

February 21, 2024

Design Review Committee Meeting

Public Comment

Public Comments

Item 5.1

Design Review No.
5092-22
901 E Katella Avenue
Intracorp Homes

Design Review Committee

Meeting Time: 02-21-24 17:30

eComments Report

Meetings	Meeting Time	Agenda Items	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
Design Review Committee	02-21-24 17:30	13	18	0	17	1

Design Review Committee

02-21-24 17:30

5.1. A proposal to construct 49 small lot homes located at 901 E. Katella Avenue (Design Review No. 5092-22).

7

0

6

1

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 4:57pm 02-21-24

The revised plans still equals

NO privacy,

NO sunlight,

NO quality of life.

Increase of injury and dangers for residence current and future, the unknowing pedestrian walking by or driving by on a windy day with items flying off of rooftop decks.

Bottom line. This project does not belong in this location.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 6:26am 02-21-24

PEOPLE over profit. PRIVACY over profit. PRIORITIES over profit. Build like you live here in Orange.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 9:35pm 02-20-24

As a resident of Carleton Avenue, we strongly oppose the housing project for 901 Katella. The proposed high-density housing units represent an incompatible use of the property in question. The nature and scale of the planned development do not align with the current use of the land and the surrounding neighborhood. Such a project could disrupt the established harmony and functionality of the area, potentially leading to a decline in the overall livability of our community. Placing 49 units on two acres of property consisting of 12 two-story units, 10 feet from our wall and neighbors, in addition, to building 37 three-story units with rooftop decks is an incompatible use of property. The rooftop decks are an invasion of privacy in both our front and back yards and create increased noise and light pollution.

Lack of Privacy Measures: The current building plans for the proposed two-story and three-story high-density units do not include provisions for shielding walls or the planting of high privacy hedging/trees. These elements are essential for maintaining the privacy and visual separation between existing residences and the new development. The absence of such measures exacerbates our concerns about privacy invasion and the loss of a peaceful residential environment. The absence of this crucial measure could potentially mitigate the privacy issues arising from the high-density proposed development.

Impact on Solar Efficiency: Many residents in our neighborhood have invested in solar panels to reduce their carbon footprint and energy costs. The proposed high-density homes could cast shadows and obstruct sunlight, significantly reducing the efficiency of these solar installations. This obstruction not only affects the economic benefits of solar energy but also undermines our collective efforts toward sustainability and renewable energy. As a homeowner, we have invested in solar energy and the high density development affects our ability to harness clean energy efficiently.

Traffic Congestions: The introduction of more homes will inevitably result in increased traffic congestion. Our roads are already struggling to handle current traffic volumes, and additional housing will exacerbate this issue, leading to safety hazards in the community and neighboring streets.

Insufficient Parking Allocation: The proposed housing development plans lack adequate provisions for parking spaces. High-density housing typically results in an increased demand for parking, yet the current plans fail to allocate sufficient parking areas for the anticipated number of residents and their visitors. This oversight could lead to a surge in street parking, congesting our neighborhood roads and creating safety hazards for pedestrians and drivers alike. This is a safety concern within the community and neighboring streets.

Community Character and Aesthetics: Our neighborhood has a unique character that will be altered significantly by the introduction of high-density housing. This change may diminish the appeal and charm that attracted many of us to live here in the first place. On the City of Orange website, it states "Orange, CA, is a great place to live, work, and shop. From the Plaza to our top-rated hospitals, schools, and parks, we're a "Slice of Old Towne Charm", our community would like to keep with that statement and motto.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 6:59pm 02-20-24

I opposed this the first time this development was on the agenda for the DRC in 2023. I still oppose it today. I'm not sure why this developer can suggest this type of proposed community when nothing surrounding it is remotely resembling its style or other dwellings. The privacy issues it would cause for me, and my neighbors is unnerving. We could never leave windows open if they faced the property, especially at night when the lights are glowing from inside to the streets. The parking and traffic would cause huge headaches.

I think Intracorp needs to completely redesign their proposal and try something with less homes, less floors, and

less potential residents/cars. It would be a joy to see the development resemble that of the local residential blocks.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 5:52pm 02-20-24

I am against the proposed 901 Katella project . In all aspects , it is poorly planned and designed in our Orange neighborhood. The builders have a reckless arrogant disregard for the existing neighborhood and families already there. They have not cosidered peoples privacy, the existing space and what this dense development project will do to the E Carleton Ave families.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 11:50am 02-19-24

The risk to the people that live around the proposed area will be greatly impacted by the increased traffic. Traffic is difficult at best now. Was a traffic study done? I understand the need to develop vacant land but why not put in a dog park or a senior center. Build something that can improve the quality of life to the surrounding area not density housing.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 10:51am 02-19-24

My name is Steve Fingal and I am a resident of Carleton Ave. The Design Review Committee's first priority is the safety of the citizens of Orange. The 37 fourth floor open decks proposed for this project constitute an inherently dangerous condition which cannot be remediated by any CC&R for local ordinance. No law can prevent a resident from forgetting to bring in dangerous items from their deck prior to a wind storm.

The Santa Ana Winds occur on 20 or more days a year. The frequency and severity of these winds have been consistently increasing since year 2000. Assuming a fifty year life span of the project that is at least 10,000 Santa Ana Wind days over the life of the project and multiplied by 37 decks, it equates to 37,000 chances for something to go wrong.

The Santa Ana Winds blow from the Northeast to the Southwest. This means that any items blown off the patios will land on the project, adjacent sidewalks, or in the middle of Katella Avenue or Cambridge Street. Remember, Santa Ana Winds blow as hard at night as they do in the daytime.

An item blown off these roof decks does not need to be patio furniture or an umbrella to cause serious injuries. A ball, toy, towel, tablecloth, jacket or sweater falling on the windshield of a car can result in catastrophic damage.

It is almost a statistical certainty that during the life of the project multiple serious injuries and deaths will occur caused by items blown off these 37 launching sites.

The question is: is there any benefit for the construction of 37 fourth floor patios to the citizens of Orange to justify their use?

The simple answer is no. The sold purpose of these patios is to provide 'personal space' for each resident, thereby allowing the developer to increase the density of the project, thereby increasing the developer's profit margin from the project.

Increasing the developer's profit margin does not justify risking the safety of the citizens of Orange.

In my opinion, this proposed inherently dangerous condition requires that you reject this project in order to do your duty to keep the people you serve safe.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 3:47pm 02-16-24

I am not opposed to new housing developments. I strongly oppose the project as designed because 2-3 story units with rooftop decks does not match the existing neighborhoods. These units would not only invade our privacy with a 10 foot setback but they would also interfere with any natural plant growth due to zero sunlight for a fair amount of the year. If the proposed development would be modified to have single story homes against the existing single story homes and 2 story homes on the 2nd and 3rd row, I'm sure no one would oppose that. Rooftop decks do not belong in such close proximity to existing single story neighborhoods when Katella is a main wind alley which could whip up umbrellas, patio sets, etc sending them like projectiles to unsuspecting cars and persons.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 12:13pm 02-16-24

As an E. Carleton Ave. resident, I strongly oppose this project and have grave concerns related to the Intracorp application of building a high-density small lot subdivision adjacent to our R-1 zone property. The primary purpose of zoning laws is to separate incompatible uses of property. These 2, 3, and 4 story buildings will tower over our homes blocking out the sun, increase traffic issues, devalue our homes, and rob us of our privacy. Putting 49 units on two acres of property consisting of 12 two-story units ten feet from our fences and allowing 37 three-story units with 37 roof top decks which can be lighted and used day and night less than 50 feet from our single-story homes is an invasion of our privacy and will create horrible environmental impact. This invasion of privacy would affect us inside of our homes, and in both our front and back yards, as well as, create substantial noise and light pollution, parking overflow onto our block, less sunshine for our yards and gardens, etc. In short, this density project on a 2-acre parcel of land is the definition of an incompatible use. This project will create serious traffic problems and additional dangers to our families as residents of East Carleton Avenue. The Cambridge street adjacent to the AT&T property is incredibly poorly designed with a curve in the road that makes it impossible for drivers on East Carleton to see cars in the curve that are going north, while attempting to make a left turn onto Cambridge. This project seriously increases this dangerous driving condition with a higher likelihood for traffic accidents and most importantly increases safety risks to us, our children and pedestrians.

Rather than approving a General Plan Amendment to allow this small lot subdivision next to single family zoned property, the General Plan should be amended to prohibit small lot subdivision from being allowed next to R-1 zoning anywhere in Orange. Such a General Plan Amendment would relieve other neighborhoods in Orange from the necessity of fighting this incompatible use in the future. I did not choose to move my young family to this beautiful city with high property taxes to live next to 4-story buildings with roof top decks invading the privacy and sanctity of our home. Please reassess this plan and consider these grave concerns.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 9:04am 02-16-24

According to the City of Orange website, the AT&T parcel is not even considered for housing. It's not on the map. A Zone change would be needed. Why even consider this project if it isn't in keeping with the charm of our established neighborhood? According to the City's own guidelines stating that they care about privacy. We don't want this huge project looming over our single story houses and yards. Why should we have to suffer because a developer thinks that money is more important than what we've built here? What about our rights as homeowners? This proposed development would de-value our homes. Why would anyone want to buy a house that has a 10 foot setback from two story homes? And three story homes with 4th floor decks? What about our quality of life?

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 12:14pm 02-16-24

As an E. Carleton Ave. resident, I strongly oppose this project and have grave concerns related to the Intracorp application of building a high-density small lot subdivision adjacent to our R-1 zone property.

The primary purpose of zoning laws is to separate incompatible uses of property. These 2, 3, and 4 story buildings will tower over our homes blocking out the sun, increase traffic issues, devalue our homes, and rob us of our privacy. Putting 49 units on two acres of property consisting of 12 two-story units ten feet from our fences and allowing 37 three-story units with 37 roof top decks which can be lighted and used day and night less than 50 feet from our single-story homes is an invasion of our privacy and will create horrible environmental impact. This invasion of privacy would affect us inside of our homes, and in both our front and back yards, as well as, create substantial noise and light pollution, parking overflow onto our block, less sunshine for our yards and gardens, etc. In short, this density project on a 2-acre parcel of land is the definition of an incompatible use.

This project will create serious traffic problems and additional dangers to our families as residents of East Carleton Avenue. The Cambridge street adjacent to the AT&T property is incredibly poorly designed with a curve in the road that makes it impossible for drivers on East Carleton to see cars in the curve that are going north, while attempting to make a left turn onto Cambridge. This project seriously increases this dangerous driving condition with a higher likelihood for traffic accidents and most importantly increases safety risks to us, our children and pedestrians.

Rather than approving a General Plan Amendment to allow this small lot subdivision next to single family zoned property, the General Plan should be amended to prohibit small lot subdivision from being allowed next to R-1 zoning anywhere in Orange. Such a General Plan Amendment would relieve other neighborhoods in Orange from the necessity of fighting this incompatible use in the future. I did not choose to move my young family to this beautiful city with high property taxes to live next to 4-story buildings with roof top decks invading the privacy and sanctity of our home.

Please reassess this plan and consider these grave concerns.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 5:20pm 02-21-24

It's difficult to express all the reasons I am firmly opposed to this proposed development.

Intercorp claims to have compassion towards the residents of Orange (and specifically E. Carleton Ave.), yet I have seen zero compassion!

I'm appalled at this proposition and absolutely disgusted such a proposal (which includes a ZONING CHANGE) can be made, while requiring people only within 400 feet of the property needing to be notified. That is saddening and completely unacceptable! Personally I feel a zoning change such as this should require much more than that.

This development will drastically impact the quality of life on E. Carleton Ave.! It will create additional traffic problems, most certainly create parking issues on Carleton Avenue (which I myself will absolutely not stand for!), It will crush our property values, which is completely unacceptable/unfair, and it will drastically diminish the look, feel and comfort of our beloved street! When completed, the residence of Carleton Avenue will have a three-story plus, towering, looming, massive structure towering over our single-family homes. Carleton Avenue and the surrounding streets are of a classic/traditional suburban setting... A small lot subdivision development has no place immediately adjacent.

My understanding is this project would be the first of its kind in the city of Orange. My question is, who benefits from this project? Certainly not the residents of Carleton Avenue, most of whom have lived here for well over 20 years. We did not sign up for this when we bought our homes, took out 30 year mortgages and started families on this street.

There is however one aspect of this project I am in favor of... That is the approximate 15' x 15' pocket-park Intercorp has proposed. My only suggestion is that it needs to be a little bit larger to the tune of approximately 2 acres. Let's start with that and make open, park space a priority for the existing residence Of Orange. I look at the city website and I see dozens and dozens of Development proposals, however I see virtually no additional open space, park square footage being proposed. Why is this? Shouldn't we have a certain amount of park space per home...!? If we put forth the proposal for a park to be developed I'd like to see what type of feedback we get for that...??? I believe as residents of Orange we need to take responsibility for making the best use of that space, and the opinions of the current residents, should weigh much more heavily than a foreign developer.

When considering the approval or disapproval of this project, I believe one should ask themselves if they would approve of this project in their own backyard (10 feet on the other side of your back fence/wall)!? I myself do not, and I don't believe any other residents of the city of Orange would either.

Should this project be approved and this development finished, I fear for the quick demise of Carleton Avenue. With the drastic drop in quality of life, many residents will be motivated to build an ADU, or do garage conversions, and exploit our properties to the maximum amount possible, renting out the house and the ADU and moving out and away from the city of Orange.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 4:47pm 02-21-24

I oppose the revised proposed design by Intracorp at 901 E Katella.

The proposed project would rob us of our privacy, sunlight, and quality of life.

This project will drastically impact the privacy and quality of life for me, my husband, my neighbors and their children. The revised proposed units will still have a direct line of site into the interior living spaces of our homes. The privacy and security of living in our homes will no longer exist. There will still be No privacy in our homes, backyards and front yards.

As previously stated to DRC before and I will say it again:

I will be living my life in a fish bowl, always wondering if someone is watching, looking over me.

I DO NOT want to live my life with my curtains closed 24 hours a day.

Let's be very clear Intracorp does NOT care about the current or future residents of Orange, our privacy and quality of life means nothing to them. They do not care about our need for natural Sunlight into the windows of our house, our yards, gardens...

The revised plans intracorp submitted to the city still does not allow privacy within the interior living space of mine and my neighbors homes. Many of us resident have been in our homes for over 20 years+

Keep in mind if this was your home, would you want something built directly behind you 10 feet away that gets to look into your daily life and your security that you have known for the last 20 years is now taken away.

For no other reason than pure profit. They actually said it would not be profitable for them to make the houses along the existing neighborhood property line walls single-story. They also know that they are not giving the future residence of the presented project any natural green living space of their own either. That is why they had to incorporate rooftop decks into units so they could give them outdoor living space which is required by the state of California. They just want to stack people on top of people for profit.

They only care about maximizing their profit which has been made very clear through over density plan development and lack of revisions requested by the DRC and neighboring properties. Along with the lack of peoples safety with 4th floor rooftop decks.

There are concerns, after concerns and opposition, after oppositions.

If this project goes through and rezoning is approved, it will be the first of its kind ever in the city of Orange which means it will not be it's last which means the city of Orange, that we know and love will no longer be.

The Architectural design is not comparable or compatible to the surrounding existing neighbors. Especially the design lacks old town orange character. It's a cookie cutter look that belongs in major downtown urban cities not our small town suburb of Orange.

We are not opposed to having housing behind us, but we are opposed to having this specific design project behind us. If housing is to be built behind us, it should be mirrored to what already exist, which is single story homes with a 20 foot setback from the property line.

This project does not belong in the proposed location. The city of orange Council members should strongly consider the quality of life of its residents and oppose this project.
Thank you.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 2:17pm 02-21-24

I stand in solidarity with my neighbors on Carleton street who back yard privacy is threatened and who have major concerns with the current design. Intracorp and any builder needs to be very cognizant of how these high density projects encroach on the privacy of the surrounding neighborhood and design their projects with them in mind.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 11:55am 02-21-24

This project belongs on an entirely different parcel of land, somewhere off a main road (Katella) and away from a single story .25 acre lot single family home neighborhood (Carleton, Van Owen, Trenton)

Please tell the developers to find a new location to build this proposal.

The residents of Carleton Avenue, especially the 10 whose privacy and sunshine would be stolen deserve a much better and less dense development on this parcel. Thank You for upholding the City of Orange regulations

of making sure any new developments fit the existing properties surrounding.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 6:15pm 02-19-24

I, unlike most here, am neutral on the proposal. Firstly, I would like to state that affordable housing is a tantamount issue. No housing matters if people cannot afford that housing, point blank. However, I will acknowledge that there are problems with the development, however when looking at its integration into the existing area, I think it is important to realize that there are apartments almost directly across the street, at 1350 N Cambridge St. There's an even more similar proposal on 1300 N Shaffer St, sure there are valid concerns, however, Anaheim is not home to only suburban sprawl, and I believe that critics need some additional reasons as to why some aspects of this build are uniquely bad compared to other structures, especially considering the fact that it would benefit affordable housing. That being said, I am concerned over whether it will- what mechanisms are in place to ensure there will be affordable units that wont have abusive price rises? Will there be rent controlled units? Additionally, I am also concerned with the landscaping, yes they are removing trees and planting more- however their landscaping is primarily, if not entirely, non-native species. This, at best will be a net neutral impact on the environment, and not provide adequate homes for native species, be they bats, butterflies, bacteria, or any of the numerous species that are indigenous to this land. Ultimately, this project must be looked at in its totality.

David Nelson

Location:

Submitted At: 11:09am 02-17-24

I am still opposed to the project in its latest form.

The design is not consistent with the surrounding area.

The close proximity of the two-story units to the north property line infringes on the Privacy of the existing properties.

and shades their yards for an excessive amount of time.

The roof top patios are a hazard when there Santa Ana winds as items will be blown on to adjacent streets and yards.

The on-site parking is not adequate in that are only 12 visitor spaces. Two car garages for four-bedroom houses will not be large enough.

The Cambridge access will impact ingress and egress for vehicles on Carleton Ave. to the north in that cars exiting the development will be obscured from view of the Carleton traffic.

Requiring the HOA to enforce parking and roof top usage is not a workable option in that they will not have police powers.

This project will have an overall negative impact on the neighborhood.

and should not be approved.

Guest User

Location:

Submitted At: 12:14pm 02-16-24

As an E. Carleton Ave. resident, I strongly oppose this project and have grave concerns related to the Intracorp application of building a high-density small lot subdivision adjacent to our R-1 zone property.

The primary purpose of zoning laws is to separate incompatible uses of property. These 2, 3, and 4 story buildings will tower over our homes blocking out the sun, increase traffic issues, devalue our homes, and rob us of our privacy. Putting 49 units on two acres of property consisting of 12 two-story units ten feet from our fences and allowing 37 three-story units with 37 roof top decks which can be lighted and used day and night less than 50 feet from our single-story homes is an invasion of our privacy and will create horrible environmental impact. This invasion of privacy would affect us inside of our homes, and in both our front and back yards, as well as, create substantial noise and light pollution, parking overflow onto our block, less sunshine for our yards and gardens, etc. In short, this density project on a 2-acre parcel of land is the definition of an incompatible use.

This project will create serious traffic problems and additional dangers to our families as residents of East Carleton Avenue. The Cambridge street adjacent to the AT&T property is incredibly poorly designed with a curve in the road that makes it impossible for drivers on East Carleton to see cars in the curve that are going north, while attempting to make a left turn onto Cambridge. This project seriously increases this dangerous driving condition with a higher likelihood for traffic accidents and most importantly increases safety risks to us, our

children and pedestrians.

Rather than approving a General Plan Amendment to allow this small lot subdivision next to single family zoned property, the General Plan should be amended to prohibit small lot subdivision from being allowed next to R-1 zoning anywhere in Orange. Such a General Plan Amendment would relieve other neighborhoods in Orange from the necessity of fighting this incompatible use in the future. I did not choose to move my young family to this beautiful city with high property taxes to live next to 4-story buildings with roof top decks invading the privacy and sanctity of our home.

Please reassess this plan and consider these grave concerns.