



Design Concepts

ARCHITECTURE • ENGINEERING • PLANNING • CONSTRUCTION
3340 Riverside Drive, Suite M • Chino • CA 91710
909-591-3939
Email: dsignconcepts@yahoo.com

From: Shiv Talwar, AIA (C23417) &
Robert Taft, LA
Design Concepts
3340 Riverside Drive, Ste. M
Chino, CA. 91709

To: Ms. Monique Schwartz
Associate Planner
City of Orange
Planning Department
300 E. Chapman Avenue
Orange, CA 92866
(714) 744-7220

Date: June 23, 2021

Subject: Response to Design Review Committee comments dated August 5, 2020 for:
Proposed Shell Station Remodel & New Drive-through Automatic Car Wash
Santiago Center
2640 N. Santiago Boulevard.
Orange, CA 92867

Design Review: #4898-17; 2640-2658

Ms. Monique Schwartz,

Thank you for Design Review for the above referenced subject project. This letter is in response to the DRC meeting minutes dated August 5, 2020. Please see our responses to the comments below (responses in blue).

Committee members had questions and comments on the following:

Will the project be built according to the City of Orange Conceptual Grading Plan or the Architectural Site Plan? Ms. Schwartz responded the architectural site plan.

- Clarification on placement of trees and tree count.

Response – We have adjusted the location of the trees so as not to impede on the roof overhang or the signage for the project. Also, the quantity of trees has been increased. Trees are color coded with the legend. The tree count is correctly shown on the plans. It is noted on the plans that the street tree, the existing on-site trees to remain, and the existing trees and palms to be removed are not counted toward the total required project tree count.

- Concerns about the depth of the overhang of the carwash roof on the south elevation. It appears that the roof hangs over the portion of the retaining wall that has the wrought iron fence on it undermining the viability of the trees proposed adjacent to the building.

Response – We have adjusted the location of the trees so as not to impede on the roof overhang.

- Distance between the retaining wall that the car wash sits on and the retaining wall that separates the Caltrans easement.

See revised site plan and ALTA survey for easements

- There is a discrepancy on the plans on southwest corner; there is a wall next to a curb.

It's the trash enclosure roof line-See revised site plan T-1.2

- The lack of landscaping west of the chain link fence.

Response – Landscape has been added on the west side of the chain link fence up to the edge of pavement at the freeway offramp.

- The lack of design thought given to the placement of the fence.

- The wrought iron fence and retaining wall should tie in to the southwest corner of the proposed carwash and the lower wrought iron fence should be eliminated; there is no reason to have two fences going in the same direction so close together.

The wrought iron fence has been eliminated. See revised site plan T1.2 and elevations A-2.0

- Whether or not the property west of the chain link fence is an easement.

See ALTA survey

- How the wood structure over the trash enclosure is attached to the masonry structure.

See detail 16/ sheet AD-1.

- The survivability of plants and delivery of irrigation on the slope given the 2:1 slope.

Response – The plants selected are ones specified in like situations and can withstand harsh conditions. The irrigation will be a drip system with emitters built into the tubing and placed at 18” spacings. The drip tubing will be pinned to the slope with metal stakes manufactured for this specific use and the tubing will be covered with a 3” layer of medium ground mulch. The mulch will have a natural fibrous plant bark that will bind the mulch so as not to ‘slide’ down the slope. This is a specified material blend of mulch produced for this type of condition.

- The lack of protection for the light in the queuing lane because there is no curb and the pavement runs from the building to the wall.

Curb is provided. See revised site plan T1.2

- The landscape between the two fences does not appear to have an access point for maintenance purposes.

The Committee suggested a connection, no more than 4 feet, from the southwest corner of the building and to a point due west that ties into the new chain link wrought iron fence, and placement of a door for access.

Two gate have been provided- see revised site plan T1.2

The Committee recommended eliminating the iceberg roses due to the high frequency of maintenance required and the difficult access to this area.

[Response – Iceberg Roses have been removed from the legend and replaced with the ‘Snow Whit India Hawthorn.](#)

Realign the proposed wrought iron fence to be parallel to the T-wall rather than at an angle. The Committee, applicant and staff discussed the property at the chain link fence; there is nothing on the plans that shows where the easement ends.

[Wrought iron wall has been eliminated, and see ALTA survey for easement.](#)

The applicant should provide an ALTA survey.

[See attached ALTA survey](#)

The fence should mirror the direction of the T-wall and make it parallel to the structure rather than having it move away.

[See revised site plan T1.2](#)

The Committee is concerned about the height of the retaining wall near the trash enclosure and that there are only two trees due to lack of space.

[See revised site plan T1.2](#)

The 10-foot 9-inch retaining wall along the freeway with no screening.

[Response – Landscape screening has been provided in front of all retaining walls.](#)

The building is too large and is being pushed out over a narrow slope.

[See revised building size in site plan T1.2](#)

Because the site design is so tight and the proposed parking exceeds City standards, consider removing one or two parking spaces and moving the trash enclosure 9' to the east.

[The trash enclosure has been moved. See revised site plan T1.2](#)

The footprint of the carwash is dictated by the access around the building and the inside program.

[See revised car wash footprint](#)

There are still discrepancies between trades in the drawings.

[Revised- landscape and civil plans are matching Architectural plans](#)

The Committee is not convinced that the trees can exist so close to the building given it has a 36-inch roof overhang.

[Response – We have adjusted the location of the trees so as not to impede on the roof overhang.](#)

This project does not reflect a clear understanding of the slope and it does not address concerns that the Committee has had from the beginning.

[Comments has been addressed in this submittal-see revised plans.](#)

It is possible that the applicant may run into a problem when obtaining a permit for the retaining wall. The footing configuration in section CC does not appear to be buildable.

[See revised section C-C in sheet C-1.](#)

□ Per the previous landscape plan, the Committee stated that if the entire area of the back slope was not available for landscaping as proposed, the project would not be feasible. There would be no way to make the required findings if the site plan does not match the conditions and if the mitigation that is being proposed is not achievable.

Response – The Landscape Plans have been revised to include the current conditions and new wall/fencing layout for the slope and area between the fence and the edge of pavement at the freeway offramp. This along with the adjustments of the tree locations make this an achievable and viable project.

□ The amount of landscape and hardscape is grossly out of balance.

Response – The area of landscape is 16,986 square feet which equates to 23.7% of the total site which includes buildings as well as hardscape.