accessory to the Gill house on the corner, a secondary structure and to allow Irving Gill to shine and to build something compatible next door.

Committee Member Gladson stated she concurred with her colleagues and she suggested reviewing the FAR and to be sensitive to the floor area ratios and averages on the block. There was a way to build a two-story that was not imposing and it was all about good design. Just dealing with a better pitch on the roof would change things. She had to find the project compatible with the In-Fill Guidelines.

Mr. Johannsen stated the real challenge was that he was given a program and with "X" number of bedrooms and there was a lot of house there; in placing the accessory unit in the back there was no other way to achieve all the requirements without having the structure be a two-story home.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the accessory needed to be a separate unit?

Mr. Johannsen stated it had to be separate.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was fascinated that it was the Glassell/Chapman tract or something like that.

Mr. Ryan stated there were some similar period buildings on the map that were very good, but not as large.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was also another large structure on the other side of the street and he knew the people who lived there.

Committee Member Gladson stated La Veta had a lot of wonderful homes on that street.

Chair Cathcart asked the applicant and Staff if they had enough input.

Ms. Thakur stated she had her notes and the tape.

The item was presented for preliminary review and a motion was not needed.

#### (8) DRC No. 4506-10 - THE BRUXIE – SIGNS, AWNINGS, & SCREENING

- A proposal for new signs, awnings, and screening of roof-top equipment on a fast food restaurant.
- 292 N. Glassell Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Dean Simon, address on file, stated one of the options for the wall sign was to use a vinyl film with some type of anti-graffiti coating on it. One thing he noticed was that one of the poles at the site had been tagged, obviously the sign was reachable and if they painted something or something detachable it could be ruined. If the wall was smooth, or if they textured the waffle pattern in it or not they wanted to have some type of coating over it. The main focus was to maintain the building's integrity and to keep the nostalgic look and in doing that to keep costs down.

Chair Cathcart stated he was correct in being concerned with tagging; his office had been in the downtown area for 30 some odd years and he had finally had it. It was a situation that had to be looked at daily and if it was removed enough times the taggers would leave the site alone.

Mr. Simon stated he owned a produce business on  $6^{th}$  and Alameda and he was also a chef; he started work at 2:00 a.m. and dealt with tagging. It was reality and people invested a lot in buildings and then there were those who thought they could wreck them.

#### **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated the proposal was for a sign, but it was more than just a sign. Apparently Mr. Ryan had not felt compelled to address any of the site issues, such as why were the posts still there and why was there paving between the sidewalk and the building and issues like that.

Mr. Ryan stated if there was obviously something there that needed to be addressed on the property, Staff would encourage the applicant to address those issues; but when someone came in with a proposal and it was specific to the extent of what they wanted to do, the DRC was open to add suggestions, however, the proposal before the DRC was for site signage.

Chair Cathcart stated he remembered when the bollards went in, it was when a car had gone through there.

Mr. Simon stated there was a dent on the building and it was from a previous time when there were parking spaces there and it was a safety issue. He assured them that it would not have been his choice to have the bollards there, but he felt it they removed them now and there was an incident it could be a liability issue.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested painting them in a different color.

Mr. Simon stated he was open to suggestions. They were a functional element and not a design feature.

Committee Member Woollett stated what he perceived to be Staff's approach was that in a sense the corner was not historic, but it was almost an icon and he thought it was worthy of special consideration. He liked the approach that was being taken to the building and he saw a real potential. In the last two years it had been kind of ragged, like the muffler shop. It seemed that it was moving in the right direction and with a few little tweaks here and there going in the same direction could only add to the project.

Mr. Simon stated he had been looking in the area for over a year and had the fortune of knocking on the owner's door and he had very dear friends that had attended Orange High School in the 1950's who had helped them. They had photos from the past and they were working with the nostalgic look. Regarding the bollards, they were looking at the space from a design perspective and he felt the bollards were not inviting. He was open to changes, but within reason for cost purposes.

Chair Cathcart stated bollards added a psychological safety net for pedestrians and that was a busy intersection with Chapman kids going one way and cars trying to get across.

Mr. Simon stated if there was a way to achieve an aesthetic look and maintain the bollards he was open to suggestions.

Committee Member Gladson stated the bollards at Plaza Park added a barrier, but they looked compatible.

Chair Cathcart stated they were etched so if they were hit they would fall over.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was reviewing the north elevation of the building which he felt was going in a really good direction and when he thought of waffles he thought of them as being round, but they were also rectangular. It seemed that emphasizing the rectangular form was more important and not attempting to carry the pattern around to the western end, and maybe use another color, to allow the one wall to appear as the waffle side. Maybe taking it to the higher roof and bringing the line down there would have a rectangle with the pattern on it and it would resemble a waffle. He thought the colors were great and going through there with the fascias in the red color was a great idea and picking up the same hue in the waffle made sense. The yellow on the bollards was probably not a good idea, and he thought it would look better if it had not looked like a hazard zone. They could leave the posts there and paint them a different color and they could add fencing that was decorative. They could remove the asphalt and it would allow the building to be more quirky and attractive, almost more cottage like and not in

the middle of a hazard zone-to have the building be more inviting and lure people under the cover for shade. He felt there was too much sun most of the time in the climate of Orange; it was just too hot and shade was really welcoming. The bollards become a visual separation that stated it was much nicer on the other side of the fence. Landscaping could also be added and the barrier would not be a barrier but more of a welcome separation from the street. The colors would be great and he could see the bollards being a dark brown, which would work with the red. The applicant could do something creative with the roof equipment, and one of the most interesting shops in a San Diego shopping center built near Old Town, was a pastry shop with a piece of the venting duct that stuck out and the air was blown down at the entrance and the smells from the pastry shop came through it. In a sense, the project would be cleaning the site up, but it could also become some type of a caricature of what was happening inside. He had no problem with that.

Mr. Ryan stated they could have a cube of butter on top.

Committee Member Gladson asked if a regular waffle could be ordered in addition to just a waffle as a sandwich?

Mr. Simon stated they would have waffle sundaes, waffle sandwiches, but the primary menu item would be waffle sandwiches. It was an authentic Brussels waffle which was light, airy, savory and not sweet. They could make a sweet profile or something more savory; there would actually be a Bruxie burger.

Committee Member Woollett stated the restaurant would really be in the spirit of Old Towne. If you walked the streets of Old Towne years ago there would have been places such as the proposed project that would lure people in.

Chair Cathcart stated the collaborative had been trying to pull the fun stuff out of the closet and put it out there. When the designers had done the signage on the original go-around for the collaborative, the barber shop had scissors and it was more of a playful nature.

Committee Member Gladson stated she generally was pleased with where the proposed project was headed. On the pole sign, and understanding it was non-conforming, one of the fun elements of the sign was the ice cream cone on the sign and it was the imagery that they were attempting to get back to with that building. It was too bad that the cabinet could not be changed to appear more like a waffle; it would be fun to play off the waffle elements in that sign too. She respected that the sign could not be touched unless they would comply with the code.

Mr. Simon stated it was a pretty dated cabinet and they had spoke of having it be internally illuminated and changing it to a waffle and to have it be in the same diameter, but after speaking with Mr. Ryan they realized that it was a non-conforming sign.

Committee Member Gladson stated she understood that and they would just have to let it be. She felt they would need to screen the equipment, and if they turned it into a tub of butter that would be fine. In the Staff Report there was detail about the use of colors, three colors and five colors, and she asked what the sign was allowed to have?

Mr. Simon stated it had three colors in it. The crème would be the background color.

Committee Member Gladson stated she also remembered some information about the Bruxie lettering being more of a channel.

Mr. Ryan stated the individual letters should have some sort of reveal.

Committee Member Gladson asked if it would be prone to vandalism, or could they ensure the lettering stayed on the building.

Chair Cathcart stated he had not known of any incidents with rip and tear, just tagging.

Mr. Simon stated if they used fixed letters the chances of repairing the letter would be small. His sign designer felt the treatment proposed would be nice and have a functionality and taking in the reality that they were prone to tagging. They would probably have gone in a different direction if the sign had been higher, but the reality was that the sign was low.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was nothing that said "bad restaurant" more than the teriyaki and ice cream; it was the prime example of the wrong thing to do. He felt the applicant was going in a really good direction and one of the first thoughts he had was that he really liked the waffle theme. There were so many things they could use, turf block placed vertically, panels, or actually placing a material up there. When they began painting a waffle pattern on the wall and they got tagged it would all start to thread away, and would not be as good as when it had been done initially. He suggested adding material up there; the waffle was a great idea and with some added "dimension" would make a statement. He liked the direction of the project. The bollards stated nothing but a person had died there and don't go there; he felt they needed to get rid of the bollards. There were many things they could do; it was the only place in the City that had that situation.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was that way on the Foster Freeze on West Chapman, there were bollards there.

Committee Member Woollett asked why was that corner more vulnerable than the corner across the street?

Mr. Simon stated he was just taking a stab at it, but thought that someone had driven into the building and the insurance company had asked that the bollards be placed there. Someone could jump the sidewalk and wipe out the entire front. He completely understood what he was hearing, but his issue was that he would prefer to hide them or make the bollards more tasteful, as he was afraid of removing them in the event that something occurred he could lose everything.

Chair Cathcart stated the Police Department might have suggested the bollards as there had been multiple accidents on that corner.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was a suggestion they could just throw out there to remove the bollards in the future if it worked out. If they were there for five years and Mr. Simon felt they were no longer needed it could be something he could look at. She had not felt the applicant would need to take them out.

Mr. Simon stated he would want to hear some suggestions, possibly from a landscape perspective or use perspective as they had spoke of placing something over them, some type of texture or turning them into a fence or counter. He would want them to disappear visually but not remove them for liability reasons.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested adding a round element to them like the bollards in Plaza Park and adding a chain between them.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could add a stand up counter at barstool height and the wall as a backdrop and taking a page from Chapman and have a seat wall, and to be able to sit on either side of the wall. An opening could be created where the waiting line would go and they could add table and chairs.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the people sitting on the outside of the wall could be vulnerable if the wall was hit.

Mr. Simon stated they would be on the sidewalk if they sat on the other side.

Chair Cathcart stated he would dispel the myth of Landscape Architects always wanting to add landscape. He would not want to add any landscape as there would be kids all over the place out there.

Committee Member McCormack stated there could be higher seating, people looking out.

Mr. Simon stated they would add a bike rack too.

Committee Member Woollett asked why paving was needed at the north wall?

Chair Cathcart stated the film school was at Chapman and Olive and kids walked that way, they would walk through and right through the side of it.

Committee Member McCormack suggested adding a hedge right up against the wall and keeping it tight and pave it nicely, to remove the asphalt and to create a walkable surface. It could be turned into a brand new image; it was going to be great.

Mr. Simon stated they had not looked at any type of planting yet, there was a nice wall with some greenery on the south side, and the intent was what the DRC was suggesting.

Committee Member Gladson suggested, and it was just a suggestion, she understood the building was not historic but there was a cultural connection and there would be some folks in town that would say their dairy treat was gone; and there might be some benefit in paying homage to that. If in an area they could have a story posted about the history of the building and there were photos for the archives.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was concerned that the Committee was not being very constructive with the proposal and they were wandering all over the place. The item was being presented for a final determination on the signage.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that there had been a suggestion to carry it out to a rectangle, to suggest a waffle, he pointed to the area he spoke to on the photos. It might get them into a bit of problem in adding to the roof and suggested developing a square in the other area.

Mr. Simon stated that was what they had thought would work too.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was the same area he was referring to.

Mr. Simon stated if they added a hedge it would square it off more and add more dimension.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they would be finishing off the three other walls?

Mr. Simon stated just with the base colored paint.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the board and batten would remain?

Mr. Simon stated they had to inspect that material and if the material was damaged they might just have those walls be flat textured and painted as they wanted it to appear as clean as possible, with the press board it had not appeared as sturdy as he would want it to be, that would be dictated by what they found.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the corrugated form that dropped down would be removed?

Mr. Simon stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the shape of the pole sign bothered him. He asked why they were introducing the froufrou curves and why not just have another waffle shape up there and have it be simple. It was just a suggestion. He thought the chains would work on the bollards.

Mr. Simon stated he agreed with the sign suggestion and they would initially do something with the bollards and eventually the possibility of adding a counter. He had someone come in and provide him with a quote for redoing the pavement. He had not explored removing any sections of asphalt yet.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was hearing a lot of recommendations and the proposal was a final determination and he asked if it would be a better thing to allow the applicant to modify the proposal and return to the DRC?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he disagreed with that as it was a proposal for signage.

Chair Cathcart stated they were wandering all over the place.

Committee Member McCormack stated he just wanted to confirm they were making a recommendation on signage only and not on the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not wanted to go further than what they were being asked to look at.

Committee Member McCormack stated the DRC would be making a recommendation on everything that would be new.

Mr. Simon stated the bollards were currently yellow, they had been left yellow and they basically had not wanted to paint them as he was afraid that it would bring up a can of worms. He would certainly take in all the suggestions and use some of them. At the end of the day he was looking to get his signs approved and the canopy approved and he planned for the site to be more aesthetically appealing one step at a time.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested painting the bollards red.

Mr. Simon stated he had looked at red as well. The only issue was that having them red or yellow it would keep them a safety issue; and if they were painted black someone could run into them in the dark.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed with what was proposed, and in the future they could use some of the suggestions provided to incorporate further changes.

Mr. Simon stated they could possibly add the chains, adding counters would be something further in the future. Mr. Ryan had done a lot for them and he had dealt with other cities in construction phases, but he had the best experience in working with the Planning Staff in the City of Orange. There had been a lot of interaction and it streamlined the process for them.

Committee Member Gladson stated Mr. Simon appeared to be open and receptive to their suggestions.

Committee Member Woollett stated they needed to remember the proposal was for signage and the only things he had heard was that they wished the sign was not the shape as presented, and the applicant was receptive to their suggestions. He would suggest approval of the project and have the sign be a different shape, rectangle or square.

Mr. Simon stated he agreed with rectangle.

Applicant, Cindy Simon, address on file, asked what they thought of the lights?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the signs would not be internally illuminated so there had to be external lighting.

Mr. Simon stated the sign would be rectangular, and the bollards would be red to match the trim and they could look at a waffle pattern on the sign.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4506-10, The Bruxie Signs, Awnings, and Screening, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The bollards shall be painted the same reddish color to match the sign pole and building.
- 2. The shape of sign "A" be rectangular without the ornamentation around the edges.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 15, 2010.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.