CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

September 5, 2012

Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack

Carol Fox

Robert Imboden Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner

Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:10 p.m. with a review of the Agenda.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, had an item to present at the Planning Commission meeting that began at 7:00 p.m. and asked that his item, item No. 5, be moved up in the agenda. Item No. 7 would not be heard based on a request by the applicant to continue.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of August 15, 2012. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:17 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 were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 15, 2012

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of August 15, 2012, with corrections and changes noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4615-12 - AMERICA'S TIRE

- A proposal to modify the existing north elevation of an 8,382 sq. ft. building by adding five bay doors where glazing currently exists, adding a trellis with vines over the bay doors, adding on-building signage to the north and east elevations, and eliminating 11 parking spaces for bay door access.
- 1542 E. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Chad Ortlieb, 714-744-7237, cortlieb@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC Meetings: June 6, 2012 and July 18, 2012
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member McCormack recused himself from the item's presentation as he had worked with one of the consultants who was present.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Committee Member Wheeler asked Mr. Ortlieb what the DRC's action would be on the request that the CUP be just for a tire store. Would it be just a suggestion to the Planning Commission?

Mr. Ortlieb stated in their recommendation, the DRC could make a recommendation of approval or a denial recommendation or a contingency approval. The DRC could state that in the event the Planning Commission took General Plan considerations, other than design, in factoring their decision, if the DRC were to approve the project, limitations on the use would have to be a condition of the Planning Commission approval.

Committee Member Fox asked if a subsequent tire store were to move into the space would that new business be required to go back before the DRC, or only if they made a change?

Mr. Ortlieb stated only if they were to make a change of operation. If the Committee had a concern such as promotional sales or items outside, the DRC could specifically recommend conditions that affected the aesthetics.

Committee Member Fox asked if those conditions would need to be added to the item before them?

Mr. Ortlieb stated only a recommendation to the Planning Commission was being made and Staff would add those types of conditions to the Resolution.

Committee Member Fox wanted to confirm that if a new user came in and was not making any changes to the site, they would not need to go before the DRC or the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ortlieb stated that was correct.

Applicant, Chris Pederson, address on file, stated on the CUP they had narrowed it down to specifically tire wheel sales and they were unique in that most tire stores specialized in tire repairs and mechanical types of things. Those things would be outside of the CUP. The recommendations from the previous meeting were reviewed and the idea of bringing the bays in at the end of the building or just having two doors out front with the pergolas with a horseshoe loop entry into the store, had not worked for their business model. The standard store footprint had six bays that allowed six cars to move in and out and the modified design would restrict them to only three bays and would not allow them to grow their business. There were some stores that were very small, but those were old style, and they had a very low ceiling for the amount of tires that could be sold every month. Changing the design limited their business goals and would not allow them to work efficiently and service their customers. The goal was to get customers in and out as quickly as possible, under an hour or less. The design before them was a variation with the doors out front and an expanded pergola with vines.

Applicant, Jim Baldovin, address on file, stated the trellis was a pretty simple concept. It distracted the eye, allowing the eye to see something other than a retail façade, and it would bring color to the building. The architecture had a nice rhythm to it and the trellis would enhance it. The vines would be a Carolina jasmine, something that would provide for faster growth and grow all year round.

Applicant, Pako Pimsoguam, address on file, stated it was not just a trellis; it was actually a pergola that was free standing and 6 feet in depth. A car would actually drive under it.

Mr. Pederson stated the other designs that they had looked at would have open bay doors facing residential properties. The proposed design would have no impact on the residential properties, which was another major thing that they would not need to deal with.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Chair Woollett asked if there was a decibel sound limit at the property line?

Mr. Ortlieb stated there was a residential standard.

Chair Woollett stated it might be important to understand what that was in order to assure that the limits were not exceeded.

Mr. Ortlieb stated that there may be the need for a condition referencing the Municipal Code.

Chair Woollett stated that some of the DRC members would want to know what the limitations were. There was a lot of traffic noise on Chapman and he wondered what the noise limitation would be at the north property line.

Mr. Ortlieb stated he would check his code book and provide that information. He went on to state that the manner that the codes were constructed provided limits for residential areas, but he had not known if the code addressed commercial-to-commercial use impacts or industrial-to-industrial use impacts.

Chair Woollett stated there was residential development on the north side of Chapman Avenue. If the noise level was a 50 or 60 decibel or rating of 15 decibel of ambient noise it might apply to the north side of Chapman.

Mr. Ortlieb stated they would need to address the total quality and frequency of noise.

Chair Woollett stated it would be helpful to obtain that information.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there would be paving under the pergola?

Mr. Pimsaquan stated they typically use black concrete.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the plans noted decorative concrete to remain.

Mr. Pimsaquan stated because currently there was a sidewalk there.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had the feeling they would be ramping up there with paving as shown on sheet A-2.

Applicant, Noel Anaesco, address on file, stated the existing sidewalk was a textured concrete finish. They would keep that and taper the concrete from the edge of the concrete sidewalk and then pave from there.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the proposal before them was certainly a step in the right direction and his only real condition would be to change the design of the trellis columns to more closely resemble the columns on the other buildings in the shopping center. He presented a sketch to the applicant and reviewed the design. He stated it would be more compatible with the other columns in the center and it would be a nice feature to match the stone too. He stated it would be better to remove the sloped awnings and canopies as they appeared to run into the trellis.

Mr. Pimsaquan stated the canopies could be removed from behind the trellis areas.

Committee Member Fox stated she was extremely disappointed that the CUP could not end with the tenant; she understood what the attorneys were stating. What had been an issue for her, was to allow that type of use at the "gateway" of the City and it went against the General Plan of what should occur at that intersection. The suggestion of minimizing the number of bay doors visible from the street would have mitigated that and the proposal before them was not mitigating those areas. She was having a difficult time accepting that the aesthetic effects of the proposed use had been mitigated. She could not see it and she could not make the findings and approve the aesthetics of the five bay doors.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was looking for the justification in not coming back to the DRC with something different from what he believed they had suggested at the last meeting and he wanted some further information of why the other suggestions had not worked?

Mr. Pederson stated a large part of their business was being very efficient and getting customers in and out in less than an hour and they tended to be very busy. Part of their service was free flat tire repairs, rotations, and balancing; they had people come in not to purchase, but just for those services. Those types of services were relegated to two bays and the other bay for the tire changes. They really needed four, if not five, bays actively working to conduct their business efficiently.

Chair Woollett stated if they only had three bays the store would not be able to sell enough tires.

Mr. Pimsaguan stated that was one reason, but also with an internal bay design it changed their storage space, and when they didn't have enough space it would necessitate adding on to the store for storage. They had determined that the addition of space would not work based on their negotiations with Walgreens.

Committee Member Imboden stated what he was trying to get at was if there was a nexus between the number of openings and the number of bays and what that had done to their operation.

Mr. Pimsaguan stated what that would do to the business was not provide enough storage in their store, and with an internal bay system they would need a much larger store to accommodate their internal storage capacity.

Chair Woollett stated he took another look at the store and stood across Chapman and he had been concerned with the noise issue and he would obtain that information from Staff. The properties on the north side of Chapman were not residential, they were businesses, and as he looked at the shopping center the tire store's neighbor was Walgreens. His inclination was if he was satisfied with the sound issue, he felt the tire store was compatible with what existed and that there would be no harm to the neighbors to the north. He agreed with the aesthetic adjustments as proposed by Committee Member Wheeler. He had no issues with it.

Mr. Ortlieb stated in the Orange Municipal Code (OMC) it spoke of interior noise levels being no higher than 55 decibels beginning at 7:00 a.m. The noise contours for that area of Chapman were already at 70 and it tapered off to 65. The General Plan stated if it was an increase above 3 decibels there would be an impact.

Chair Woollett stated that would be at the boundary line of residential properties.

Mr. Ortlieb noted that the noise contours on the General Plan map were difficult to interpret as they were not specific to a parcel of land based on the scale of the map.

Mr. Pimsaguan provided a table from the applicant's noise study.

Chair Woollett asked if the table had been reviewed by City Staff in how it pertained to the noise ordinance?

Mr. Ortlieb stated no, and that staff may need to consult with someone to have it reviewed for accuracy.

Chair Woollett stated in reading the information, the noise from the proposed use had no effect.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the north side of Chapman was zoned as OP?

Mr. Ortlieb stated it was OP across the street and C-1 on Tustin. There were no strictly residential areas until crossing to Shattuck, and the OP zone had a residential option.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had thought that they had done away with the true OP zone recently. He asked to review the map as it was pertinent to the decision they had to make.

Chair Woollett stated they were dealing with aesthetics and not Planning issues.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was a design that could potentially have impacts on the neighbors; he asked if there had been noticing on the item?

Mr. Ortlieb stated there was not noticing. It only happened when the CUP when moved on to the Planning Commission. All interested parties had been notified along the process.

Chair Woollett asked if the Committee was ready to take an action?

Committee Member Imboden stated he had a question regarding the apron area as it was not called out as a slope. He reviewed the plans with the applicants and asked if the concrete would be demolished?

Chair Woollett stated they would take the asphalt out.

Committee Member Imboden stated it would be an edge of a ramp.

Mr. Pederson stated there would be a curb there; typically they used black concrete on their aprons.

Mr. Pimsaguan stated they would use a civil engineer to define it for them, to assure they came out far enough so there was not a sharp edge. They were looking at 6" and they would need to come out 6'.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the planters would be raised?

Mr. Pimsaguan stated yes.

Committee Member Imboden stated if they came out 6' that would affect the back-up space and the drive aisle.

Committee Member Fox stated it would be checked with the grading plan.

The Committee reviewed the design of the ramps and the drive aisle with the applicants.

Mr. Pederson stated there was a wide drive aisle and the back-up space would not affect the drive aisle. He reviewed the plans and explained how cars would maneuver in that area.

Committee Member Imboden asked if they were okay in removing 11 spaces from the parking lot?

Mr. Ortlieb stated it worked with the code.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4615-12, America's Tire, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- The trellis columns be redesigned to more closely match the straight columns that existed in front of Walgreens.
- The existing canopies and awning-type structures located directly behind the new trellis treatments be removed.
- The DRC strongly recommends to the Planning Commission that they adopt the suggested condition limiting use to strictly installation and repairs of tires for passenger and commercial vehicles.

Committee Member Imboden stated that signage had not been discussed at all, and the way the image appeared before them now was not typical of images of tire stores. Usually there were big banners and window graphics.

Mr. Pimsaguan stated the signage would be the type that appeared on Walgreens.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not been on the DRC when Walgreens was approved. He asked Staff if that would be dealt with at another level?

Mr. Ortlieb stated that the sign provisions of the code would be applicable and there would be no illegal banners, A-frames, outdoor displays and such. There was a mechanism to obtain permits for special event signage.

Mr. Pederson stated they would never muddy up their windows, not even at Christmas time.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett NOES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden

ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Tim McCormack

Chair Woollett asked Staff what happened now since there were two opposed and two approving?

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for September 5, 2012 Page 9 of 37

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated the item would move to the Planning Commission. When it was a tie, it failed, and that information would go to the next body.

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4616-12 – MICHA RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a detached 628 sq. ft. accessory unit, relocate a one-car garage, and provide two open parking spaces on a site with a contributing 1926 Provincial residence and garage.
- 545 E. Jefferson Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Preliminary Review: April 18, 2012
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, John Micha, address on file, stated they took in the recommendation of the Committee Members and Staff. It was much better and they were pleased with the project.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he had met with Mr. Ely and that was another lengthy discussion about how to go about creating a project that met the applicant's needs but also fit in the context of the existing garage and structure. The main issue had been the relocation of the contributing garage and they opposed relocation. In the proposal the garage would be minimally relocated while maintaining the historic orientation. The applicant had complied with the DRC recommendations. The design worked using appropriate materials and complemented the main structure. He was sorry for the loss of the tree. The project looked good.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how the hardware would be treated on the beams along the front porch?

Applicant, Doug Ely, address on file, stated there would be a column capital added.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would not be in keeping with the design and he suggested using some sort of epoxy bolt.

Mr. Ely stated he had used knife plate connectors before in similar situations. There was some ornate detail on the porch and they were keeping away from that much detail and he had not felt there was a problem with adding a little piece of trim around that particular area. He could do a simple post to beam if that was an issue.

Committee Member Wheeler asked about the base?

Mr. Ely stated he proposed the same.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the DRC had been very consistent in requesting that the top edge of the shed roof dormer be below the ridge and not at the ridge.

Mr. Ely stated it would be something that was not visible. He asked how much below?

Committee Member Wheeler stated 8"-10", something in that range.

Mr. Ely discussed the detail with Committee Member Wheeler.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not wanted to break with tradition as the next person would want the same design. His opinion would be to have it dropped; he shared a drawing with the applicants and explained the components of the ridge with a ridge board.

Mr. Ely stated he had not had a problem with that, but the only thing that concerned him was to keep the roof pitch as it was and lower the dormer roof would take the size out of the windows.

Chair Woollett recalled looking at shed roofs during a trip to Nantucket with the same situation. In Nantucket they were all done the way that it was proposed. He was told that he was not in Nantucket. His point was that there was nothing wrong with it, and there was nothing wrong with an alternate design. However, to remain consistent with long-time DRC practice, the dormer roof should be dropped.

Committee Member Imboden asked what the offset was, and if he could bring it forward a bit?

Mr. Ely stated there was a light fixture and a television on the wall; it could be pushed a bit.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the barges be framed in the traditional manner.

Committee Member McCormack stated what he was questioning was a little stoop, and it would be much better to not have the stoop come out and all of that envelop the post and to have it all at the same height.

Mr. Ely presented a different drawing and stated it was all one elevation and there was a step there.

Committee Member McCormack and Mr. Ely reviewed the area of concern and Mr. Ely explained how the area would work.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he considered taking the rail all the way around the porch?

Mr. Ely stated he had not wanted to add that much detail for that space.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member McCormack stated instead of taking a 6" step down, to bring it up more. He liked to take the architecture to the same plane.

Mr. Ely stated he had designed it in that manner to avoid having two steps. If it was too tall it might feel that a rail was needed.

Committee Member Fox stated she felt it was nicer lower. She was the new member on the Committee and she had not felt the dormer was out of character and that was how the area was handled on homes in many historic districts.

Mr. Ely stated they had looked at a shed roof but the client had felt it was too contemporary. Committee Member Wheeler had provided some feedback to look at a shed roof and he had wanted to respond to that.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission, DRC No. 4616-12, Micha Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- Add the trim on the connectors.
- To drop the shed roof.
- Use the traditional method for framing on the barge boards.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to mention, purely as a note to the applicants, if they were going to the trouble of installing wood windows, to include wood screens. And lastly he wanted to state that they had brought back a much better project. He wanted to state for the record, as the application was moving to the Planning Commission, he hoped that the Planning Commission would think about newer applications coming forward with larger accessory units, larger than what had been seen in the past that had the potential of avoiding parking requirements. He had sat on the Planning Commission for a number of years and Mr. Ryan had been correct that many of those additions were additions to a single family use and not an addition of accessory uses. He hoped that as a variance went before the Planning Commission that they considered that it was a different type of use. He supported the project and it was a much better project that had come back before them.

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4628-12 – MOLINA & PORTER RESIDENCE

- A proposal to remodel a front and rear porch on an 1889 Victorian residence.
- 435 E. Palmyra Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC Meeting: July 5, 2012
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant Jeff Jeanette, address on file, stated the walls would be kept the same. Therefore, the project would not need to go to the Planning Commission. The applicants had "one in the oven" and they wanted to push the item through as quickly as they could. There was one outstanding item and that was the windows. He completely understood how the windows were part of the somewhat original project and that the service porch was added at a later date. Mr. Ryan had presented a 1922 aerial that showed the service porch was there; the construction of it was very haphazard. Attempting to retrofit windows would require demolishing much of the wall. It was a question of replacing the windows with a casement-type window or a double-hung. The choice was for a double-hung window and was in keeping with the Victorian style. The home had double-hung windows and the owners had spent a lot of time perusing the neighborhood and doing their own comparisons. There were other service porches that had double-hung windows and they had found quite a few. He presented photos to the Committee Members.

Chair Woollett stated that if the roof remained as existed that the project would not need to go to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct as the project would no longer be considered a demolition.

Mr. Jeanette stated they would be replacing materials that had been compromised, and would keep the material the same as much as they could.

Chair Woollett stated they would be rehabilitating the walls.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the additional information reduced his comments quite a bit and it was now his understanding that the service porch would remain in its original configuration. The single wall construction would be rebuilt from within to allow for insulation. He was pleased that they were doing that and they were doing a fine job. He noted the porch columns that would be added to the home. If the service porch had been there in 1922 it could have been built on the house and the same construction techniques might not have been used for a service porch and the porch was probably screened in. Another solution for windows was to use a hopper window. He had installed wooden hopper windows and they operated easily. The ventilation would not be the same, but with so many of those windows

there would be ventilation. He was pleased that the original configuration for the service porch was being used.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the kitchen would have a much better feeling than what they might expect. He had worked for a company back in the 1970's that had 7' plates with cathedral ceilings and they used a 3 in 12 pitch and the space inside was wonderful. He had not heard any complaints. The space would be great. He believed there was more pitch to the porch roof than what was shown on the drawings. He reviewed the drawings with the applicant. He believed it was a 3 in 12 pitch and it would be a much nicer space and a 7' plate was gorgeous. He wanted to comment on the windows and in reviewing the photos not one of the examples appeared to be a service porch; in fact, he recognized one of the homes he had worked on and noted that it was not the service porch. As Mr. Frankel had mentioned, the service porches were screened in and they were of a much inferior construction than the main house. Typically they were done with fixed glass or casement windows. He had not recalled any homes with service porches having double-hung windows. His final comment was on the trim for the service porch. There were horizontal members wrapping around over the vertical corner piece. The photos had it the other way around and he thought it was wise to change that to have the corner piece go through. Other than that it was great and he was pleased the railing was brought down to 36".

Applicant, Hope Molina-Porter, address on file, stated she wanted to respond to his comments. On the photos, she had not contended that the windows were originally double-hung and she had not thought that they were, but what she was offering was that they were now and that was what they were hoping for. It was going to be their kitchen and one of the warmest places in their home and they wanted it to be especially comfortable and they really wanted double-hung windows.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the reason he had stated that the photos had not appeared to have been service porches was that they had not had the series of windows going across them that was typical of a service porch.

Committee Member Fox stated she was relieved that they were maintaining the roof and the one light window sash would be a better match with the service porch feel of the place. The height would be fabulous and it was going to be a much more interesting space. The homeowners were great stewards of maintaining that home and the things that were being done to a very unique structure in Old Towne were so appreciated; it was wonderful and they had one of the few authentic service porches that were still around and single light windows would make it. She suggested a casement window or a hopper or even an awning window. She wondered how they felt about a mullion.

Applicant, Laura Sanders, address on file, stated another thing to consider was back in the day as the porches were screened in would be to have wooden screens to camouflage the horizontal bar and passerby would see the screens. The corner entry at the rear of the house had a series of three windows and windows that flanked the door as you approached, the windows had a horizontal bar and it would follow suit to have those same size windows along the service porch wall as both those areas were enclosed at one time. What differentiated the double-hung windows of the home with the windows of the service porch was that the windows on the home

were much larger and the service porch character was of much smaller proportions; a doublehung window might not be a key factor in that respect.

Committee Member Imboden stated the difference for him was that a screened porch was screened, they were not window frames that were screened and it would not get them on the same page to just pop screens in. He believed that single pane windows would be a better choice and he believed everything the homeowners were doing was fantastic. They were going to have quite a gem. He hoped the lower ceiling in the kitchen would be embraced and it presented opportunities that were yet to be realized. He suggested that a hopper window would provide the best ventilation.

Chair Woollett stated he concurred with what had been stated and he wanted the decision for the windows to be a recommendation and not a requirement. He believed it would be a better project with more windows, but that it should be the owners preference, and to allow it to be the property owners' choice of what windows to use.

Applicant, Michael Williams, address on file, referencing elevation sheet A8, stated that one thing that might need to occur involved the right hand side where the new bathroom was proposed. There was a window shown and there was a sheer wall issue; it had been recommended that 25% sheer be maintained and the window might need to be eliminated. The two windows on the wall could possibly be maintained. He just wanted to bring that to their attention.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he thought it might appear better to eliminate that window and to have continuous glazing without a hole.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the applicants had done a great job on the project.

Committee Member Fox asked what the consensus was on the windows?

Chair Woollett stated he would want it to be a recommendation; the owner really wanted to use double-hung windows and he wanted to provide for that option.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was coming at it from a Standards point of view and making that change changed the very nature of the house and the simplicity of the service porch. If it was on another part of the house it would not be that big of an issue.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed with those comments and he believed service porches were very unique and they should appear different.

Committee Member Fox stated if they used casements they would have the maximum ventilation for that space.

Chair Woollett stated with casement the screens would be to the inside.

Committee Member Fox stated a hopper window opened in, with the screen on the outside.

Chair Woollett stated with a hopper window the window would open in and then there was a kitchen counter there.

Committee Member Fox stated that hopper windows were very charming.

Ms. Molina-Porter asked if with a hopper window she would have the ability to shout out to children in the yard.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with single light both hoppers and casements would be possible; they could use a combination.

Mr. Jeanette asked if sliding sideways windows could be used?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would be out of character.

Committee Member Fox stated it appeared that the temperature of the Committee was to accept the conditions as presented in the Staff Report.

Mr. Williams asked Ms. Molina-Porter about Mr. Ryan's position presented in the Staff Report that if the roof was to be raised slightly in order to have a flat 8' ceiling, approval of the project would be needed by the Planning Commission. If they slept on it and decided they had not wanted to raise the roof they would not need to go to the Planning Commission. Did a determination one way or the other need to be made?

Chair Woollett stated what he had heard was to leave the roof the way it was, not raise it, which would omit the requirement to go to the Planning Commission. As far as he could tell everyone was pleased with that.

Committee Member Fox stated she would not recommend the project to the Planning Commission with a raised roof.

Chair Woollett stated he wanted to propose a motion and if they were not in agreement they could go from there.

Chair Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4628-12, Molina & Porter Residence, subject to the conditions and finding contained in the Staff Report, and with the following clarifications and modifications:

- The roof remain as it existed and not to be replaced.
- The western most window of the rear elevation may be removed.

And with the following recommendation:

• Service porch windows may be replaced with single glass fenestration such as casement windows, awning windows, or hopper windows.

There was not a second to the motion. The motion failed.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4628-12, Molina & Porter Residence, subject to the conditions and finding contained in the Staff Report, and with special emphasis on Condition No. 3 that required that the rear porch roof be retained and Condition No. 4 that single light windows be installed in the service porch, rather than double-hung windows; and with the following additional conditions:

- The trim on the service porch, the vertical corner trim, supersedes the sill trim.
- And with the statement that the decision presented was a final determination as the applicants agree that no portion of the structure shall be demolished, thereby not requiring approval by the Planning Commission.
- The western most window at the rear elevation may be eliminated.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Tim McCormack, Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(5) DRC No. 4638-12 – COLGAN RESIDENCE

- A proposal to demolish an existing single-family residence and rebuild a 2,548 sq. ft. two-story single-family residence.
- 137 N. Shattuck Place
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Woollett stated the item before them was being presented for preliminary review.

Mr. Garcia stated the applicant may choose to seek a recommendation from the DRC, but from a Staff perspective they felt it was not ready to move forward.

Chair Woollett asked what action could the Committee take?

Mr. Garcia stated the Committee could make a determination based on the submittal.

Chair Woollett stated they could take action and then it would not need to go to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Garcia stated if it was denied the applicant could appeal the decision. Staff had not felt the project met the requirements.

Committee Member Wheeler stated Staff had not expected the Committee to take any action.

Mr. Garcia stated not unless the Committee decided they wanted to take an action.

Committee Member Imboden stated the Committee could determine that they wanted to take an action.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct.

Applicant, Lorena Arce, address on file, stated the expectation was that they were hoping that the Committee would take action to approve the proposal to demolish the existing building and build the project before them. The in-fill guidelines were very clear, but also very general and the fact that some people were starting out with a blank canvas and the in-fill guidelines were in fact guidelines. From the photos in the submittal package there were several examples of different styles that appeared in that neighborhood, not just on the block but in the neighborhood. She had hoped that they had time to review the submittal package as everything was in there and if they had questions she would be happy to discuss the proposal.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated when he visited the site he had discussed the project with the applicant.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had also met with the applicant.

Committee Member Imboden stated Staff had expressed clearly that the proposal had not been in character with the neighborhood and the applicant had stated the opposite and he asked for justification.

Ms. Arce stated it was most evident in the photos that had been submitted. There was one house that had a block feeling to it, another one had a more modern feel, some had the garage in the front, some in the back, and there was a large variety of representations. To state that the homes were generally Ranch-style was not the case. In the neighborhood there were Craftsman style elements.

Committee Member Imboden asked specifically for bulk and mass how the proposal was in context of the neighborhood?

Applicant, Robert Colgan, address on file, stated in reference to bulk and mass it was difficult to compare to anything else as the proposal would be the first two-story on the block. On Monterey there was a home that was more bulky and had more mass and less architectural features; that was a street similar to his and only a block away. It was a change to two-story on a street that was all single story homes. As far as architectural features, the proposal was consistent with the existing home and the house directly across the street was very similar in style and flare. He had been there since 1986 and he was being sensitive to the neighborhood; it was actually his paper route as a kid and he had lived there all of his life. He was wanting to be sensitive to the neighbors and the neighborhood in coming up with a product and architectural design that was pleasing and acceptable to the neighborhood. It had a detached garage and there was not much they could do based on the restrictions set forth by the code. He wanted a home of adequate size to support his family and without having to get variances and keeping in consideration his neighbors in the positioning of the windows and the setback. The redesign of the roof structure and changing the line of massing from the porch to above center line of the house and changing the materials. He proposed a trellis to support a vine system to also reduce the massing. He could remove a beautiful Sycamore tree, but the house was designed with the intent to maintain the large trees and he was very sensitive to the feel of the neighbors and the neighborhood. He would not build anything that the neighbors were not in favor of. Another thing that was important was the construction of the home; the house would be built through panelized construction so all of the systems within the house existed in the wall panels. He was open to suggestions to change the architectural exterior of the house. The box was the system of the house and everything from engineering and systems were built into the floor plan and the interior structure. He had a structure entity that had limited architectural design; the house had been built in 10 surrounding cities and had been approved with far less architectural features. He attempted

to take that product and take it to another level. He was not an architect, but there were limitations within the structure.

Chair Woollett stated it appeared that what he had done was to improve the appearance of a basic structural model. Some of the thematic material of a Craftsman style had been incorporated. He asked if there was a reason that style had been chosen as there were no houses of that type in the neighborhood?

Mr. Colgan stated his home was actually a Craftsman house and the house across the street was too.

Chair Woollett stated they would not see that home as a Craftsman. There were two fundamental issues related to the proposal: (1) it was a two-story home in a single story neighborhood; and (2) the style of the house. Maybe the applicant was attempting to justify the second story by incorporating a style that would be more attractive. In his mind those were two separate issues; and the fact that it was a two-story proposal was a big issue with him. The twostory house would be more palatable if it was not the style proposed. The style proposed was not compatible with the neighborhood. Since a lot of the DRC's work was within the Old Towne area where there were many Craftsman style homes, to now have a house outside Old Towne that was attempting to copy one of the old style houses had not made any sense. If the home was in Old Towne he would not accept it as being compatible with the Craftsman style of homes found in Old Towne. Since it was not in Old Towne and in a neighborhood of post WW II houses and regardless of what those homes had on them they were clearly 1940-1950's houses which the proposal was not. It would be much easier to accept if it was compatible with late 1940 or early 1950 homes. In terms of the second story, there was some justification because of what it backed up to, except for the fact that the street was all single-story homes and the character of the street was single story homes. Putting a two-story home was a real challenge in meeting the ordinance.

Ms. Arce stated the home kitty-corner to the home was a two-story home on the corner and that should account for something.

Chair Woollett stated not for him because it was not part of the character of the street.

Ms. Arce stated, and in coming back to the design guidelines that were handed to them, there was no preclusion to a two-story home on a single-story street.

Committee Member Imboden stated all of them had seen homes that they would not ever guess were two-story homes and he had not believed it would be impossible to put a two-story home on that block and be respectful of the street, but the project before them was not an attempt to do that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the DRC had been very consistent in requiring a new twostory home in a single-story neighborhood to start as a one-story element at the front façade and move into a two-story structure to the rear.

Ms. Arce stated she would bring them back to what Mr. Garcia had stated; that he had not wanted to see the large roof structure because many of the homes had small roof structures. But

many of the homes had large roof structures too and there were so many variations in the same block and it would seem that anything was possible.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not felt that way. He viewed the area as a fairly consistent collection of late mid-century California Ranch homes. It may be that they had a disagreement on that, and he was not certain how the other Committee Members felt, but he felt that the particular neighborhood of the proposal before them had a very defined character and the project was not hitting the mark.

Committee Member Fox stated she completely agreed with Staff that the proposal read as a 2 ½ story structure. There was a ½ story thing that they dealt with in Orange and a ½ story looked like it was folded into the roof and because of the dormers and very large expansive roof plane and the vents on the side and everything. If the bottom floor came off, then it would be a two-story Craftsman house. She indicated on the renderings how that could have been achieved. A true Craftsman house would be 1 ½ stories. In a single-story neighborhood the applicant was proposing a 2 ½ story home due to the nature of what was proposed for the roof. It was making it much larger. On such a deep lot, the back of the lot would be a much more appropriate choice to keep the single-story element toward the front, and it was a really deep lot. To mitigate the second story she would suggest moving the structure back.

Mr. Colgan stated he could not move it back; there was a building in the back with a setback requirement that would not allow the move. He had looked at the positioning of the home and even trying to go to a single-story he would not be able to obtain the square footage that he wanted due to code.

Committee Member Fox stated if he proposed tearing down the structure at the back and building back there she would have much less difficulty approving the project.

Mr. Colgan stated he was not going to tear down the back structure.

Committee Member Imboden stated the proposed home was set forward approximately 10' more than the average home on the block.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct. The average was 35' and the proposed project was 25' and it had met the code requirements.

Ms. Arce stated the average had not meant much because the average was taken from some far setbacks and there were some really close setbacks too.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the proposed home would loom out and be a huge statement.

Mr. Colgan stated the porch was at the front setback and if he wanted a Colonial style home he would not have the porch that was causing the closer setback.

Committee Member Fox stated if there was a single-story portion at the front and a two-story structure at the rear, and she was not wanting to design the home for the applicant, but to point out things that would be approvable and to remain in context with the block.

Ms. Arce stated that was great but a little too late for the project before them and that the DRC needed to revisit the whole process. A developer, homeowner, or whomever, should not have to get to a point of highly developed plans to then get the type of feedback they were now receiving. That type of feedback should be provided up front.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they had been getting that feedback from Staff?

Ms. Arce stated they got that feedback after a design was submitted.

Committee Member Wheeler stated feedback was provided from what had been submitted.

Ms. Arce stated she could not show anything until an application had been submitted and that was when a Staff person was assigned.

Committee Member Imboden stated that was typical in the industry and the ideas needed to be communicated before talking about it.

Committee Member McCormack asked what the FAR was?

Mr. Garcia stated FAR for the zone was .6 and around 50%. The proposal was below that, but larger than any of the properties out there.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there had not been much information provided for the property at the rear and was there any information on parking. Was there sufficient parking?

Mr. Garcia stated yes. The structure in the back was approximately 21 square feet and included in the FAR.

Committee Member Imboden questioned if he was understanding that the average FAR for the street was over 5,000 square feet of structure?

Mr. Garcia stated no, the allowable code was .6; the FAR of the proposed project was a little over .5.

Committee Member McCormack asked what was the FAR of homes in the neighborhood as that was what could be used for a compatibility measurement?

Mr. Garcia stated he had not gathered that information for the neighborhood, but had taken the homes adjacent and across the street and the average for those was 1,400 square feet.

Committee Member Imboden stated in Old Towne they had a fairly good grip on the FAR issue. Was there that kind of information for other areas?

Mr. Garcia stated no, only in Old Towne.

Chair Woollett asked if the submittal would be considered minimal and could the applicant have submitted less?

Mr. Garcia stated what was before them was what was submitted after the initial plans had been submitted. He would agree that what was submitted was minimal.

Chair Woollett asked if the applicant could have submitted less and gone before the DRC?

Mr. Garcia stated yes. Upon review, he had not had the conceptual plans.

Chair Woollett stated the point of the applicant having to submit a lot of detail, and if lesser plans could have been submitted, such as a site plan, floor plan and an elevation he wondered if that would have sufficed for the process.

Committee Member McCormack stated being the non-architect on the Committee and having reviewed many projects in and outside of Old Towne, he felt Committee Member Fox had hit right on it about how to treat an addition on a street of all single-story homes. Although on Monterey there were two-story homes, there were four two-story homes on that block and it was appropriate. He reviewed the proposal before them and with all the architectural features to make it compatible he would agree pushing the structure back would help. The boxy nature of the submittal was an issue and it was not a Craftsman; still not knowing if it would be compatible with the neighborhood. He agreed with Committee Member Fox that it could be a story and a half; that made sense. They had approved two-story structures that were a story and a half. Whether he liked it or not, his biggest issue was compatibility and would it stand out, or would no one notice it. That was why the in-fill guidelines were written.

Mr. Colgan stated the guidelines had not precluded him from building a two-story home in a single-story neighborhood.

Committee Member Fox stated there were ways that it could be designed to be approved.

Mr. Colgan asked the DRC to take that floor plan and that structure and help him design something that they could approve.

Committee Member Imboden stated that was not their job and he could understand why Mr. Colgan wanted to build with the proposed method, but that method might not work to the benefit of the design. He understood the project much better when that system had been explained, however, there were some limitations in using that system. He would not state to not use the system but it may not be a system that would work for the house. The DRC members were not charged with designing homes for applicants.

Mr. Colgan stated but they were charged with reviewing, approving, or denying.

Committee Member Fox stated the Committee Members provided the feedback as outlined by Staff. They had also provided some design guidelines through sketches, things that were approvable. She was not certain how much more could be done.

Chair Woollett stated they had a couple of choices: (1) to continue to allow the applicant to reconsider and come back, or (2) to deny the project, and then the applicant would have the option to appeal their decision.

Committee Member Imboden asked if they could continue the project?

Mr. Garcia stated the applicant could ask for a decision and a denial to take to another body.

Committee Member Imboden asked if they were premature in seeking a decision?

Chair Woollett stated they also had the choice of no decision and to have just provided feedback to the applicant since the item before them was for preliminary review.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they denied the proposal it could be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Colgan stated after sitting through several Committee meetings he had not wanted the project to go on for a year before a decision was made. He would rather receive a denial and then continue with the process.

Chair Woollett stated if they denied it the only option would be to appeal the DRC's decision.

Ms. Arce stated the situation was that there was a specific construction method and the need for the property owner's family to live together comfortably. The property owner also desires to keep the tree and swimming pool, and it was all of that together that was forcing him to just move on.

Committee Member Imboden asked Mr. Garcia if the Staff Report would have been different if he had been seeking a determination; not that it would have a different recommendation but that there would be a much more in-depth analysis?

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct.

Ms. Arce stated in the initial submittal there was a complete set of architectural plans with dimensions and everything there, they were submittal sets.

Committee Member Imboden asked what had been submitted?

Committee Member Fox stated the site plan was incomplete; there were no density details, FAR calculations, square footage, and such.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not wanted to be pushed into making a decision on a proposal that had not come to them as a legitimate application. The way he saw it, the proposal was not before them for a determination, but that the applicant was asking for a determination.

Mr. Garcia stated ves.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would not be forced into making a decision as all the information was not before them and he felt it was circumventing the system to bump it up to the next level.

Mr. Colgan stated everything was submitted. He had made it clear to Staff that he had been seeking a decision at the end of the DRC meeting. To recommend the project move forward or a denial so he could continue with the process. He could sit in front of them and speak to design forever, but if the DRC could not buy into the system, the design, or the process, than they were all wasting their time. There was only so much that could be done with the process he would be using. The Design Review Committee collectively had 100 years or more of architectural experience and he would gladly change the design elements on the exterior of the structure.

Committee Member Fox stated without the correct dimensions, she could not state what color or kind of material to clad on the box that would make it acceptable.

Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner, stated she had received some information from the Assistant City Attorney about the nature of the application and the action. In the case of an item that came before the DRC for preliminary review no action could be taken and it would necessitate the item to be re-agendized.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they could provide some feedback to the applicant on the height, because whatever they approved or denied would be moved to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Colgan asked why there could not be an action taken?

Ms. Pehoushek stated the item was not agendized as an item for action, only as an item for preliminary review.

Mr. Colgan asked why was the proposal not agendized as an action item?

Mr. Garcia stated because it was at a preliminary review status and Staff had provided comments which the applicant had refused to address. The project was brought forth to the DRC for comments and the applicant continued to insist on an action, but the project was not ready for an action and that had been made clear.

Mr. Colgan stated when he resubmitted the proposal with the exact same drawings with an elevation that showed the height, which was already provided, what would occur?

Chair Woollett stated the project would be denied.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a checklist with a myriad of things that needed to be included with regard to finished floor elevations, with respect to other site elements, adjacent grades, density. They also needed area calculations and FAR.

Chair Woollett stated it was misleading, if the applicant had not changed the design, it was clear.

Committee Member Fox stated the applicant wanted a denial.

Chair Woollett stated just adding the checklist of information would not be enough for Mr. Garcia to want to put it forward for an action; for the very reasons he had cited.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was understanding that the construction system could not be changed; and there was nothing they could do. Maybe paint it or put shutters on it.

Mr. Colgan stated the outside could be changed by making a wider first floor.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would have concern with such a large home that far up on the site would be difficult to approve; that was the direction he would provide.

Chair Woollett stated a two-story element on the front of the building would not be approvable.

Ms. Arce asked if they were to enclose the porch, that was a one-story element with a two-story element behind it. If the roof was sloped upward and to do something with dormers, would that be acceptable?

Committee Member Imboden asked if enclosing the porch reduced the perception of bulk and mass?

Ms. Arce stated it reduced the appearance of a box.

Committee Member Fox stated it was the consensus of the Committee Members that a large structure so far forward was too much. She would not mind having that size structure at the back of the site.

Mr. Colgan stated they had already been through that. He had the other structure and a fifth wheel and if he wanted to expand the square footage of his home he had to go up.

Chair Woollett stated he wanted to call a closure to the discussion.

Mr. Colgan stated he wanted to go on record that he had asked to obtain a decision and a conclusion at this meeting; he specifically asked Staff for that and he had made it clear that it was his objective tonight and he felt that whatever had been asked of him, and much was asked of them, he had responded quickly and effectively and he was unable to meet his objective. His proposal was not passed or denied.

Ms. Arce stated she was present with the expectation that the project would be approved with maybe some modifications or that the proposal would be denied.

Mr. Colgan stated they were prepared for that.

Chair Woollett stated that information would be in the record.

(6) DRC No. 4639-12 – DE VONE RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a 285 sq. ft. one-story addition to the rear of a 1923 Bungalow. The addition exceeds 20% of existing floor area requiring Planning Commission review.
- 174 N. Cambridge Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, T. Drummond, address on file, stated they were in agreement with the Conditions of Approval, but wanted clarification on condition No. 4, the line of demarcation.

Chair Woollett stated they would provide information on that.

Mr. Drummond stated he had spoken with Mr. Ryan and spoke of siding that would be removed in some areas, but not on the entire house. The house had been painted already and he presented the plans and pointed out the areas where siding would be removed.

Chair Woollett asked where the area of asbestos siding would remain?

Mr. Drummond showed them the area on the plans.

Applicant, Adam De Vone, address on file, stated they had already painted to the front porch and had stopped where the asbestos was. He pointed out on the plans what would be removed and the areas where siding had already been removed. He would tear it all out and match it all. There was no paper on the structure and there had been some dry rot in some areas of the wall. Some areas were stained with no paper backing. He would replace that all back to the original. All the wood windows had been completely redone, with the weights in the walls and all the windows had been re-hung and every window in the house was functional. When he had gotten the house it was a disaster. All the wood floors had been redone.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated unfortunately the project began without review or approval and the foundation had already been poured. The pluses were that he had thought all of the asbestos siding was being removed, but in reviewing the plans and what had just been pointed out that was not the case. It would significantly improve the look of the house and the paint on the asbestos siding would never come off. He agreed with Staff on the roof height to make it secondary. It seemed that adding an addition to an addition created an odd building form and it probably would not be viewed from the street. He had no additional comments except it seemed that much of the lot had been paved.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Fox asked if a permit was pulled and then the work was stopped?

Mr. Ryan stated there were no permits pulled or plans submitted and a stop order was issued.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how would they lower the roof, would that mean a lower roof pitch?

Mr. Drummond explained the offsets of the garage.

Mr. De Vone stated he was not asking about the offsets but the roof height.

Committee Member Wheeler stated Mr. Ryan was asking for the height of the ridge to be reduced and the only way to do that was to reduce the plate height or reduce the pitch.

Mr. Drummond stated the ridge would not be seen.

Committee Member Fox stated the manner in which to reduce the height would be to run the ridge the other way.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not seen it as a problem and it was lower than the main house roof. He would not like to see a lower plate or lower pitch, and that it would appear out of place.

Mr. Ryan stated based on scale it was a 12'-6" or 13'-6" and to have the addition be secondary in nature.

Committee Member Fox stated it was secondary to the main house. She asked if the applicant knew when the house was built?

Mr. Drummond stated they had not discovered that date.

Mr. De Vone stated he had found photos, and he no longer had them, but the concrete foundation had already been there. The foundation had a green house. There was the addition with a green house that attached to the house. He had actually planted new grass and completely brought it back, it was beautiful. The concrete already existed and it had tie downs. When they went through the house he found plans for a green house. They had removed that slab.

Mr. Ryan stated the aerial photos shows the bedroom was constructed between 1938 and 1947, with the main house in 1920.

Committee Member Fox stated the existing addition was already secondary to the main house and to have the new addition be secondary again was almost too "dog housey" on the back. If the ridge was altered to rotate it with a California frame over it, the demarcation would be created better and it acted like a hyphen between two forms; this approach is used in other communities, like Tustin, as a way to connect additions to historic structures. She would not feel that a jog out would be necessary and a piece of trim could be added there. With the roof changing dramatically that would be a better solution.

Mr. Drummond stated the reason he had not done it in that manner was that there was a load coming down on the existing. The way it was presented was there were no loads coming down on it.

Committee Member Fox stated it could be alleviated by not using California framing, but using a true valley and transferring the load to the corners where there would be new footings. Not to use a continuous rafter, and to create true valleys with all the load going to the valley.

Mr. De Vone stated he liked that idea better. The footings would carry a second story load.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that the distance between the footing and the pool was much less than the dimensions of 8' and conceivably a problem could occur once the loads were added with a surcharge to the pool; the depth of those footings may need to be addressed with the Building Department. He stated on the separation of the eaves the new code required that anything less than 5' required fireproofing. He had spoken with a building official and in Old Towne they were looking at that on a case-to-case basis and he seemed to suggest it would not be a problem, but the applicant might want to check into that before the project got too far along.

Mr. De Vone stated on the eaves there was an extension of the eaves and he was not certain when it occurred. The eave extended out and he wanted to bring the eaves back. He presented photos of the area he was referring to. He would remove the entire structure and bring the eaves back and that would create distance between the eaves and the garage structure.

Committee Member Fox stated he was referring to cutting the eaves back to the garage door.

Mr. De Vone stated he wanted to cut the eaves back to the house; there was an area of eaves coming out of nowhere in the middle. The eaves jutted out, instead of following the eave line of the existing house. When the addition was done the eaves were pulled out.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he wished that had been added to the drawings.

Committee Member Imboden stated he understood that an area he pointed to in the photo would be taken off and he asked what it would appear like when it was done?

Mr. De Vone stated he would remove the entire structure and where the beams extended all the way out on the other side of the house there were extended eaves that came out of nowhere and a normal eave would be 18", they just extended out and made no sense. He wanted to remove all of that. He pointed out the area on the plans.

Committee Member Fox stated the photo he referred to was the garage area. She believed the existing eave went the other way and when he spoke of the eave overhang he was speaking of the other area.

The Committee Members reviewed the photo and the plans with the applicant.

Committee Member Imboden stated it appeared that the roof was higher than that.

Mr. De Vone stated all of that had to be removed. That section where there were eaves out of nowhere that extended out and he pointed out the section of the home he was referring to. He wanted to pull the eaves in and it would appear better.

Committee Member Imboden stated the DRC would need to understand that and make a determination as they would not just want eaves hacked off. He wanted to understand what the roof would look like upon completion. He wanted to understand what that would be (pointing to the plans).

Mr. De Vone stated since Staff had asked to remove it (pointing to the plans) he had not cared if it was left or removed. If it was removed he would take the eaves and finish them across the front.

Committee Member Imboden asked what he meant by finishing them?

Mr. De Vone stated he would finish them off and there was a piece of plastic pipe that ran down. All the properties drained to the back and the neighbor's home was flooded. In the ground there was a makeshift sump pump and he needed to get a gutter onto that area with something in front of the garage. Everything drained to the back and in order to prevent that he would finish that off with 2"x 4" and add a gutter system, increase the catch basin, and install a sump pump that was correctly installed. He wanted to finish that off, maintain the structure, and finish that area. That roof pitched and everything ran inside that building today, it was a major drainage issue and there was not enough fall. They had to be cautious with the roof. Once the roof was designed all of it had to be guttered to push all the water to the sump pump. Luckily they ran a 2" pipe bored out to the curb and that had resolved some of the issues. If the eaves were finished, and there was old construction and it was framed in; if the roof line came out, the roof line would be consistent forward. The window area was replicated further out front and would be identical and wrapped with the new construction. If the roof line would be changed it had not mattered to him, change it anyway it may be more appealing to the DRC, plus it might shed less water that way.

Committee Member Fox stated the water would come down in a concentrated valley.

Mr. De Vone asked where would it drop?

Committee Member Fox pointed the area out on the plans.

Committee Member Imboden stated a fascia was proposed for that (he pointed to the plans) but was very inconsistent with that style of architecture.

Mr. De Vone stated he wanted the fascia for the gutter system.

Committee Member Imboden stated that home would have originally have had a gutter built into the roof that had been lost over the years. There were several things that needed to be resolved. The Committee Members needed to understand what that would look like and the same thing at the other side of the house. Would it remain, would things change, and how would it appear. He became concerned when he heard mention of hacking off eaves and it was not a way to preserve a home.

Committee Member Fox stated the rafter tails that were all along the eaves were exposed. The front of the house had fascia. She stated on the front of the house there was fascia, that were probably added and there were some inconsistencies.

The Committee Members discussed the various areas of the proposal and the dimensions and reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was curious as the applicant had mentioned there had been a green house.

Mr. De Vone stated there was concrete with a green house.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the footings extended past that, but they were not structurally using that.

Mr. De Vone stated no, that would not be used.

Committee Member McCormack (pointing to the plans) stated that was 14'-6" it was not scaled out, and was that longer. It was scaling 15 and was the pool bigger?

Committee Member Fox stated aside from the drafting issues was there an issue with the proximity to the pool. She was smelling a continuance and if they were making a continuance to alter the ridge line, but to also gain more specific information of the existing rafter tails, they would want to see more specific information.

Mr. De Vone stated they had the information.

Committee Member Fox stated Mr. De Vone was proposing cutting back some areas.

Mr. De Vone stated he would leave the rafters alone if it made the DRC happy. In construction there were always problems, one problem created another problem. When it rained, and when he bought the house it smelled like animal droppings and more, and at the end of the day he cleaned up the entire home. His neighbor told him there was a sump pump and the water pooled into his yard. On the roof area the water would need to be captured and put somewhere. If the Committee wanted, he would tear the whole roof off and put gutters inside, but the issue was that right now the ridges had not matched what was there. It had been done by someone who had no money and did poor construction on the addition. The existing rafters would remain the way they were. Where there were inconsistencies on the addition, he wanted to bring the rafters back and blade them so he could put up gutters.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was a fundamental misunderstanding for that period of architecture. He would need to look at that home a bit closer and originally the rafters extended beyond the roof line. There was a built-up curb, a 2" x 4" that ran along the edge with a rolled roof and there were a number of those in town. The fascia on the front was probably added as it was inconsistent. Changing the roof the other direction, which he supported, would only make the problem worse. It would send the water the other way. They needed to find a way to make it all acceptable. He was not going to require that the fascia be removed, but he was not interested in having any areas that were historic cut away.

Mr. De Vone asked if he deemed that portion historic? With all due respect, the breezeway was probably put in with the addition. He was being asked to remove the breezeway but not to bring consistency with the roof line.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not followed that.

Mr. De Vone stated the structure was most likely designed with the addition.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not believed that.

Mr. De Vone stated it was not original or historic.

Committee Member Imboden stated that was not true.

Mr. De Vone stated he was being asked to remove that structure which had met with their approval and their request, but not to fix the ridge line. He wanted to be clear, and he had not cared if the Committee wanted him to leave them the way they were. But he wanted to be clear if it was okay to remove a non-historic structure, but to leave the other areas alone.

Mr. Ryan stated from the aerials there two separate units and nothing attached them. The construction came later and was added on top of the detached garage.

Committee Member Imboden stated the historic photographs show that the construction was not done at the same time, and that had not told them when it was done. Everyone needed to understand that what was being proposed needed to be in the plans and needed to be clear in order for the Committee Members to evaluate it.

Mr. De Vone stated he had not cared if he removed it or not, he wanted to cooperate.

Committee Member Imboden stated an applicant came to them with plans in order for evaluation of what was being proposed, and they could approve or deny this project. They had gone through it and could not understand what would remain, what was being changed, removed, and it was difficult to approve the project. The plans needed to be clear. He felt that they were going in circles and he spoke for himself, but what he felt was that the Committee could provide their input and recommendations and the applicant could go back and revise the plans with much more detail than what was before them, and then they could hopefully approve the project.

Committee Member Fox stated the information provided stated the roof would be removed, but there were no dimensions of what would be left or how it would tie the gutter in, and they needed to see that.

Mr. De Vone stated okay, to make it easier he would not remove any of the structure or any of the eaves and he would leave it the way it was and just do the addition.

Committee Member Imboden stated they could move for a continuance and ask that the plans be returned with more information or they could deny it.

Committee Member McCormack stated typically when they reviewed similar situations there was a plan that showed existing conditions, and a plan that showed proposed conditions.

Mr. De Vone stated he would make it easy for them and deem everything historical; he liked every bit of it and he would do a room addition.

Committee Member McCormack stated the applicant had stated that there was a drainage issue that he wanted to resolve.

Committee Member Fox asked who precipitated the removal of the roof?

Mr. Ryan stated that was a Staff suggestion, it was a not historic feature, and the garage was supposed to be detached.

Committee Member Fox stated since there were aerial photos that showed a detached garage and now it was attached it was probably a non-permitted addition that probably compromised the fire requirement for separation of structures.

Mr. De Vone asked if they wanted it removed?

Committee Member Fox stated a proposal was before them and they had not spoken with anyone and she assumed the applicant wanted it removed per the plan. She was not certain if the Fire Department recommended removal of a fire bridge between the garage and the house.

Mr. De Vone stated what he meant was that he had no problem with removing the structure, but then there were the inconsistencies of what was historic and what was not historic and when things were removed, and City Staff had asked for certain things to be removed and it was confusing to him as the homeowner. Unless someone wanted to go out with a magic marker and tell him what should be removed he would not know what that was.

Chair Woollett stated he had sat and listened to the discussion and the drawings before him were not adequate. There was a building out there that construction was started on without plans or approvals. The plans before them were not clear enough to tell what was proposed. They were not adequate and that was why there was so much discussion and banter back and forth.

Mr. De Vone stated he would return with a set of plans that showed no removal of anything and only the room addition and they could approve it or not.

Chair Woollett stated they may not approve it and the applicant had met with Staff and the plans before them were not complete.

Mr. De Vone stated he would make the same comment. He would submit a set of plans with no removal of anything, as it was not clear as to what should be removed. He would only bring a set of plans with the addition to the property and they could approve or disapprove. If the DRC wanted certain things removed, or things that were non-historic, then the Committee Members needed to tell him what that was and the Committee Members needed to mark the plans and provide that information. Should he knock the whole house down?

Chair Woollett stated the applicant was wrong. The Committee Members were not present to design his home; they were present to approve drawings of what was proposed. They had made suggestions and explained why the plans before them were not approvable and that should be enough.

Mr. De Vone stated he would be as nice as he possibly could be; he would draw up a set of plans that showed what he wanted to do and take them to Mr. Ryan and if there were any other alterations they could tell him.

Chair Woollett stated Mr. Ryan had been out to the house and had suggested and provided information on what he considered were approvable changes; but if that was ignored and not shown on the plans he would be in trouble.

Mr. De Vone stated he could not remove things from a structure unless he was told where those were. He asked if they understood that?

Committee Member Wheeler stated they needed to know what currently existed.

Mr. De Vone asked if they wanted a replicated drawing of the entire house? He would have Mr. Drummond draw the house as it existed and he was open-minded to removing the breezeway and he could come back and the DRC could provide dimensions of how much they wanted the eaves cut back. When an area of the eave was cut, should it be cut back 18" or 36"? He was not sure.

Committee Member Imboden stated that was the job of his architect with an understanding of the Old Towne Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It was up to the designer of the project to understand the regulations that were in place and to have the applicant return with a proposal that took into account all of that.

Mr. De Vone stated when he came back the DRC would tell him if they wanted, for example, the breezeway removed.

Committee Member Imboden stated no. If he wanted it removed it was the responsibility of the applicant to show how it would be removed and how it would appear after it was done.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they wanted to see what was proposed and in coming back they needed to see the roof design. There were new code requirements and the applicant should also check with the Fire Department for their fire proofing requirements. He also asked for the applicant to look at the wiring which would provide an age of the structure.

Chair Woollett stated the Committee Members had stated to the applicant that he would need to return with the information of what he wanted to do, and that was not accurate because he had to deal with Mr. Ryan. It was not just what he wanted to do, but what he had worked out with Mr. Ryan.

Mr. De Vone stated he understood the recommendations from Mr. Ryan; the purpose of his discussion with the Committee Members was to gain information on who determined what remained and what should be removed. He now understood that he needed to provide the information on what existed from a historic perspective.

Committee Member Fox stated sometimes one overhang was the same as what existed on the other side, but without that dimension it was difficult to determine. She wanted to speak to some of the other aesthetic issues. She was pleased that all the windows would be restored and that some of the siding was being restored and she appreciated the clean up of a historic property.

Mr. De Vone stated he was doing that to three homes. He wanted to make the area better. Mr. Ryan had been great and he now understood what should come back.

Chair Woollett stated they really liked what he was doing.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4639-12, De Vone Residence.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(7) DRC No. 4644-12 – NV PROPERTIES

- A proposal to upgrade existing landscaping, reconstruct a front entry courtyard, install a water feature, and provide new walkways for a contributing commercial office building.
- 1015 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

The item was not presented. Applicant requested a continuance to September 19, 2012.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Fox made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, September 19, 2012.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.