

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE: APRIL 18, 2012

To: Chair Woollett and Members of the Design Review Committee

THRU: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager FROM: Daniel Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

SUBJECT: DRC NO. 4616-12 - MICHA – ACCESSORY SECOND - UNIT

SUMMARY

The applicant is proposing to develop a new detached accessory unit on the rear of the property, relocate the existing one car garage and provide access to two new open parking spaces. The proposal includes a Variance request to exceed the allowed area (50% area of principle residence) for accessory structures including the existing garage and proposed accessory unit. The Variance request also includes allowing one enclosed parking space instead of two enclosed parking spaces as required.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Staff recommends the DRC continue the project for revisions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant: Doug Ely

Owner: John and Vicki Micha

Property Location: 545 E. Jefferson Avenue, Old Towne Orange Historic District

General Plan Designation: LDR (Low Density Residential)

Zoning Classification: R 1-6 (Single-Family Residential District)

Existing Development: One-story, single-family 1920 Provincial Revival

Property Size: 6,057 square feet

Associated Applications: Variance No. 2215-12

Previous DRC Review: None

PUBLIC NOTICE

No Public Notice is required for this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3 - Construction of a second dwelling unit in a residential zone).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The property contains a 1920 contributing 785 square foot Provincial Revival residence and contributing 200 sq. ft. one car detached garage. An existing 300 square foot, unpermitted residential unit attached to the rear of the contributing garage will be demolished. The applicant proposes to construct a 628 square foot detached accessory second unit at the rear of the property. The existing garage will be relocated approximately 20 feet to the north. The relocation will allow access to two new open parking spaces located between the existing residence and the proposed accessory unit. Applicant is requesting a Variance to exceed the allowed 50% of existing floor area for existing garage and proposed accessory unit. The Variance request includes enclosed parking for one vehicle instead of two enclosed spaces.

EXISTING SITE AND AREA CONTEXT

The property is on the north side of the 500 - 600 block of East Jefferson Avenue. The block contains 10 structures constructed between 1920 and 1946. Ten structures are one-story in height. Seven structures are contributing one-story residences and three are non-contributing contemporary styled residences. Architectural styles are Classical Revival, Provincial Revival, Mediterranean Revival, and Bungalow. The existing residence, garage and unpermitted units consists of 785+200+300 square feet of area on the 6,057 sq. ft. lot yielding an existing .21 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). With the proposed accessory second unit, the property will have 1,613 sq. ft. in area and a .27 FAR.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Section 17.10.070 establishes the general criteria the Design Review Committee should use when reviewing the project. This section states the following:

The project shall have an internally consistent, integrated design theme, which is reflected in the following elements:

1. **Architectural Features**.

- a. The architectural features shall reflect a similar design style or period.
- b. Creative building elements and identifying features should be used to create a high quality project with visual interest and an architectural style.

2. Landscape.

- a. The type, size and location of landscape materials shall support the project's overall design concept.
- b. Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of required addressing nor shall it obstruct the vision of motorists or pedestrians in proximity to the site.

- c. Landscape areas shall be provided in and around parking lots to break up the appearance of large expanses of hardscape.
- 3. **Secondary Functional and Accessory Features**. Trash receptacles, storage and loading areas, transformers and mechanical equipment shall be screened in a manner, which is architecturally compatible with the principal building(s).

ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

<u>Issue No. 1 – Project Scope and Review Under the Old Towne Design Standards:</u>

The proposal did not include elevations of the front residence, only photographs, so it was difficult to ascertain and compare the plate or roof height and specific design elements of the accessory unit with the contributing Provincial Revival Residence. However, there was sufficient information to examine the existing and proposed building forms, roof shape and general design elements on the proposed accessory second unit. The applicant's efforts to relocate the existing historic garage and maintain similar side yard setbacks limiting the visibility of the in-fill accessory unit are noteworthy and meet some of the Old Towne Design Standards.

However, additional Old Towne Design Standards need to be addressed to:

- 1. Avoid potential impacts that may degrade or diminish the individual qualities and defining characteristics of the historic resource and its surrounding context.
- 2. Maintain the historic character, context and established development patterns of the site, block and neighborhood.

The following design review elements need to be resolved to achieve the above goals:

- Building Form and Complexity of Design
- Orientation, Placement, Directional Expression & Open Space
- Roof Form, Height and Pitch
- Porches and Defined Entrances
- Character Defining Features Foundation, windows, wall form, and cornice line

<u>Issue No. 2 - Building Form and Complexity of Design of the Accessory Unit:</u>

Existing residence

The existing Provincial Revival residence has a simple "L" plan, with a steep pitched roof, limited gables, with an entry at the apex of the "L" via a small portico. Simple, defined elements express the best of Provincial Revival design.

Proposed Accessory Unit

The proposed in-fill accessory second unit has four complex roof forms, multiple dormers, and zigzag building form in contrast to the simple Provincial Revival building form of the main residence. At the very rear section of the unit, the entrance consists of a shed roof over a small entry landing. This is at an odd orientation, at the rear, and the preferred historical treatment would be to have the entry porch on the front elevation of the new in-fill residence.

Looking at the form, shape, and design of the proposed accessory second unit, one cannot discern what type of Old Towne architectural style the building references. The juxtaposition of very different forms and design between the existing and proposed structures impacts the historic setting. New construction should be compatible with the historic structure through similarities in size, shape, materials building elements and detailing, yet be discernible as new construction.

Analysis

A simplified rectangular or "L" building form with a similar pitched roof, without dormers, would be more in harmony with the residence and surrounding neighborhood. Relocating the one-car garage father back on the lot may provide a larger building area, more flexibility of design and placement, and have a larger area of open space rather than the proposed zigzag layout.

New construction should be compatible with the historic structure through similarities in size, shape, materials building elements and detailing, yet be discernible as new construction. The design of the accessory structure should carry over the simple form and design of the main residence. The applicant has prioritized saving the existing tree to the rear of the property which severely constrains the building to the north east corner of the site. The proposed placement of the garage further constrains the building envelope for the accessory unit. These site constraints dictate the proposed building form and design resulting in a form which is not compatible with the existing structure.

Issue No. 3 - Orientation, Placement, Directional Expression & Open Space:

Proposed Accessory Unit

Orientation refers to the direction in which the front of the building faces. A residential building's orientation often relates to the era and style in which it was built. New construction primary elevation should be oriented closest to the street and not inward as proposed. This guideline addresses the relationship of height and width of the front elevation of a building mass.

The primary front elevation of the accessory unit is a plan gable end with two windows. Each different off-set gable section gets wider and farther back from the front building plane. Additionally, the stepped layout with the small front facing gable does not reflect the height, width and proportion of the existing front façade on the Provincial Styled residence. At the rear third of the proposed accessory is the location of a shed roof with the entrance to the accessory unit. Although the recessed building entrance faces the street, its location is not at all typical of the historic pattern of an entrance on the front façade.

Proposed Relocated One-Car Garage

Most original garages are constructed at or close to the rear of the lot. Moving the garage the additional distance to the rear of the lot would be consistent with the established setting and placement of garages within the Old Towne district. The movement of the garage to the rear of the lot would provide a sufficient area for a revised building form or foot print that would be in keeping with the layout of a Provincial Revival designed residence. This placement would also provide a larger open space and distance between buildings which is typically found within Old Towne. The proposal exceeds the total allowed area for recreational open space for the occupants on the site. However, all of the proposed open space area of 1,148 square feet is oriented toward the rear accessory unit. There is no use able open space associated with the main

front residence. Each unit must have its own directly accessible recreational open space. The proposed layout and placement of the accessory structure is inconsistent with the historic development pattern.

<u>Issue No. 4 - Roof Form, Height and Pitch:</u>

Existing Residence

The existing residence has a wide cross gable with an intersecting projecting gable forming an "L" intersection that defines the front entrance. The roof has a steep pitch (15:12 or higher) typical of Provincial Revival buildings of the period. The roof height from grade is approximately 16'-0". With the raised foundation the eave cornice height is approximately 9'-6".

The Proposed Accessory Unit

The roof on the accessory unit has two off set front projection gable roofs, a side cross gable roof extending to the west connected to another rear facing projecting gable roof. All of the roofs have an 8:12 pitch, the height of the three roofs varies from a height of 12'-1", 12'-8" and 14'-8". The accessory unit is constructed on grade the approximate cornice height is 8'-0".

Analysis

The roof design, form, pitch ridgelines and cornice of new construction should match or be compatible with the existing architectural style of the primary historic structure on site. Introduction of new complex multiple gables and roof dormers on the proposed accessory unit are not compatible with the existing historic residence. The use building forms similar to the existing architectural style of the historic residence and/or the predominant architectural style within the same block would be appropriate.

The number and size of dormers should be limited on a roof, such that the primary roof form remains prominent. If the principle residence does not have dormers installed on them, dormers on the new structure is discouraged; however, they be permitted on elevations not visible to the street.

Mixed roof forms of different heights and architectural styles diminish the integrity of the historic resource, surrounding properties and the historic district. For the new construction, the roof height, form and style should be representative of the traditional pattern as for the defined Provincial Revival architectural style.

Issue No. 5 – Porches and Defined Entrances:

Existing Residence

The front porch landing of the existing residence is square with one supporting column, with a trimmed arch entry top carried back to each wall section of the front and side gable roofs. The front facing gable roof has an extended sweeping projecting eave roof form that extends over the entry porch forming the roof. The simple porch entry is well defined by the intersection roof forms.

Proposed Accessory Unit

The existing entry for the accessory second unit is approximately 22 feet back from the front facing gable roof. A pathway to the entrance is between the relocated garage and the accessory

unit. A small roof dormer is directly above the shed roof over the entrance. Both the roof dormer and the shed roof, do not carryover the design treatment of the front entry on the main residence. This placement of the entry is not reflective of the existing architectural style and is an odd orientation; the preferred historical treatment would be to have the entry porch on the front elevation of the new in-fill residence.

Porches are a distinctive element and focal point of historic structures with the residential areas of the district. They help to define the style of the building and are both functional and ceremonial. The Old Towne Design Standards note that each building must have a front porch or entry treatment with a shape, roof form, materials and colors that are typical of the style and period of the building. New porches should reflect the size, proportion and placement of historic porches. A front entrance or porch must reflect the dominant horizontal and vertical characteristics of the main building.

Issue No.6 – Character Defining Features:

<u>Foundation-</u> The applicant is proposing to have a slab-on-grade foundation instead of a raised foundation as found on the principle residence. Staff is recommending that the proposal have a raised foundation using the same finish materials.

<u>Windows</u> — The windows in the accessory unit have similar proportions as found on the main residence, however, the placement of several windows at or near the inside or outside corners of the building do not reflect the historic pattern or fenestration of wall or siding area surrounding the existing windows on the main residence. The alignment of the windows should be modified to be no closer than 18' to an end wall or inside corner.

<u>Wall Form and Cornice</u> – The proposed hot-water-heater enclosure with a shed roof on the east wall of the accessory unit distracts from the design and should be incorporated into the interior of the proposed accessory unit. There should be similar height and design of the new cornice to match the existing cornice treatment on the main residence.

Issue No. 7 – Relocation of Garage:

The applicant proposes to relocate the existing one-car garage 20 feet directly back from the existing location. The orientation will remain the same facing Jefferson Avenue. The National Register criteria limits the consideration of moved properties because the significance is embodied in locations and setting as well as the properties themselves. Moving a property destroys the relationships between the property and its surroundings and destroys the associations with historic events and persons. A moved property must retain enough historic features to convey its architectural values and retain integrity of design, materials workmanship, feeling and association. Considering the above requirements, relocating the garage and/or accessory structure within the same site, with the same general alignment and pattern as found within the historic district will have the least impact.

The placement of the garage to the rear of the property rather than mid-point on the lot fits the historic pattern for placement of garages within the Old Towne Historic District. Moreover, to leave sufficient open space to design a new in-fill accessory unit with a similar building footprint or building form as the principle residence, the relocation of the garage to the rear of the property would be required. The placement of the garage to the rear of the property would have the least impact and permit a larger area of open space between existing and proposed buildings.

Special cautions are noted for relocating historic structures within Old Towne to ensure that the building can be moved safely and without danger of collapse. A qualified engineer and house mover shall review the structure, the method of bracing and moving plan as part of the approval process.

Issue No. 8 Local CEQA Guidelines:

At this point the proposed work does not comply with the City's Local CEQA Guidelines as to its placement and orientation of the new construction in relation to the site, block and surrounding Historic District. The proposed development does not maintain the established historic relationship between buildings, streetscape pattern and open space.

Issue No 9 – Landscape:

The applicant has indicated that the existing avocado tree has an estimated diameter of 18 inches, and has a bent trunk. Staff is also requesting that a final landscape plan and Tree Removal Permit be submitted for Staff review.

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REQUIRED FINDINGS

Staff recommends the DRC continue the project for revisions, no findings are given.

CONDITIONS

No conditions are proposed, Staff is recommending that the Design Review Committee provide direction to the applicant to address the issues identified in the preliminary review of the project.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Vicinity Map
- 2. Small Scale black-line plans dated January 19, 2012

cc: Dr. John and Vicki Micha C/o Micha Investment Corporation, 351 Hospital Road, Suite 507 Newport Beach, CA 92663 949.887.3670

> Doug Ely 145 S. Olive Street, Orange, CA 92866 714.639.3958