DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE:	JUNE 6, 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. 4606-11 – KAULARD – NEW SINGLE CAR GARAGE & PARTIAL CONVERSION OF RESIDENCE TO ACCESSORY 2ND UNIT

SUMMARY

The applicant proposes to:

1. Construct a new 238 square foot, one-car detached garage and laundry at the southeast edge of the residential lot.
2. Convert existing floor area of a single-family one-story contributing 1913 Craftsman Bungalow residence to an accessory second unit.
3. Use an existing one-car garage on the site and install one open parking space.
4. Request an Administrative Adjustment AA No. 0193-11, to reduce the length of the enclosed parking space by 10%.

RECOMMENDED ACTION- FINAL DETERMINATION

Staff recommends the DRC deny the application.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant/Owner:	Liz Kaulard
Property Location:	363 S. Orange Street, Old Towne Orange Historic District
General Plan Designation:	Low Density Residential (2 to 6 Du/Ac)
Zoning Classification:	R2-6 (Duplex Residential District)
Existing Development:	Contributing 1923 Craftsman Bungalow
Property Size:	.15 Acre (6,600 sq. ft.)
Associated Applications:	None
Previous DRC Review:	None

PUBLIC NOTICE

No Public Notice was required for this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Staff is recommending denial of the request, and per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements no environmental determination is needed.

After review and consideration, if the Design Review Committee is considering approval of the request, Staff will need to return before the DRC with a determination of the appropriate environmental category. In this staff report Staff has determined that the project is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The existing property is a single-family residence. The applicant proposes to convert an earlier 500 square foot addition located at the rear of the residence to an accessory second unit. The property has a shared driveway that serves the subject property and the adjoining duplex property to the north (both are under the same ownership). The existing property has a one-car garage that was supposed to be demolished and replaced with a new two-car detached garage when the existing addition at the rear was constructed in 1985. The applicant now proposes to construct a second (238 square foot) one-car detached garage and laundry at the southeast edge of the residential lot. The existing 10 foot wide shared driveway of the proposed project will provide access to all four residential units. The project includes an Administrative Adjustment AA No. 0193-11, to reduce the length of the enclosed parking space by 10%. (See attachment No. 5 – Small Scale Plans).

EXISTING SITE

The City's Historic Building Survey lists the property as a contributing one-story, 1913 Craftsman Bungalow. The original residence was 1,178 square feet in area. A one-story 500 sq. ft. addition was permitted on the rear of the residence in 1985. The 1,678 sq. ft. residence has five bedrooms and two baths. The property has a shared driveway with the property to the north (under same ownership as the subject property). The north elevation of the current residence has a flush side door entry with a small concrete landing next to the existing driveway. The property has an existing one-car 322 square foot garage located on the northeast corner of the lot (of which the approved plans from 1985 was to be demolished).

EXISTING AREA CONTEXT

The east side of the 300 block of south Orange Street contains eight parcels of which six (6) are contributing historic structures, and two (2) are noncontributing structures. The construction dates range from 1904 to 1947. Seven homes are one-story in height, and one residence is one and one half stories in height. The architectural styles range from Craftsman, Hip Roof Cottage, Minimal Traditional and Contemporary styles with the subject property being a contributing Craftsman Bungalow. The lots vary from 6,216 to 6,477 square feet in area, with the subject

property having 6,388 sq. ft. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the subject property is .31 FAR, the block ranges from .15 to .45 FAR, with an average FAR of .28.

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. **Signage**. All signage shall be compatible with the building(s) design, scale, colors, materials and lighting.
4. **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

Issue 1 – Existing Development Was Not Completed as Planned and Permitted:

In 1985, the same owners obtained approval to construct a 500 square foot addition to the rear of the residence, demolish the existing one-car garage and construct a new 550 square foot two-car detached garage as noted on the attached site plan approved by Planning and Building. The addition was constructed, whereas the new two-car detached garage was not constructed as per the approved site plan. If the construction of the two-car garage was completed as approved by the City, today's proposal could not be constructed due to the lack of access and need for required parking for the accessory unit. The existing addition is non-conforming because it did not meet (construct the required enclosed parking) the requirements in effect at the time the application for the addition was made (See Attachment No. 3 - Approved Site Plan, dated June 3, 1985).

Issue 2 - Parking and Circulation:

The Orange Municipal Code Section 17.34.110 (I) - Interior Circulation Requirements, Section 2) - A car is not permitted to enter a street backwards except within residential developments containing three or fewer units. The shared access driveway currently serves three units. With the addition of a fourth unit as proposed, this section of the parking code would not permit vehicles to back-out on to Orange Street. As both properties are under the same ownership and use a shared driveway, it is considered a residential development. All cars exiting the proposed parking spaces at the rear of the subject site require vehicles to back-up to exit the residential property.

Staff believes that the arrangement and access to and from garages and parking spaces must be safe, usable and convenient to tenants, visitors and owners alike. Staff laid a parking turning radius template over the proposed turn into the parking area behind the subject property. Based on the number of multiple turns required to enter and exit the proposed parking area, the proposal would not satisfy the intent of the code for safe, adequate circulation, and would effectively render the on-site parking useless and unavailable to the residents.

Compounding this situation, the existing common driveway serves both the subject property and the adjoining duplex to the north. This common access driveway could intensify issues with vehicles blocking access to the proposed new and existing parking behind the subject property. Upon an early inspection of the property, Staff did not notice that there was one parking space at the very end of the driveway on the adjoining property as it was overgrown with tall weeds. This parking space would be the most easily accessible parking space and based on the lack of use, would indicate that existing parking spaces on the site were not being fully used.

Issue 3: Architectural:

Although there is no code provision whether a new accessory unit is attached or detached to the principle residence, such construction offers an opportunity to design a unit that is architecturally complementary and distinct as a separate living unit. The conversion of a portion of the existing residence into an accessory unit does not allow design changes or modifications to articulate and define an entrance for the proposed second unit. The practice and tradition of constructing historic duplexes has been where the structure had two defined entrances on the front façade, and/or historic corner duplexes with entrances on the front and side. In more recent duplex construction of the 1950-1960s, the second entrance was offset to the side and faced the street so it could be easily recognized by the public. While this is not a duplex but an accessory unit, the location and design of an entrance is still an important architectural design feature in the historic district. The entrance of the proposed accessory unit is on the east elevation appears as a back door of the single-family residence.

The existing garage is located to the right and at the end of the shared driveway. The existing garage appears to be a contributing structure even though it has some of the exterior covered with plywood.

On the proposed new garage, the offset design for the laundry presents an odd building form with a different roof design, pitch and footprint which is not consistent with the design of a new in-fill garage within the historic neighborhood. Staff would recommend that the proposed laundry be installed in the existing garage as it has sufficient depth of 23 feet to accommodate a

washer and dryer without impacting the interior space for required parking. This would eliminate the need for the pop-out of the laundry on the new garage. The proposed design of the garage adds to the width and area of the garage, yet the length of the garage (18'-6") is less than the required 20 feet depth. The second garage would not be compatible in roof height and pitch when compared with the existing garage. The juxtaposition of having two single-car garages on the same parcel is in not consistent with the established placement and building pattern of accessory building forms within the historic district. The construction of two-car replacement garages is an accepted in-fill concept Old Towne provided the architectural character, massing, placement and orientation is consistent with adopted standards and does not impact the streetscape and/or side yard setback pattern.

Issue 4: Public Safety:

The Crime Prevention section of Orange Police Department has concerns that the project, as proposed, does not have a recognizable entrance for the accessory second-unit so that Police and Fire can respond to the correct unit (See Attachment No. 2 - Crime Prevention Memo).

Issue 5: Streetscape, Side yard Setback and Building Pattern:

The placement of a second one-car garage at the south east corner of the property disrupts the existing open side yard setback pattern found within the block. The odd arrangement of the visibility of a side of a garage to public view is out of character with the placement of accessory structures within the historic district. The side of the garage is to be located within two-feet of the south property line, which will necessitate a change in exterior material and design of the exterior wall and gable end of the roof to achieve the required fire protection. The installation of a second one-car garage, one open parking space and driveway approaches does not leave adequate open and easily accessible recreational space for one or both living units on the property.

The layout and placement of the garages on the property is not historically consistent and not in keeping with the historic pattern and placement of accessory structures within the district. Additionally, the Old Towne Design Standards require evaluation of each individual project and its relationship to its surroundings including: Site planning, rhythm and spacing of buildings on a street, entrances and approaches, and overall design quality. The proposal is not workable from any of the above concerns and would impact the district and add to the increase of off-site street parking.

Optional Approaches:

- Keep the existing one-car garage and provide open parking spaces for the additional two required parking spaces; and
- Construct a new covered entrance on the southeast corner of the existing addition. This would require a small south projecting gable roof over a side porch landing, to articulate a separate entrance for the accessory second unit. Staff would recommend maintaining a minimum nine-foot wide side yard setback, and a new walkway along the south side terminating at the front yard. A new fence could be installed to screen the open parking area visible along the south side yard.

The above options may require additional Staff review and a determination of what, if any, environmental review would be required as well as Design Review Committee review.

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REQUIRED FINDINGS

The courts define a "Finding" as a conclusion which describes the method of analysis decision makers utilize to make the final decision. A decision making body "makes a Finding," or draws a conclusion, through identifying evidence in the record (i.e., testimony, reports, environmental documents, etc.) and should not contain unsupported statements. The statements which support the Findings bridge the gap between the raw data and the ultimate decision, thereby showing the rational decision making process that took place. The "Findings" are, in essence, the ultimate conclusions which must be reached in order to approve (or recommend approval of) a project. The same holds true if denying a project; the decision making body must detail why it cannot make the Findings.

Old Towne Historic District – Applies to all projects within the district.

1. *In the Old Towne Historic District, the proposed work conforms to the prescriptive standards and design criteria referenced and/or recommended by the DRC or other reviewing body for the project (OMC 17.10.070.F.1 and OTDS).*

   a) The Old Towne Design Standards require evaluation of each individual project and its relationship to its surroundings including: Site planning, rhythm and spacing of buildings on a street, entrances and approaches, and overall design quality. The project fails to achieve the above criteria as noted below:

      (1) The project does not satisfy the intent of the code for safe, adequate circulation, and would effectively render the on-site parking as useless and unavailable to the residences. Additionally, this would increase the use of on-street parking within an already under parked neighborhood.

      (2) The conversion of a portion of the existing residence into an accessory unit does not allow design changes or modifications to articulate and define an entrance for the proposed second unit. All residential buildings in the district present some form of defined entry that is visible to public view. However, the entrance of the proposed accessory unit is on the east elevation can be mistaken as a back door of the single-family residence.

      (3) The juxtaposition of having two single-car garages on the same parcel is not consistent with the established placement and building pattern of accessory building forms within the historic district.

      (4) The placement of a second one-car garage at the south east corner of the property disrupts the existing open side yard setback pattern found within the block.

(5) The layout of the multiple garages on the property is not historically consistent and not in keeping with the historic pattern and placement of accessory structures within the district.

(6) The installation of a second one-car garage and one open parking space does not leave adequate open and easily accessible recreational space for one or both living units on the property. This impacts the overall design quality and use of the site by the occupants.

This finding cannot be made.

Old Towne Historic District – National Register Historic District -- additional finding applies to sites within the National Register Historic District.

2. *In any National Register Historic District, the proposed work complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines (OMC 17.10.07.F.2).*

The factors that shall be considered when determining incompatibility include bulk and mass, architectural articulation, and the placement and orientation of additions or accessory buildings on the site. Required findings under the Old Towne Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards cannot be made to support the project.

The project as proposed fails to meet the following criteria:

a) Introduction of an additional accessory building that interrupts the historical development pattern of buildings and open space relationships on the historic site.

b) Introduction and layout of the multiple garages on the property is not historically consistent and not in keeping with the historic pattern and placement of accessory structures within the district.

c) Introduction of a new building or site feature that is out of scale or of an otherwise inappropriate design.

d) Creating a false historical appearance with the introduction of a second accessory structure that destroys the historical relationships and is out of character with the historic district.

e) Radically changing site features which are important in defining the overall character of the property so that as a result, the character is diminished.

f) Destroying the relationship between building and landscape features within the setting, or constructing inappropriately located new parking areas.

This finding cannot be made.

3. *The project design upholds community aesthetics through the use of an internally consistent, integrated design theme and is consistent with all adopted specific plans, applicable design standards, and their required findings (OMC 17.10.07.F.3).*

The project does not have an internally consistent, integrated design theme and is not consistent with all applicable design standards, and their required findings as noted in the above findings.

This finding cannot be made.

4. *For infill residential development, as specified in the City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines, the new structure(s) or addition are compatible with the scale, massing, orientation, and articulation of the surrounding development and will preserve or enhance existing neighborhood character (OMC 17.10.07.F.4).*
   As the *City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines* do not apply to projects located within the Old Towne Orange Historic District, this finding does not apply.

   Staff is recommends that the Design Review Committee deny the proposed conversion and construction of a second one car garage on the property and consider additional options to address the above issues.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Orange Police Department - Crime Prevention Memo, dated April 3, 2012
3. Copy of 1985 approved site plan for new addition and two car detached garage
4. Additional photographs of existing garage and rear of residence
5. Small scale site, elevation, floor plans and photographs, dated December 8, 2012

CC: Liz Kaulard
10381 Greenbrier,
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Jon Califf
369 N. Harwood Street,
Orange, Ca 92866