CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

October 7, 2009

Committee Members Present: Adrienne Gladson

Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Bill Cathcart

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Sonal Thakur, Assistant Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair McCormack opened the Administrative Session with a review of the Agenda.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda and there were a few policy items to discuss. In regard to the item that Committee Member Wheeler had on the Agenda, Staff had been reviewing circumstances when a Committee Member would be able to appear before the Design Review Committee (DRC) to present their project and answer questions. The memo dated August 23, 2006; copies had been given to the Committee Members, which addressed specifically conflict of interest issues. Staff had looked at that information to be certain they were handling the issue correctly and as it stood a DRC Member's project could go before the DRC provided the Committee Member was out of the room during the presentation of their project. There were limited circumstances when they could be in the room, but the most important component of when that would apply was when the DRC would be a recommending body only and the person presenting the project would need to be a sole provider. There were a number of different things that would apply. In the current situation the DRC was the final determining body for the project and Committee Member Wheeler would not be able to be in the room during presentation of his project. The item would be presented per the Agenda and Committee Member Wheeler would recuse himself from the presentation and explain the reason he would not be present.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the project would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission, could the Committee Member present their project before the DRC?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated a Committee Member could present their project if they met the following:

- 1. DRC member only had contact with City Staff and DRC Members with respect to the project as was necessary for processing and evaluating.
- 2. DRC role on the project would be to review and make a recommendation; DRC could not be the final determining body on the project.

- 3. The DRC member was a sole practitioner.
- 4. The DRC member had recused himself and stated the reason for his recusal. That member could be on the other side of the table to present.

In the current situation, the DRC was not making a recommendation to the Planning Commission. The particular project on the Agenda only met three of the four requirements. Committee Member Wheeler could not be before the DRC as the architect of record on his project.

Committee Member Woollett stated he started all of this because he contacted Ms. Aranda Roseberry to find out if there would be any reason why he could not speak to Committee Member Wheeler about the project. He assumed he would not be present for the project and since the members were allowed to speak with one other member about any projects, he felt it was okay to speak with Committee Member Wheeler.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated he could if the conversation were specific to the process and the evaluation of the project. She read from the memo; contact with City Staff and the DRC on the project would be that which was only necessary to process the project. What it had not spoken to was whether or not the applicant or the architect of record could have contact with the DRC members outside of the DRC meeting. That was not clear in the memo and she would check with the Assistant City Attorney, Gary Sheatz, to gain that information.

Committee Member Woollett stated theoretically each of the DRC members that would be voting on the project could contact that person; gather information necessary, because they would not be meeting with each other.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated that would turn it into a serial meeting, which was why Staff requested that questions were channeled through staff.

Committee Member Woollett stated if an individual contacted Committee Member Wheeler he could state that he had already been contacted by another member of the DRC and he could not further discuss the project.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was her own personal strategy to decide on her own and not speak with any of the other DRC members and to leave the discussion for the DRC Meeting.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated these types of situations came up few and far between; she had asked Mr. Sheatz to join them. He had a 4:30 p.m. briefing and he was not certain that he would be able to join them. She could contact him and invite him to another administrative session to discuss the issues. It was an important issue.

Committee Member Woollett stated what they were attempting to do was to provide the best service to the City.

Committee Member Gladson stated having no conflicts was their goal, or perceived conflicts of interest. It was amazing how the public or other decision makers could perceive the reason for a DRC member being in the Council Chamber during a presentation that might not have anything

to do with items before the DRC. But as fun as it might be to sit in the audience it was better not to be there.

Chair McCormack asked if Committee Member Gladson was implying that DRC members should not show up at City Council meetings?

Committee Member Gladson stated she would ask herself what could potentially be perceived by her presence at a City Council meeting. If it was a social reason as someone being sworn in and there were no Agenda issues it would not be critical. Due to some of the projects presented before the DRC, it was a natural curiosity to see how an item progressed. However, she resisted attending any of the Planning Commission meetings just for that reason. She wanted to be ultra conservative and err on the side of caution.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated if Mr. Sheatz stepped into the meeting they could revisit the situation or she could invite him to another meeting. On another matter, the DRC members were all advised that they had the Ridgeline Equestrian Estates EIR in their boxes for pick up. What was discovered, thanks to Committee Member Wheeler, was that the EIR was missing a section, Section 5.4 of the Cultural Resources section. The result was that the EIR was not complete. All EIRs had a 45-day review period based on the fact that the EIR would be complete. Staff would be re-noticing and restarting the EIR 45-day review period. As appalled as everyone was, she focused on the fact that the discovery was made a week in and only two weeks were lost. If the omission had been discovered on day 45, that would have caused the timeline to start all over again. Staff was grateful to the discovery made by Committee Member Wheeler. She distributed a memo explaining what had occurred and an updated CD of the EIR and a copy of the noticing, also indicating that a meeting was set on the matter on November 4, 2009. The public notice was sent out and it was unusual that a DRC meeting was noticed, but for more controversial projects they were prepared to send out a separate notice. The final item in the packet was Section 5.4.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that the Appendix for that section was missing and had not been included on the second disc.

Chair McCormack asked if the members could contact Ms. Aranda Roseberry if they had questions on the EIR.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the members could contact Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, or herself regarding the EIR. They were asking the DRC to review the Aesthetic section and the Cultural Resources section. The EIR was set up not as a novel; they would want to review the first few sections that gave project descriptions then jump to existing settings for Aesthetics and Cultural Resources and the Environmental Impacts for both. Feel free to read further; however, they would be looking purely at those two sections.

Chair McCormack asked if the November 4, 2009 meeting would be for their input or would they be making a recommendation at that meeting?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated Staff would be asking for a recommendation at that time; it would be a recommendation to the Planning Commission. They were anticipating a large turnout for that meeting.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting of September 16, 2009. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Bill Cathcart was absent.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Design Review Committee on matters not listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

CONSENT ITEMS:

All matters that are announced as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action.

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 16, 2009

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting of September 16, 2009, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

- (2) DRC No. 4423-09 QUALITY SUITES FAÇADE REMODEL
 - A proposal to remodel the façade of an existing leasing office building associated with a motel.
 - 3101 W. Chapman Avenue
 - Staff Contact: Sonal Thakur, 714-744-7239, sthakur@cityoforange.org
 - Continued from the DRC meeting of July 15, 2009
 - DRC Action: Final Determination

Assistant Planner, Sonal Thakur, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Mark Raber, address on file, stated they had simplified the design quite a bit and they had taken the previous suggestions from the DRC members and incorporated those into the design.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Gladson asked for further clarification on the foam piece on the chimney?

Applicant, Sue Lee, address on file, stated the rationale and the approach was that reviewing the existing chimney there was no detail at all on it. It was just a plain structure with no detail. They wanted to give it a little bit of character. The way she felt about it was that it was just a piece of structure and they added a bit of architectural detail to it. The theme of the building was Versailles, a French style. There had to be a bit of detail.

Chair McCormack asked if the chimney was functional?

Ms. Lee stated yes it was; it was an existing masonry structure with a stucco exterior. It was functional inside and it operated on gas. She felt they had made all the corrections on the plans that had been suggested by the DRC.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there needed to be some work on the roof plans as there appeared to be some areas that had not worked out. He had sketched out what he thought was happening. The flat section would wrap around, but there was a small piece and some cut-offs; from the elevations there was a projection (which he pointed to on the plans), which had not appeared on the plans. He reviewed the plans with the applicant and pointed out the discrepancies. He was concerned as he wanted what was built to match what was being presented and that it would not turn into a series of mistakes and ultimately a different design.

Mr. Raber stated he felt that would not occur as the engineers would go through the plans and ensure that the project was built as approved. The plans would go through Building Check and everyone would view it to make sure it had not differed from what was approved. He thought it would be okay. It was a bit deceiving, from the drawings, how the roof lines were. He reviewed the plans with Committee Member Wheeler. There was an area that was not being touched; he was not sure if the plans were still a bit incorrect.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the front portion of the roof was being changed.

Mr. Raber stated that was existing.

Committee Member Wheeler stated according to the drawings the plane was set back, he pointed out the section he was referring to, and the roof was being projected out. He asked for clarification on a line that was on the drawings and what it represented?

Mr. Raber stated that section was existing and would remain in tact. The line could be deleted; he was not certain what it was. He would have the drawings fixed. The view would not be any different; he pointed out where the sign would be installed and he stated it would not change the design. The sign needed an area to be installed for all the electrical that would go behind it. It would not change the design or the overall look. He understood what Committee Member Wheeler was saying, however, it would not change the overall look and design and the sign would remain and be built in.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if an area, which he pointed to on the plans, was recessed or projecting?

Mr. Raber stated it was just a paint color change; it was all on the same plane.

The Committee Members reviewed the drawings and gathered further information from the applicant. He explained and answered questions regarding the various planes on the drawings and what they represented.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the upper gable appeared to line up with the wall and it was a contradiction of what the applicant was explaining. He stated the new wall had nothing to do with the other wall.

Mr. Raber stated then it was designed to extend out.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a projection in that area, and there should be something that projected out on the roof plans.

Mr. Raber stated there was the flat roof that came out and showed a projecting gable. He reviewed the plans with Committee Member Wheeler.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on every drawing except the roof plan the drawings were showing a projecting gable, which was fine; however, all the plans had to be consistent. They

had not wanted to find that upon construction that detail was left off or that something else would happen.

Mr. Raber stated it was shown on the drawings.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was not correct on the drawings and someone needed to really think about it, especially before it went before the engineer. If it was not correct it would not be built correctly.

Mr. Raber stated there was another architect putting together the roof plan. There would be changes from the architect's submission once it went to building. He could bring the plans by and meet with Committee Member Wheeler to review it to ensure that everything was okay and that it met the design requirements.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they would need to discuss that with the Committee.

Mr. Raber stated they just wanted to get the project started; the rest of the property was already painted. It was a pretty basic change, the sign was being moved it could be recessed or not.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they needed to see what the applicant was really proposing; drawings that were consistent and that agreed with each other. There was also a new awning design and the window was shown very small on the drawing and he was not certain they would be able to get the type of arched awning proposed on that small area, which was much smaller. He reviewed the dimensions with the applicant.

Committee Member Gladson stated she felt they were generally going in the right direction with getting a cohesive paint scheme and general concept of what the applicant wanted to do. The DRC's role was to ensure that what was built was predictable with what was presented in the plans. If that all matched up they were generally supportive. She was not certain what her colleagues would think but perhaps there were two approaches; they could condition the project to death with a lot of specific language in what they wanted or they were in a position to request more corrections. She had no preference, but she had not wanted to leave the project up to chance.

Chair McCormack stated on the fireplace it appeared on the south elevation, but not on the east or west elevations. He was confused with the discussion about the foam detail; he had not been present for the previous presentation and he asked if it was a skewed plane and was the chimney being boxed out?

Mr. Raber stated it was a foam plant on and it would not square out the plane.

Ms. Lee stated it was just an appliqué.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was confusing as there was a line that seemed to indicate that the draftsman felt there was a change in the plane. There was none and it was in the discussion previously. What was being decorated was a plane that he pointed to on the plans. He asked what a line on the plans represented?

Mr. Raber stated it was probably just left over from the other side; it should just be for the chimney.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the floor plan had not matched the actual situation; the floor plan showed a recessed plane and it was not recessed. There were a few other things: the columns appeared to go to the eaves, but they showed up on the plans as quite a bit lower and the trim had not appeared as what existed or what was on the other buildings and he asked for an explanation on the trim they proposed to use?

Ms. Lee stated they would be using the same trim that existed on the rest of the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the trim showed as a bit larger and was deceptive in what they wanted to use. If they were using the same trim he suggested omitting the curved awning and to bring the same window trim around that form and to skip use of the awnings.

Ms. Lee stated the awning guy already measured all of that as it was existing.

Committee Member Gladson stated there would be awnings throughout the whole complex and that brought consistency too.

Chair McCormack stated he had noticed in the minutes on page 12, and it was a question probably more to Staff, it had been brought up in the minutes that Ms. Lee stated that she would want to address the landscaping with the DRC and hire a landscape architect. He asked if a landscape plan was required on the project?

Ms. Thakur stated no. The only thing that the proposal involved was an exterior façade remodel. If the applicant would change the site, change the parking, or want to re-do the landscape they would then review that.

Chair McCormack asked if they proposed to change the landscaping?

Ms. Lee stated they had a concept that she was suggesting but it had not been agreed too. The project had been ongoing for eight months and with winter coming and the rain she asked what would they do? If they had to add more landscaping it could take years; it was a business and they needed to go forward and she was pleading to the DRC to assist them with their proposal. The rooms were beautiful, she handed them a brochure. Everything was clean and brand new inside.

Chair McCormack stated the decision with the DRC was a final determination. He had no other issues with the project. He had been confused by the drawings. The project from his point of view was okay; there were just some drawing malfunctions that needed to be fixed.

Ms. Lee stated the modifications could be changed when going into planning. The architect and engineer would be there with all the calculations. Ms. Thakur would have all of that before planning would give them the okay.

Committee Member Gladson stated it would be brought back if there was a substantial change from what the DRC had approved.

Ms. Thakur asked if there was a reason the architect could not get involved, in order for the DRC to review correct plans?

Mr. Raber stated the architect would be there within seven days and the plans could be brought back for review. He could ensure that the areas were recessed or not, or what was preferred. The roof line could remain as it was and they would correct the plans and bring them in to get those approved to ensure everything was clear and matched.

Ms. Thakur stated that was precisely the point the DRC members were attempting to make; they had not wanted to move forward with an approval on plans that had been presented on more than one occasion that were not clear. They would want the architect to get involved to show exactly what was there and what was being requested. They could then give an approval or suggestions of what was needed. A determination could not be made on what potentially could happen.

Committee Member Woollett stated to approve drawings based on what the applicant was stating they would do, would be virtually impossible. The sticking point was that the project had not made sense; it was a pretty picture that had not worked.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the Committee Members could not guess at what the applicant wanted to do unless they had before them a set of consistent and accurate drawings.

Committee Member Gladson stated it was a roadmap for building and work on the building, if there was a left turn or a right turn that was wrong, there could be a mistake in the field and it could prevent the applicant from executing the design they wanted to achieve.

Mr. Raber stated they were bringing the roof line out and it would have an additional roof line added to the plans, the sign would be below it. It had nothing to do with the existing structure; it would be a new piece. He pointed out an area that would be recessed. He had not understood what the confusion was.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt the applicant was confused, as a bit ago he had stated that the roof was not projecting and now he was stating it was projecting. If he was confused how would the architect know what was wanted?

Mr. Raber stated he would review the plans and see that there was something coming out that was clouded and new. It was called out as new partial extended roof. He would not need to guess too hard, it was circled, and it showed it.

Committee Member Gladson stated the roof plan was the sticking point.

Mr. Raber stated the roof plan needed to be approved by Building, and would they not notice the roof plan had not matched the floor plan?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the point that was being made was that the engineer would need something to work from or he would not know what he was supposed to build. What was being shown was not what was to be built.

Committee Member Gladson stated that was the benefit of having the creator of the documents present to review the plans with the DRC and discuss the details. It was critical in getting the proposed project correct. She felt that she was in a position to propose a continuation to allow the applicant another attempt to get it right.

Chair McCormack asked if there were any issues with the sign?

Ms. Thakur stated there were no problems with the sign. It was illuminated and it was consistent within the sign code. The sign would come through as a separate item and it was being shown just for location.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to continue DRC 4423-09, Quality Suites Façade Remodel, to allow the applicant to return with revised drawings specifically focusing on obtaining an accurate roof plan and eliminating any stray lines or errors on the drawings and to correct the awning situation.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they would be adding conditions. He wanted to ensure the applicant had the information on what the DRC would be requiring them to come back with.

Committee Member Gladson stated the request would be to come back with a revised roof plan, and to have the northerly awning reviewed and potentially eliminated.

Ms. Thakur asked if there was any preference in whether the sign should be recessed?

Committee Member Woollett stated it needed to be clarified.

Committee Member Gladson stated the sign placement needed to be clarified in the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they would want to see the window and door trim presented more accurately.

Committee Member Woollett stated they would want to clarify the taper on the chimney and the relationship to any surface treatment. He asked if they could add to the recommendation that no foam shall be added onto the chimney, as had been suggested previously.

Committee Member Gladson stated she supported that and would add it to her motion.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4433-09 - SCHARER REHABILITATION

- A proposal to rehabilitate a contributing residence and accessory structure, including porch modifications.
- 525 W. La Veta Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the presentation as he was the architect on the project.

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

Applicant, Linda Day, address on file, stated she felt the security issue on the stairway was a good point and they had not thought of that, she liked the slats and it was a very good point.

Mr. Ryan stated it might get changed at plan check and they would need to discuss that.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated it was a long drawn out process getting to this point and they would rather restore and rehabilitate the structure rather than demolish it. The City finally came to that conclusion too and the best option was rehabilitation rather than demolition. The applicant had done a phenomenal job on the Edward's relocation and rehabilitation and there was no doubt that would be carried over on the proposed project as well. The OTPA were sticklers for the Old Towne Design Standards and it was their opinion that changes to the front façade by adding a porch and extending the roof line would not meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards or the Old Towne Design Standards and they agreed that the front façade should be rehabilitated and restored using appropriate materials and maintaining the building height was important too. Adding a porch, as it was not an original defining feature, would be inappropriate. An added porch would create a false sense of history and it would be hard to determine whether the porch was an addition to the structure.

Chair McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had a number of questions. He had not felt the guidelines were intended to make a museum out of downtown Orange. People needed to live in those structures and they needed to be maintained, renovated and, in some cases, to provide viable businesses. Over the years many people had come in and wanted to add to the small buildings, it seemed in a certain sense that anything that would be done could create a false sense of history. The DRC had been sticklers about how the changes were made, so that in investigating the changes there would be a line of demarcation. To the person driving by on the street it was not often apparent. One of the reasons was that the City had discouraged making dramatic changes,

such as a contemporary addition which was not supported. It could be allowed, and somewhat preferred as it would define the old building very clearly, but it would not be the intent of those who wrote and approved the guidelines to allow that to occur. To introduce modern elements created problems. Having said that it seemed to be the question of viability as a residence was really important and he was surprised the applicant had not wanted to make it bigger as it was a very small structure. It was limited by its size. The addition over the garage created a very different situation and it gave them some insight to the history of Orange. He could only presume that with the building set so far back he would not expect it to be what it started out to be, he understood there were tractors that had been worked on, on that property.

Ms. Day stated there were orange groves on the property and the tractor service was along the railroad tracks.

Committee MemberWoollett asked if the applicant anticipated returning it to an orange grove?

Ms. Day stated they would plant four orange trees and add parking to the side; it was a hard area to get in an out of and she pointed out where a parking space would be located. It would allow a person to back in and pull out easier to the street.

Committee Member Woollett stated the porch would add more livability to the property. It was a south exposure, there were doors and windows and it made the building a lot more useful. He had made the comment that it was not a museum; it was a place for people to live in. He felt the porch should be done in such a manner that it would not give a false sense of history when it was looked at. He was intrigued with the height of the building and there had been discussion that would end in a compromise; that the building could be raised a bit and it would not be too low that it would meet structural and code requirements.

Mr. Ryan stated there was a minimum clearance from grade to mud sill and they could add two steps on there, rather than three steps and it would be six inches lower than what was shown. The building would be higher and the rise would be 14 and the building would be 10 inches higher.

Chair McCormack stated the plan showed three steps.

Mr. Ryan stated there was a slight change in grade on the property and it would be two steps in the front.

Committee Member Woollett stated the architect had expressed some concerns that the existing conditions really had not allowed the building to be down so low, due to the grade.

Mr. Ryan stated Staff realized after looking at the photos a little closer that the foundation could not be laid to meet code. They looked at the minimum rise and the foundation clearance requirement by code and what could be constructed. They found that two steps worked out; three steps would get into requirements for railings. They wanted to maintain the essential character of the front of the building.

Committee Member Woollett stated Staff's recommendation was that the roof in front not be added.

Mr. Ryan stated it went back to the original thought; there were issues with the basement and the structural support under the basement. The main residence, if moved forward, could handle a larger addition added to the back and it would give the applicant the ability to expand the residence. There was a residence on Washington that was built way back on the property and it was historically interesting and people called to ask what they could do with that property. That building was only 640 square feet. It all went back to the consistency; Staff had always looked at the front façade as the most important component. If the applicant wanted to move the building 10' or 15' forward they could add onto the back. He had not wanted to add any burden financially for the applicant, to add anything extra. The repair to the foundation was requiring that the house be lifted up.

Committee Member Woollett stated the City had allowed extensions of porches in the past.

Mr. Ryan stated the Bullock residence was the last one that they had done. It was originally built one way, recessed and someone had filled in the porch and there was a small porch centered on the front. That property owner had wanted to extend the porch to give the property the same symmetry that had originally existed. The initial change had not kept within the style or period of the residence and the change actually made the home more appropriate to the historic period. With the proposed project it would be adding something that had not existed. He had looked at other properties and had found they all had flush front doors and maybe a landing of one step, that was basically it.

Ms. Day stated she was ready to keep the front façade as it was and not add the porch. With the sun issue, there was a large avocado tree next door that shaded the area and they would just remove the porch idea.

Chair McCormack asked where was the avocado tree?

Ms. Day pointed out the area on the photo.

Chair McCormack stated he had visited the site and the one feature that stood out was the setback, and one of the recommendations was that the applicant submit a final landscape and irrigation plan. He wondered who would review that since there was not a landscape person on City Staff, he was concerned about that. The reason for his concern was, if Staff was worried about adding a porch, and the front yard was three times the size of the façade, he could just imagine what a bad landscape plan or an ill-conceived plan would do to the property. It would circumvent everything. It would be the first thing anyone would see. Part of his pain was that it was not being addressed. Being a Landscape Architect he was a little passionate about it and the fact that they had the resource that had been an orange grove and it made sense to repeat that. There were issues in today's landscaping about drought tolerance and water that were cogent issues. They were issues that dealt with cost and it was a big issue. He had a problem with Staff review since there was no one to review it.

Committee Member Gladson stated there could be a condition added regarding the landscape. Chair McCormack stated they reviewed the property in whole and the proposal had a huge landscape element attached to it. In the previous submittal they required that the applicant get the plans corrected and he believed with the proposed project the landscape needed to be correct.

There could be a new porch added and it could be totally obliterated with landscape and the porch would not be visible. He wanted to review the development of that resource which was a historical resource in and of itself. Landscape was a living resource and often he found that some people had not liked trees. There was a mentality that would just leave the landscape on the property as it existed, he was not stating it was right or wrong, but it was a lost opportunity if the area was left as just dirt.

Ms. Day stated the property currently had grass.

Applicant, Joe Day, address on file, stated it was grass with an irrigation system.

Ms. Day stated they proposed to plant trees and the original house had a planter that was rock and there was a pond, which they would not add due to safety issues.

Chair McCormack stated one of the things that caught his eye was a large wire running over the property to a pole he pointed to on the photos. He reviewed the architect's plans, and on keynote 14, called out as existing stuff, and in reviewing the proposal the existing stuff was not there. He was curious how some of those items would be handled.

Ms. Day stated she believed they would need a new electrical panel and the knob and tube still existed in the garage. It would be revised and the electrical would probably be moved so the lines would not run across the house. There would be a tankless water heater.

Committee Member Gladson asked the applicant if she resided in the house?

Ms. Day stated the house was vacant. They would use the home as a rental for income property.

Committee Member Gladson stated she commended the applicant for saving the home and working on a rehabilitation and restoration effort. She had driven by the home for 15 years and had not noticed it until recently. For her, the setback of the home was one of the most unique aspects of the property. She was in agreement with Staff's recommendations, although she loved porches, the porch had not initially existed. She understood the value of it and appreciated the applicant's understanding of the issue. In terms of the height she was not bugged by that and she could go either way on the staircase; on the safety side, pickets were a better option and she could go either way on it.

Ms. Day stated when the siding was going another way it gave another architectural element.

Committee Member Gladson stated if the Chair would be more comfortable reviewing a landscape plan they could craft that into their motion.

Mr. Ryan stated once the applicant started the work, things could change. Through the process of discovery, he wanted to leave the option open to the applicant to move the building forward enough to clear the basement area if they found there was compaction there. Having that option would give them the option and not require that they return to the DRC. Staff would support that and would allow the applicant to add something to the back of the property. His experience was that many times once they began the project there could be problems with compacting the basement and getting it correct. The costs could go in the other direction.

Chair McCormack stated the basement was being abandoned.

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct.

Committee Member Woollett stated in moving the building forward they might run into some other things. A landscape plan was suggested.

Mr. Ryan stated Chair McCormack had a good point about who would review it.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were a number of issues, the steps had changed, the building height had changed and would it be inappropriate or create a huge hardship to have the item continued, to allow the applicant to revise the plan with the changes and bring it back.

Mr. Ryan stated he felt there were not many changes.

Committee Member Woollett stated a landscape plan was not generally required on a residence.

Mr. Ryan stated it was a two unit space with income property and would justify a landscape plan.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was the south exposure issue; perhaps they could work into the suggestions the options upon moving the building. Would it create too much of a hardship to simply document some of the changes and ask that the applicant bring the project back?

Ms. Day stated the way the foundation was, part of the house was basically sitting on the ground and until the house was raised they would have no idea of what they would need to do. In the event that they had problems filling the basement there could be that option to move the building forward. They had people go in underneath and they could not determine the situation. They would need to rip up the living room floor, which was a beautiful oak floor, just to see what was underneath.

Chair McCormack stated in mitigating the basement issue was there a magic number of feet the home would need to be moved to get away from that zone? It would create additional issues with the avocado tree and driveway.

Ms. Day stated they had looked at moving the building forward and they had measured and it would not disrupt the avocado tree.

Chair McCormack stated moving the building forward was fine, there was an extended driveway issue and that all needed to be planned out.

Ms. Day stated the additional parking space could be moved to the west side, there was a fence across the front and she pointed the area out in the photos. She reviewed the photos with the Committee Members.

Chair McCormack stated there were a whole bunch of alternatives to solve the problem. He asked if the driveway was historic and would it need to remain on the property?

Mr. Ryan stated he had not known if that was original.

Chair McCormack stated once they began reviewing the front parcel there were many other issues that needed to be looked at.

Mr. Ryan stated the existing elevation of the plan was what they would go back to; the rest of the language would remain. If the applicant started the work they would have the option to move the building forward. The applicant could develop a landscape plan that would work with the building in its present site or if it had to be moved.

Chair McCormack asked the applicant if they would be agreeable to a continuation of the project to allow them to get all the details worked out?

Ms. Day stated that would be fine.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to continue DRC No. 4433-09, Scharer Rehabilitation, to allow the applicant to come back with a landscape plan and to make the revisions to the height of the building and to rework the roof plan. They could add a dotted line to notate where the building would be moved to if the applicant exercised that option.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

(4) DRC No. 4446-09 – SPRINT/NEXTEL

- A proposal to install microwave antennas within an existing stealth chimney enclosure on the roof of the Elk's Building.
- 211 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Celly Adamo, address on file, stated she felt Mr. Ryan had covered everything they wanted to do. The antennae needed to be inside and they were able to accommodate that process and it would be placed in the existing screen.

Mr. Ryan presented a photo of the existing enclosure.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated they were opposed to the other installations in that area. The only stealth aspect about it was that the equipment was not visible, however, now there were several unsightly structures piled on top of the historic structure. The concern was that there not be any additional structures added to add to the visual impact. Mr. Ryan assured him that all the components would be internally installed, and that being the case they were happy with that.

Chair McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he felt the installation was fine.

Chair McCormack asked if everything was inside a structure he pointed to on the plans?

Mr. Ryan stated it was all inside an existing structure.

Ms. Adamo stated they were going to add the GPS on an area that she pointed to on the plans; with current technology they were able to move it below the top of the structure. There was an existing GPS located in the corner and the new one would not go any higher.

Mr. Ryan suggested installing it at the rear of the structure for further elimination of any visibility.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had sensitivity on the existing equipment that existed on the structure and the view from the east side, which was not an issue with the proposed project. The sensitivity was that the historic parapet not be disturbed; she would venture to guess that the building that housed the structure was one of the taller buildings in the Plaza. She suggested aside from the Son Light Church, which surprisingly had not housed any equipment, it was high

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for October 7, 2009 Page 20 of 25

enough that it would be a good facility to house that type of equipment. She looked at roofs and wanted those types of things to look attractive. She was generally okay with the proposed project.

Mr. Ryan stated it had been a requested site on several applications, but had not made it to approval.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the last time a proposal for roof equipment that had come to the DRC, they had conditioned that the skirt or the form be built down to obscure any visibility from the street.

Mr. Ryan stated they had conditioned that for the elevator tower.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would want that space to be improved as it was visible from Maple as a phony chimney.

Mr. Ryan reviewed the photos with the DRC Members to gain further clarification.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the stealth material should go down as far as the top of the parapet.

Ms. Adamo stated that would not be a problem and they would extend the skirt.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4446-09, Sprint/Nextel, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following condition:

1. Extend the enclosure material of the false chimney down to a height no higher than the parapet around the building.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(5) DRC No. 4447-09 – CASA RAMON APTS. – EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS

- A proposal to modify the exterior of a 75 unit, 1970's non-contributing apartment.
- 820-840 W. Walnut Ave, 455 N. Clark Street, and 455 N. Batavia Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Eunice Boberi, address on file, stated they were contracted to remove the siding and create a similar look with a contrasting color on the existing stucco. The buildings were predominantly stucco with wood siding on the front elevations.

Public Comment

None.

Chair McCormack opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had some concerns about the proposal. If there was plasterboard on the inside, he asked what kind of plaster board was that?

Applicant, Colin O'Connell, address on file, stated it was a type of sheet rock. It was smooth.

Committee Member Woollett asked what was the water resistant barrier?

Mr. O'Connell stated there was not a water barrier, which was the issue when they tore off a small section.

Committee Member Woollett stated there should be a moisture barrier over the sheeting. His concern was that he felt it would be tough to do it in stucco and have it work as well, particularly if the trim was removed. He asked if the applicant had considered using fiber reinforced cement board, which would provide all the resistance of stucco and be easier to apply? They could place individual boards that would run all the way up and there would still be the grooves. It appeared that the building had been maintained well. With the proper moisture barrier he suggested the use of cement board over it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would suggest the same thing and it would be just as durable as the stucco.

Chair McCormack asked for clarification on the raised vertical edge?

Mr. Ryan stated it would be a difference in the plane. There could be some vertical reveal left for detail.

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant could use Hardie sheets, panel for panel, and it would be there forever.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they went with that, he suggested a z-flashing with a piece of trim that matched the existing trim on the building. They could use the Hardie board in 4' x 8' sheets. Leave the existing trim. He would be concerned if they were to use stucco what finish would they use, there was Spanish lace stucco on the building.

Mr. Boberi asked if they could use the same stucco finish in another color?

Committee Member Woollett stated no, because it would run into all the problems of attempting to match the finish, and would therefore be a different finish. There would be a problem where the joints came together and they would end up with a flat plane that was a little different in texture and they would loose what existed. It would degrade the exterior of the building.

Committee Member Gladson stated that element, pointing to the plans, would give it a break from the stucco box feel. The vertical elements would break that up. She would not have a problem with using stucco if it was made smooth. Using a smooth finish would be more expensive.

Chair McCormack stated that what they were suggesting was to use a z-channel where the panel stopped.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested placing a piece of trim over it.

Chair McCormack stated there would be a horizontal line at the points, and would that horizontal line be the same width as the trim?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was what he was suggesting.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would look better with the horizontal piece, using Hardie trim, and would make it thinner than what was on the sides. It would not fit in but be back about a ½ inch or so.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in keeping with the period they could use some z-flashing and paint it out. He was not personally opposed to the use of stucco, what concerned him was that the applicant had not presented how the stucco would be done. He was concerned with what the texture would be, what trim would be used, and if they intended to do that he would want more information on what the applicant intended to do.

Chair McCormack stated it would look like a stucco box with stripes on it.

Committee Member Gladson stated then it would start to look a little silly.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they would replace the T1-11 with something more durable, some fiber reinforced cement panels, they could keep it the way it currently was and just add the z-flashing.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was not a T1-11 panel. The grooves were not deep enough.

Chair McCormack stated upon the recommendation was their a proposal to change the color?

Mr. Boberi stated the building was pretty much all the same color.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was fine the way it was.

Mr. Boberi stated the color difference was due to the different materials and how they took the color.

Committee Member Gladson stated she had been by other properties and she complimented the applicant on the way they maintained that property. She stated they would not want to loose that stock of housing as it was important as part of a supply of affordable housing. She asked the Committee Members if they would want to continue the item?

Committee Member Woollett stated he would want to approve it with conditions.

Chair McCormack stated the assessment of the financial issues should be looked into with the comparison for the different materials to be used and the details of the project.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was a swap of one type of panel for another type of panel with the use of a fiber reinforced panel.

Mr. Boberi stated he had no issues with investigating those options.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC 4447-09, Casa Ramon Apts. Exterior Modifications, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- 1. Eliminate Staff Condition No. 1, and Staff Recommendation No. 2 and 3.
- 2. Install fiber reinforced cement panels with a pattern similar to the existing wood siding, retaining or replacing in-kind the existing wood trim.
- 3. Treating the horizontal panel joints with z-flashing and a strip of fiber reinforced panel to match the wood trim (matching the width not the depth).
- 4. Keeping Recommendation No. 4.

Committee Member Woollett asked about the term in-kind, and asked what was meant by that?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was suggesting using material that looked the same, and he would want it to be wood.

Committee Member Woollett stated if they used Hardie trim it would be more durable and last forever.

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for October 7, 2009 Page 24 of 25

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt it would look too weak, due to the thin depth and raggedy edges.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would be the same depth.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be the same width, but not the same depth.

Committee Member Woollett stated yes, it would be the same depth.

Committee Member Wheeler asked, the Hardie board?

Committee Member Woollett stated Hardie trim.

Committee Member Wheeler stated Hardie trim; they would want to replace all of the trim if that was used.

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant should not be required to replace all of the trim due to the costs.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they were to replace some, it should all be the same. It would be better to recommend that if the trim was damaged it should be replaced with new wood trim.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on October 21, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart