# CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

October 6, 2010

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

#### **Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.**

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

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated she wanted to follow up on the question regarding the radius maps and a conflict of interest and if a parcel was within the 500' radius that was owned by the same property owner of the subject site. In particular, that had pertained to the Haven Gastropub project. She had spoken with the Assistant City Attorney, Gary Sheatz, and he was clear that the 500' radius needed to touch the parcel of the subject property. Haven Gastropub was on one site and the parking lot was owned by the building owner, however, was a separate parcel and had not counted toward a conflict area. Committee Member Wheeler was correct to have not acted on the item when the building and the parking lot had come through several years ago, but now that the item's application was strictly for the building he could act on it.

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented Informational Item No. 3. He stated Southern California Edison (SCE), in partnership with the Orange County Coastkeeper, was working with a sustainable landscape project at the SCE substation at Taft and Tustin. The site was zoned industrial and SCE proposed to remove the existing landscape and replace it with a sustainable landscape system. When the new landscape was in place, SCE would hope to reduce the water usage by 60% and the plant materials would be a mix of drought tolerant, California natives, and Mediterranean species. SCE and their representatives were present to share the information on the preliminary overview of their project.

Chair Cathcart commented that lately on fuel modification plans the Fire Department had a problem with California natives and he asked if that had been taken into consideration to use drought tolerant, non-native plantings?

Gary Brown, address on file, replied that as the project had no wild land interface there was a different set of criteria. The site was fully irrigated and the native plants they chose would be green year-round. He was partnering with SCE and it was not their first partnership with them.

The concept was to take the substation and design a landscape that would be "California friendly" and colorful year round; they would demolish and take out all the existing plantings, replant, and maintain the site for two years. The Orange County Coastkeeper would want to ensure that the plantings were fully established. During that two year period there would be an extensive outreach program to the public to educate them. There would be banners on the site to refer the public to a website that would educate them; people could go to the website and see plants that were on-site and get a referral as to where to purchase those plants. The other aspect would be a study of the consumables, including a carbon footprint of the lawn mowers going back and forth, trips to the dump for trimmings, and the site would be monitored for a two year period with hopes that the study would show savings in water consumption, 85% in the carbon footprint and another aspect of his organization was water quality. They were very focused on urban run off; the project would eliminate the low flows and that was a major aspect of the project. It would be a model that would save them 50-60% in their maintenance and operation costs. It was more than a landscape project, it was a public education project and it was a study that would open doors for their 500-plus sites.

Committee Member Gladson stated for the non-landscape experts on the Committee the reduction of water use would be calculated according to the new AB1881 Standards.

Mr. Brown stated that was correct. It would also include a compost site.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was delighted that the site was being re-done. It was wonderful to have the information and that more would be available. The Western Red Bud had a tendency toward disease and he had not known whether that was a significant issue.

Committee Member McCormack commented that he didn't have a problem with that species as the eco-system that would be designed on the site would be a reduction in water and therefore less mildew, which usually attributed to that type of disease problem.

Committee Member Woollett asked why had they chosen a mowable grass?

Bob Clark, address on file, stated it would be a low growing grass and there was a San Diego bent grass mix and it would be more meadow-like. The project had many constraints, not only physical but also operational with SCE. There had to be certain criteria for areas underneath power lines.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he thought it was wonderful. One of his favorite places was the Aloe Trail at the Los Angeles County Arboretum; there was so much color there and he hoped they would have a lot of color.

Guy Stivers, address on file, stated it would be colorful and there would be a lot of diversity. It would be a very dynamic site.

Committee Member Gladson stated the 100 year life span was also remarkable.

Mr. Stivers stated with the proper use of technology and the right tree in the right location the life span could be extended. There was space and soil that would work to design a landscape to last 100 years. The previous landscape that had been there since 1972 had pretty much seen its

last days 10 years ago. The original site had approximately 260 trees and now they were down to about 57 trees.

Committee Member Gladson asked if trees would be removed?

Mr. Clark stated many of the trees were dead, diseased, or in decline.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a great project overall and far better than what was out at the site. There were some bittersweet things and that came from a visual resource and he had gotten himself attached to the Coral trees, and those were the only ones he was concerned about. Despite how the site was being maintained the Coral trees were fairly vibrant, fairly healthy, and an arborist would never note a healthy tree in a landscape report, with that being stated the corals were ill-maintained and he had to hand it to the trees that outlasted the heavy winds. He was upset that they would be gone, so they lost a resource that may have provided shade, but most importantly for the history that was a "backdrop" to the iconic towers. With all the stuff in the middle, and he had not wanted to critique the plan, he felt they had done a good job. There were little things, such as not having the site too complicated. Some of the grasses in creating the drifts ended up being one row of planting, but along the Tustin Avenue side there were seven different plants in the one area and if there was more room they could add an additional row. One of the plants that he had questioned was the Bottle Brush non-native and it had caught his eye. The other thing was the functionality of the project. Three of the zones had an underlying clay soil horizon and he referred to the soils report, they had not wanted the horizon to take all the nice soil and moisture that they would attempt to have percolate down to create a less thick layer which would kill the plants over time. He wanted them to include in the drawing an etched out area in order to blend the good soil back in. He had projects go that way and in 5-7 years down the road when they found themselves in court they all knew who would take the fall. The soil was most important. The vegetative bio-swale was graded at .5%, 1% was flat. His concern was that on the long grade along Tustin Street the swale would want to match the grade of the sidewalk and once there was a .5% line it would be higher than the sidewalk below. The swale would not be sloped in the same gradiant and it had been put there to "retain" water. It was not good because it would be so flat that the water would not flow. They would create a flat bottom without flow and it would just sit. On the water conservation issue, as there would be other water uses on site such as the "spraying" of the SCE towers, they would not be able to calculate the water savings unless they had the landscape on a separate water meter.

Mr. Brown stated they would be on separate meters.

Committee Member McCormack asked in the soils report there was reference to Cornell University Structural Soils and would they be using that?

Mr. Stiver stated no.

Chair Cathcart stated he was concerned with the number of plants but understood the site was experimental and the study stated there would be more than less to be able to study which ones survived.

Mr. Brown stated it was also to create diversity; over time some plantings would overtake others.

Committee Member McCormack stated in reviewing the plant legend the tree sizes appeared small; he understood the costs involved and asked if they had considered the slow rate of growth of the Cirsus tree from 5-gallon containers would have and the slow to moderate rate some of the shrubs would have. If the tree was not up above the shrubs, the shrubs would grow more rapidly and would eat up the tree, and it would die. He would want them to review that relationship as he would hate to have that theory proved. Essentially, with the 15- and 24-inch box, remaining trees would be very small-looking.

Mr. Stivers stated his team would be on the job for two years and in the course of those years they would be studying plant growth, maintenance, and water consumption; then a write-up for long term specifications would be completed. They were working in tandem with Harvest Landscaping in developing those specs.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the irrigation legend there was drip system and he asked if there was spray? He cautioned them to look at the spray systems on the unmown grass areas because as the grasses grew they would block the spray irrigation systems.

Mr. Brown stated there was a combination of drip and spray, but primarily a spray system.

Chair Cathcart thanked SCE and their project representatives for their presentation.

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.

The Administrative Session adjourned at 5:46 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 CALENDAR:**

Approval of Minutes:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (a) September 1, 2010, and (b) September 15, 2010

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting on September 1, 2010, with changes as noted during the Administrative Session; and DRC No. 4510-10, AT&T Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

### (2) DRC No. 4510-10 – AT&T WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to add one 2'-6" microwave dish to the existing SCE tower with existing AT&T and Sprint wireless facilities.
- SCE easement south of Shadow Ridge Lane, north of Meats Avenue, east of Featherhill Drive
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting on September 15, 2010, with changes as noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack

ABSENT: None

**MOTION CARRIED.** 

### **AGENDA ITEMS:**

#### Continued Items:

#### (3) DRC No. 4445-09 – HAVEN GASTROPUB RESTAURANT

- A proposal to construct a new outdoor patio dining area on the Glassell Street elevation, install railing, wood entry door, heaters, and external walk-in cooler.
- 190 S. Glassell Street, Units C & D, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from August 18, 2010 DRC Meeting, and rescheduled from DRC Meeting of September 15, 2010 due to lack of quorum
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Chair Cathcart opened the item for any questions to Staff.

Committee Member Woollett stated he noticed that there was a fairly large space in front of the cars on the west side of the building, between the west wall and the parking, and that was the area that was proposed for the equipment. It was strange that a commercial building would leave that much space there and he asked if there was a limitation or constraint that limited them from building there?

Mr. Ryan stated as he recalled the Jensen building was built to allow the required parking for the site.

Committee Member Gladson stated on Attachment No. 3 of the Staff Report of the General Plan goals, she had not remembered reviewing that previously. She asked if that was something new added?

Mr. Ryan stated it was included as there had been the adoption of the new General Plan.

Committee Member Gladson asked if those were areas they could draw from?

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct.

Applicant, Alkesh Patel, address on file, stated he wanted to go through the details and he presented material samples of the fence rails. He also presented a detail of an area of the fence. It had been suggested that they use a larger 2" post and he felt from an aesthetics point of view it was too large. They had checked with their structural engineer and wanted to go back to the 1 '4" which would be large enough. They could also use a smaller escutcheon plate. The structural integrity would be resolved with an additional post being added to the 8' span of the fence. The Committee Members reviewed the drawing and the samples with the applicant. Mr. Patel explained how the components would work together.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the structural engineer had reviewed the areas that would be smaller at the corners and the gate?

Mr. Patel stated yes. By adding the middle post it really helped and the structural engineer was extremely comfortable with the integrity of the fence.

Committee Member Woollett asked for an explanation on the drink rail and how it would be attached.

Mr. Patel presented a sample of the drink rail and explained how it would be mounted onto the rails. It would look very clean and the weld spots would be shaved down.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the gates would be made of the same material?

Mr. Patel stated they would be the same material as the rails.

Committee Member McCormack asked if nothing was coming up, where would the rails be welded?

Mr. Patel pointed out the area where the welds would be made. The heaters were shown on page 1, noted as number 4. He asked for the Committee Members input on the two different samples that he presented. The Committee Members reviewed the samples.

#### Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated on the railing details he felt the design and the wrought iron should reflect the building style which had been a Frank Lloyd Wright building and it had not appeared to match that style. His main comments were with regard to the refrigeration units in the rear and he agreed with Staff. There was a City Ordinance that required screening of all mechanical equipment, including ground equipment, and the unit would be highly visible from Olive Street. Although the site was not a contributing structure it set a bad precedent for the area; there were other highly visible areas of contributing structures that might want to follow suit. The refrigeration unit would require screening; there could be a brick enclosure of some of the compatible material or better yet to have it within the building. He thought some of the other options presented by Staff were great too. The OTPA was under the impression that the interior changes would not reflect on the exterior or have an impact on the exterior. The rear area would present a visual impact if unscreened.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack stated, regarding the top rail of the fencing, that he reviewed the samples and he could support going with the smaller rail. The wall thickness was the key.

Applicant Wil Dee, address on file, stated they had not wanted anything too massive as it was a fence, not a wall.

Committee Member McCormack asked that if they were using the 1 1/4", would the fence span 8'?

Mr. Patel stated the top would only span 4'. They had considered taking every other baluster all the way through but it looked too messy with all the vertical rails.

Committee Member McCormack pointed out the sample finish that he liked.

Mr. Patel stated there was a cut sheet provided for the heaters and they could stain the heaters to match.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had the opportunity to stop by the building and get a look at the back and her comments were very similar to Mr. Frankel's observations. They were in a building that was built in 2004 and it was a handsome building and she could not understand having equipment in that back area. She looked at Haven Gastropub as a community partner and a citizen of Old Towne and the Historic District. To attempt to place equipment on the outside it was something that she had difficulty getting comfortable with and to find the proposal in compliance with the goals of the City's General Plan. It was not a good practice to have equipment outside and she saw it as being problematic.

Mr. Dee asked what part bothered her?

Committee Member Gladson stated it was aesthetically ugly.

Mr. Dee stated they had 30 plus photos of the downtown area and there was unscreened equipment all over and trash bins that were on the side of the sidewalk.

Applicant, Greg Daniels, address on file, stated what they were proposing was a very clean piece of equipment, it was stainless steel that could be painted to match the building and appeared much better than the electrical boxes that were out on the corner of the building next door.

Committee Member Gladson stated initially the proposal had come to the DRC with one refrigerator and now there was a request for an additional refrigerator.

Mr. Patel stated they were not asking for something that they just wanted, but that they truly needed. They could not build a patio unless they had additional cooler space. He presented photos of their cooler and they could not fit anything more in their current space.

Mr. Dee stated if they were truly community partners they would ask for a little bit of give from the DRC to assist them with their success in the Historic District.

Mr. Patel stated in adding 16 seats out on the patio, if they were unable to gain additional refrigeration space they might not be able to service the additional patrons. They were maxed out in size.

Mr. Dee stated they had not planned on being so successful. Now if he wanted to do a meal special he had didn't have the space to have the product available to make their specials.

Mr. Daniels stated he wanted to chime in on the solution of having daily deliveries and they were currently having daily deliveries.

Mr. Dee stated the produce companies would not come out more than once a day.

Committee Member Gladson stated if someone suddenly grew out of a pair of pants and needed new pants or your kids grew out of their space in their rooms; people would get something new.

Mr. Daniels stated what he was hearing was that their only option would be to move out of Old Towne.

Mr. Ryan stated when he looked at the Old Towne standards it stated that trash storage, loading equipment, and mechanical equipment shall be screened from view in a manner that was architecturally compatible with the building. There were two issues, visibility to the public view and compatibility with the building.

Mr. Dee stated that could be done with the equipment. The back doors were painted to match the back façade and the refrigerator could be painted to match, or a brick veneer could be added to it, there was a lot they could do.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was hearing what Staff was suggesting to resolve the issue. He wanted to know what the first alternative would be from Staff's view for the refrigerator unit?

Committee Member Gladson stated she appreciated where Committee Member McCormack was going with that; however, the applicant was charged with finding a solution. It would place Staff in an awkward position to define the hierarchy of the solutions presented.

Mr. Ryan stated Staff was willing to work with the applicant and the DRC had discretion over the options.

Mr. Patel stated short of moving into a bigger space, they could not go inside or to any other retail space. Mr. Jensen could not carve out any other piece of retail space to accommodate their needs on a long term basis and the interior space could not be changed.

Mr. Dee stated the architect for the building felt placing the refrigeration unit outside was okay.

Mr. Patel stated the architect had not wanted the unit painted.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the applicant had explored putting a brick wall around the unit?

Mr. Daniels stated they had suggested that.

Mr. Patel stated they could brick veneer the entire unit, but they had spoken with their architect and she had suggested they not use that treatment.

Committee Member McCormack stated he understood the applicant needed the unit and the problem was if everyone along that area had the same problem they could design something that would work along those spaces. They could use a screen that appeared to have been in place when the building was first built. They could not build a bunch of walls. The problem was attempting to deal with the nature of the unit and create some cadence along that back wall area. It was a design issue.

Mr. Patel stated it would be buried in the back.

Committee Member McCormack suggested incorporating a second canopy.

Committee Member Woollett stated just because there were things that existed in Old Towne, if some of those things had been applied for today they would not be approved; there was a lot of bad stuff in Old Towne. The applicant's problem of not having enough room in their restaurant was the applicant's problem; if they could not get the owner to rent more space to them it was the applicant's problem. The DRC was charged with maintaining the appearance of the building and to be consistent in rendering their decisions and there was no way he would approve the equipment sitting out in the back of the building unless it was properly screened or the building was extended. He felt it was possible to build a screen that appeared as if it had always been there and something that would conceal the equipment and not try to be brick if it was not brick and there were many ways to build a screen. He understood that the equipment would be under the overhang and he suggested that it go from the deck to the other side and to be designed by someone that understood design. He had his own idea what it should appear as, but he was not going to design it for them. They had belabored the issue and he agreed with Mr. Ryan completely that they could not just put equipment out and attempt to hide it by just painting it or to state stainless steel was beautiful was not acceptable. In terms of the front, he heard OTPA's concern regarding the style of the railing and they had thrashed around the railing enough and as far as he was concerned he was fine with it and it was acceptable. Buildings had tenants and they would do what was consistent with their theme.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not participated in the previous discussion, and felt it unfair to weigh in so late in the process, but he agreed with Mr. Frankel that the railing had not fit the building very well and it reminded him of Marcel Brouer, a leading figure in modern architecture, and it looked like one of his buildings in Germany. He suggested doing something in keeping with that style, but understood that they had their own style and it went with their theme. Technically he was a bit concerned as the hand rail had been called out as 2" x 3/8" thick and even with a 4' span, assuming the standard load of a larger fellow sitting on the railing, it had not calculated for that; if a 250-pound person sat on it the rail would sag and be overstressed. He would have an engineer take a look at it before they got too far into the project. On the refrigerator, on a technical side, and in glancing at the original drawings, the drawings were terrible and they had not received details and scale drawings. They received odd sketches that were incorrect and the Committee Members had to wade through too much material to get some specific points that should have been noted on the drawings. There could also be a problem, assuming it was a 7' door and estimating there was 32" above and the ceiling out there was 9' 8", there was no information what the screen would be and he wondered if it would fit. There were no drawings that showed that the unit would fit. He felt it should be screened; an architect or designer could come up with a solution that would bring out some of the building materials.

They might incorporate the canopy material in some type of screening and there were many ways to do that.

Mr. Ryan stated rather than build something onto the building would it be possible to install something with just one return where the veneer matched and just enough to screen it. The building was so nice and the brick work was so evident and rather than put something there that was a distraction they could add two pony walls.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that they stay away from using brick and to incorporate some other material from the building.

Committee Member McCormack agreed with Committee Members Wheeler and Woollett and they could use some other material that was already included on the building to tie into the screening.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it should read as a part of the building but nothing too elaborate.

Chair Cathcart stated from a standpoint of scale and what the eye would pick up, the top rail either needed to be bigger or smaller, and he agreed with OTPA. What the applicant had was unique to their business and he agreed to what Committee Members Wheeler and Woollett had stated.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4445-09, Haven Gastropub, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The railing on the east side of the building be installed as presented with the 1 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>" posts and with the use of the smaller base with the finish as presented on the escutcheon plate.
- 2. That the restaurant equipment may be placed at the rear of the building with a screen, presented for an approval to the DRC on a separate date, prior to installation.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

# (4) 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, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- Continued from DRC Meeting of September 1, 2010
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Members Wheeler and Woollett were recused from the presentation of the item due to conflicts.

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

Applicant, Chuck Yaghi, address on file, stated he liked the way it was designed and it made economic sense; they just had to adjust the roof to meet the other roof.

Mr. Ryan stated he had concerns with the structural integrity as it appeared to be single wall construction and that was substandard.

Mr. Yaghi stated he was not sure it was; he thought it was not.

#### **Public Comment**

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he had commented on the proposal the last time it was before them, stating concerns about if the structure was not a contributing structure, and he was not 100% convinced that it was, and he had not had 100% faith in the Sanborn maps as they had been known to be inaccurate. They had heard testimony from a neighbor who remembered the home from an 8 year olds perspective and Mr. Frankel stated he wasn't certain what he could remember as an 8 year old. If the property was deemed noncontributing he suggested that they have a qualified individual to access the property; to de-list it and that should be completed before they moved forward. Currently the property was listed as a contributing structure and before they went forward they needed to have someone review the property. They could possibly go to SHIPO to ascertain what qualifications an individual needed to be able to make the proper assessment of a historic property. There were many people who worked on the listing of historic properties and there could have been a mistake made. As far as the project itself, he agreed with Staff, if it was non-contributing, he thought there were ways to reconfigure the structures being built, or to add the new structure in front. If it was determined to be contributing they would need to return to his old comments about not obscuring a historic resource. There needed to be a full assessment by a qualified individual.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Chair Cathcart stated it appeared the applicant should come up with a suggestion on how they wished to proceed. He asked if Mr. Yaghi concurred with Staff in producing an alternate design?

Mr. Yaghi stated he liked the project as proposed.

Mr. Ryan stated currently findings were updated as they were identified. Clearly when he reviewed the 1976 topo maps and the size and layout of the structure that existed today the original structure was gone. The later maps appeared to be more accurate, there were two different time periods of Sanborn maps that showed the same conclusion. Additionally the original building had the small frontage toward Washington, the new construction gable ran eastwest and it was a different size footprint. When he looked at the building it appeared to have been there, but the other thought was had it been moved there. Based on his research and the discussions with the person who lived next door he had come to the conclusion that it was not the original structure.

Chair Cathcart stated the structure appeared to be non-contributing and he asked what the process was to remove it from the contributing structure list?

Mr. Ryan stated what they had done to list a building was to go through a formal DRC hearing; on the other side, if a property was deemed non- contributing they would go through the survey information and the survey would be updated and no formal action was needed. The issues were the period of significance which was 1910 to 1922 and they understood which buildings on the block were from that period, buildings constructed after 1946-1947 and the subject site appeared to have had some portions of its structure built during that time and some of the components had been moved to that site. There was no action required. The research had been completed and based on the information he felt confident that the structure was a non-contributing structure and the original building at that site no longer existed.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was not comfortable with recommending the proposed project to the Planning Commission and she was confident in Staff's findings that the structure was non-contributing. Concurring that finding they would be reviewing the project as an in-fill project for a block that was historic. The issue was how to complete a project that was compatible and sensitive to the other structures on the block. She personally felt a continuance might allow the applicant to come up with alternate designs.

Committee Member McCormack stated he felt the same way. What was on the property currently was old enough to be contributing, but the issue was that the structure had been moved there.

Mr. Ryan stated the structures had been moved there and therefore the original structure from the period of significance no longer existed and the site was considered non-contributing.

Mr. Yaghi stated it was pieces put together; one structure was at level grade with a raised floor, the other was a 5' grade and there was nothing to the structures.

Chair Cathcart stated the site looked piecemeal and they could now review it as an in-fill project. It would be appropriate to have the applicant revisit their designs.

Mr. Ryan stated if the building was contributing there would have been a spatial relationship with the structure out front which appeared to have been there for some agricultural purpose.

Committee Member McCormack stated the person who initially moved the structure there just screwed up; if the structure had been placed on another spot and oriented in another manner, they would be having a different discussion. [When the DRC reviewed the minutes at the October 20 2010 meeting, Committee Member McCormack wanted the record to reflect he meant to say "....placed on the same spot and oriented in the same manner....".]

Committee Member Gladson stated it was the mystery and pleasures and displeasures of cultural resources and it was looking at the whole picture and figuring out what the history was.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to continue DRC No. 4475-10, Chuck Yaghi accessory second unit, to allow the applicant to review the project more intently and return with alternate designs.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

## New Agenda Items:

## (5) 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, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Rescheduled from DRC Meeting of September 15, 2010 due to lack of quorum
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler was recused from the presentation of the item due to a conflict.

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

Applicant, Scott Jones, address on file, stated as far as the rear of the building and the equipment screening, Jack had given him full authority to state the equipment would not be visible from Orange Street, and it was a better way to screen equipment with materials that matched the building. In regard to the façade out front they would not be able to save the existing tile and they proposed to go with a lighter brick, light reds and tans; he presented brick samples to the Commission. The brick would be applied as a veneer over the existing brick. There would be some spots that they would need to patch and it would appear very nice when it was completed. Originally they had received approval for a green awning out front, but they wanted to go with a black awning and a black store front wood color. The store front would be painted black to compliment the awning.

#### Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he was going to state that they were pleased that the front façade would be restored; however, he was not certain about covering the front with a brick veneer. He was certain that there were other options and he had gone by the site and the front façade appeared as if it could be restored and he had not looked inside to see the bottom portion. He was certain there would be a manner in which to repair the façade and he had not wanted to see the original brick covered up with contemporary materials as that would be inappropriate. He strongly encouraged the restoration of the transom glass. As far as the rear portion, and he assumed that was the non-contributing area of the building, and the addition of raising the parapet would not impact any of the contributing structure. He had no issues with the sign. Most of all he was not recommending the brick veneer which would not be appropriate for a historic structure.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had no issues with the equipment screening. His reaction to the veneer was the same as Mr. Frankels'; it was a dilemma as the brick was in pretty bad shape and he wondered if a thin brick was used how would the details be handled, such as the

corners and it was obvious that the building had moved over time and he wasn't certain if the veneer would be placed brick over brick. It could be plastered with the veneer adhering to the plaster and he was not certain how that application would occur. It would add a dimension to the building.

Mr. Jones stated they would not go brick by brick as it would not follow the dips and curves; the corners would be wrapped to get the full effect of a full size brick. On the cornice it might receive a full size brick in that area.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was a piece of wood in the corner that would probably need to be removed.

Applicant, Todd Salumi, address on file, stated he thought it was a component of the green awning before it was removed and was mounted on the surface and could be removed. He was not a contractor, but he overheard the contractors discussing that there had not been that much movement on the building compared to other buildings.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was a building on Tustin, just north of Chapman on the east side that had large ceramic tiles placed over the stucco and with rain or an earthquake they started to fall off.

Mr. Ryan stated what occurred to him was that the Grinder building was an automotive building and the buildings with the prismatic glass had a bit more upscale finished appearance. On the Grinder project bricks were recycled, turned around to get enough to make it work and the Maple side was not redone as it was the cheaper side of the building. The workmanship on the subject site was more formal. Mr. Selman was concerned with the white brick next to another brick building as he had wanted his building to stand out with a warmer tone. In looking at West Chapman with some of the glazed brick buildings they had warmer tones. There may be a way to do that and there may be a way to restore and repair what existed. His concern would be to save the original finishes, but it was glazed and more formal.

Mr. Frankel stated they might check the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and review their briefs that had information on masonry or brick repair and they would have suggestions, and to get it to appear acceptable and it might be less expensive than adding veneer to the building. If they investigated ways to restore the brick through some of those resources they could find a workable solution.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was a good suggestion. One of the things they had done with brick was to remove the shell and replace it, the front inch or so and put another brick in its place. It had not needed to be perfect, it would have imperfections. Maybe that would not satisfy the sensibilities of Jack Selman, but they were caught in needing to maintain the historic appearance and authenticity of the building.

Mr. Ryan stated there were companies that specialized in refinishing and recycling. A conservator would know what type of epoxy and finish to use to get close to what was there. It was labor intense and in looking at the wall it sometimes looked worse than what it was.

Mr. Salumi asked if it was the color they were wanting preserved or just the actual bricks?

Committee Member Woollett stated it was the brick.

Mr. Salumi stated they were working with a company that was working on their interior, Gothic Moon; they had given them a sample of how they could make the original brick appear as a reddish-type brick. If they used white glazed brick it would not go with their contrast, color scheme, and sign. They had based all of their design components with the brick being a more reddish color. They could return with a sample. They could maintain the existing brick and repair holes or cracks and to touch it up with another color. The color would be changed to go with their theme. All the bricks would be coated. Mr. Selman had liked that process but was not certain it would be something the DRC would approve.

Mr. Ryan stated they might run into painted brick as that was not allowed. He was thinking of an epoxy repair to maintain the original color.

Committee Member Gladson stated she could not support the veneer when the original defining building features were still intact and she understood repairs were needed. There were guidelines to cover that. She liked everything else and it was well done and supported the other components. She had been at the site over the weekend and had watched the windows being worked on.

Mr. Jones stated they were not against repair; it was just Mr. Selman's opinion that it was not salvageable. They had come in with red brick previously and had not had any opposition and they were just returning with a color variation.

Committee Member Gladson stated they had assumed the brick presented in red was the original brick.

Chair Cathcart stated they may need to divide the sign and screening from the façade.

Committee Member McCormack stated Committee Member Woollett was thinking the same way he was, and although he had not liked white brick, the historic nature of it outweighed his preference. The historic issue was of more importance. He was okay with the screening. He was okay with the sign and he thought it appeared to be metal. He asked on the dimension of the sign, most of the other signs that they had reviewed had been lit, and he had not noticed any lighting for their sign, was there to be lighting?

Mr. Salumi stated they could have LED lights behind each letter and that had not been fully determined; the back of the "Y" might have a separate contrast color to bring out the flame.

Committee Member McCormack stated the "Y" appeared to protrude up to the brick and he asked if it would be pulled away from the face. On sheet 4 it appeared as a very flat non-dimensional sign and had not followed some of the other signs on the block that had more dimension and interest to them.

Mr. Salumi stated it would protrude a bit and was similar to the brewery sign next door. If approved they would place the lighting behind the letters.

Committee Member McCormack asked how the sign in the back would work?

Mr. Salumi stated it would hang from the trellis; there were two brackets that would hold it. He reviewed the drawings with Committee Member McCormack and explained how it would work. It would be lit in the same manner.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was the only architect present on the item's presentation and he had not seen the building; he could not appreciate the whole façade and he would like to see that and he would appreciate having more information, personally if they wanted.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated any information that would be disseminated would need to be distributed to the DRC as a whole and go through Staff.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had been on the DRC for too many years and the rules had changed; they had been able to meet with applicants and could they not do that anymore?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated he could do that and at the next DRC meeting he would need to speak about what was specifically discussed and what he had learned.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would be willing to do that and to receive some technical data and to review the materials. They needed to be careful not to attempt to turn a pig's ear into a silk purse and he wanted to see the whole thing and what appeared to be the right answer might not work and he was concerned with that. He wanted more information. He was not familiar with current technology on ways to patch the material. He would want any motion to have the façade pulled to be reviewed separately.

Committee Member Gladson stated the façade was not actually part of the action and discussion in the Staff Report.

Committee Member Woollett stated it actually was based on Mr. Ryan's observations.

Mr. Ryan stated during the restoration the fabric was uncovered and that information had been relayed to him.

Committee Member Gladson stated the use of the veneer was just presented and they would not need to make an exception to that.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to approve DRC No. 4452-09, Henry's Grill Signs and A/C Screening, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, October 20, 2010.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.