CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

November 16, 2011

Committee Members Present:	Bill Cathcart Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Dan Ryan, Historical Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:11 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated the Agenda contained a continued item from the last meeting, which could not be heard due to a quorum issue; and there were two sets of minutes. One set that was not approved, due to an oversight, and there was a second set of minutes to review and approve.

Chair Cathcart asked if they could just accept the minutes that had not been previously approved, based on the corrections from the last meeting?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there could be additional corrections, or they could be approved without further review.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of November 2, 2011. Corrections and changes were noted.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated with the retirement of Assistant Community Development Director Ed Knight, she would be attending the Planning Commission Meetings. Beginning in January other Staff Planners would rotate in her seat as the DRC's Staff contact. Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, would be the first to rotate in her seat. Once the Agenda/Packets were distributed, the DRC Members could contact Mr. Ortlieb or she would still be available for questions. Mr. Knight's last day would be December 8, 2011. She would be attending both the Planning Commission and Design Review Committee Meetings through the remainder of the year.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if another Staff member would rotate through after Mr. Ortlieb?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there were a few other people, and possibly Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, would also be available. She had enjoyed being at the DRC meetings. For

upcoming meetings in December, they would focus on a meeting on December 7 and not hold one on December 21; then they would hold one on January 4, 2012.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee Meeting.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were present and there was one open seat on the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

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.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (a) October 19, 2011 and (b) November 2, 2011

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of October 19, 2011 with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of November 2, 2011 with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Bill Cathcart
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4340-08 - WAHOO'S FISH TACOS RESTAURANT/BUILDING

- A proposal for review of the final landscape and lighting plans.
- 234-238 W. Chapman Avenue, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Meetings July 2, 2008 and August 19, 2009
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the item's presentation due to the location of his office building.

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

Applicant, Jay Rutter, address on file, was available for questions.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated his comments mirrored Staff's comments. The fence design seemed to be too contemporary based on the period and style of the building. It would be nice if some of the landscaping also reflected the historic period of the building as well.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated on the landscaping issue, much of the landscaping for the historic period of the building had not been very well done. He was less concerned about the historic quality of the landscape. He asked Mr. Ryan if he could remind him of the landscape guidelines?

Mr. Ryan stated landscape should fit the period and there were plant varieties that would be appropriate. The landscape for the historic period of the building was pretty simple and straight forward.

Committee Member Woollett stated simple and straight forward would not be appropriate for the project before them, as there was a lot of hardscape like the big brick wall and sidewalk. The site needed to be softened. He would defer that to the landscape experts. There was a condition, Condition No. 15, to repair the brick wall; he agreed with that, but as the wall belonged to someone else he was not certain how that would be handled. There was a steel pipe that ran through the wall and he was not certain what could be done with that. One of the things he was concerned with was the hard edge between the paving and the wall. The wall came down with a concrete base that appeared irregular and he was not sure how high the paving would be. It was

a very, very important joint. When he had been faced with a similar situation he would recommend planting something in that area, possibly a vine or something of that nature. Even if the wall was extensively repaired it would still be an irregular wall and that was okay as it was a historic wall; but it would be much more attractive if it had a vine on it.

Committee Member McCormack stated he mirrored what Committee Member Woollett stated. There could be a vine on it or a shrub at the base of the wall but he was not certain if he was sold on either of those two ideas. He suggested placing some gravel mulch to change the material as it hit the brick, to give it a clean edge on the concrete and to blur the edge of where the gravel hit the brick. The other thing that he was grappling with was the landscape, and he would plant a deciduous tree (in a space he pointed to on the plans), he would want it to be a warmer space next to a two-story structure that would provide full shade. The Evergreen tree that was noted on the plans would be even darker in the winter, darker than the shade the building was casting. The Bay tree was a slow growing tree and at a 36" box it would be very small, opposed to a tree that would grow quicker and be bigger in a 36" box. He had a question on the grease interceptor. He asked if it was a manhole that would be right at-grade?

Mr. Rutter stated yes, that was correct. There would be two manhole covers, similar to a sewer drain.

Committee Member McCormack asked if there was another area that it could be placed in?

Mr. Rutter stated no.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the concrete paving, it was noted score at ¼" radius and if that line changed to ½" if would create really wide joints and would create a high heel tripping hazard. On the scale detail for the gate opening, if there was a post there with an opening of 3'-6", which was not ADA compliant, it would ruin the whole geometry of that space.

Mr. Rutter stated he was not the landscape architect, but he understood the intent was to leave the gate open during business hours and there would not need to be a post in the middle.

Committee Member McCormack stated the space would need to be 4'.

Mr. Ryan stated there would not be an obstruction there.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed with Staff's comment on the style of fence. He asked if on the back gate if there would be "panic hardware" installed?

Mr. Rutter stated the gate would be open during business hours and closed and locked at night. The intention was to be able to secure the area after business hours.

Committee Member McCormack stated he wondered if they would be required to install panic hardware on that gate and he suggested that the applicant check with the Building Official for that requirement.

Committee Member Woollett stated they may allow a sign that read "to remain unlocked during business hours", and that would suffice.

Mr. Rutter stated during business hours the intention was not to have that area locked.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the 3' square tree grates, he asked what the intent was on the up-lighting? Many times a tree grate contained a pop out and the plans showed one light. The design might be better to have two lights to evenly light the space. He wanted to point out that if they intended to use tree grates, to use the type that had corner pop outs for the up-lighting. On the plants; for the Ligustrum to have even spacing and that should be called-out on the plant legend. He asked if the pots would contain some ground planting or would it be just dirt? They could add gravel to the top to finish it off nicely. He wanted to make a strong suggestion to re-think the tree variety and to use a deciduous tree to lighten things up.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the Bay trees had an aroma?

Committee Member McCormack stated yes, and the leaves could be used in cooking. He liked the tree in a garden, but in an area that they wanted trees that they could walk under, in a 36" box, the applicant might be surprised at their small size.

Chair Cathcart stated he agreed about the comments regarding the Bay tree, but he would not necessarily choose a deciduous tree. On the fence it was a bit urban, but he was not certain if he would condition that to be changed. The Ligustrum plant bothered him, as that plant attracted bees. He would feel more comfortable with another choice, as people dining with bees wafting around would be uncomfortable. On the fence base he was not concerned, it was the one thing that was historically correct as it was uneven. The applicant had taken a difficult site and had made it into something nice.

Committee Member McCormack stated the fence was stopping at the corner and he asked if it would attach to a pilaster?

Mr. Rutter stated they had spoken about that and they had wanted to get as much plant material in front of that area instead of bringing it to the pilaster.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they would consider moving the pilaster back with all the plant material moved in front?

Mr. Rutter stated that would be another option.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that the pot be placed on a pedestal. Regarding the fire pit, he asked if there was an emergency shut-off switch as he had not found that on the plans?

Mr. Rutter stated that was a Code requirement.

Committee Member McCormack asked Mr. Ryan if he would check on that? He had found a note of a gas shut-off with a key and typically there was a push-type shut-off.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would want to make the edge treatment on the fence a condition and he felt it would enhance the project.

Mr. Rutter stated on the tree choice, it was the desire of the Wahoo's associates to use Evergreen trees, there would be heaters and the fire pit; as to the tree size he could not speak to that. They had spoken about the slow growth and they had not wanted a tree that would grow too quickly. They wanted some filtered light and that was how the tree choice was made. On the edge treatment of the fence, there was some concern as the fence was up against the neighboring building and a vine could not be planted due to that. There was also a bigger concern based on the adjacent building condition and fence conditions; they would not want to destroy the integrity of the fence area. For the fence they had begun with a more Victorian-style design, but it had changed over time with the vision of Susan Secoy in blending two buildings together; and a more simple fence design was chosen.

Committee Member Woollett stated he found the explanation by the applicant sufficient and he would not condition any planting on the wall, but would recommend having some gravel between the sidewalk and wall.

Committee Member McCormack stated colored gravel could be used and it would only need to be a 6" wide space. He asked if any additional lighting would be added?

Mr. Rutter stated there would be lights on the building, but no other lighting added. The Wahoo's associates wanted patrons to spend more time at the front of the building during the night time hours.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4340-08, Wahoo's Fish Tacos Restaurant, subject to the conditions with the exception of #2 in the staff report and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. A 6" wide space be provided along the east side walkway between the sidewalk and building next door. The space to be filled with gravel.
2. Move the pilaster back to allow the fence to die into the center point of the pilaster with planting in front of the pilaster.

And with the following suggestion:

1. With the ground-mounted up-lighting on the trees to ensure there was adequate space for the light installation that would not interfere with the tree root system.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4567-11 – PLAZA BIBLE CHURCH

- A proposal for a new façade, signage, and parking lot improvements for a non-contributing commercial building.
- 240 W. Chapman Avenue, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from the item's presentation, as he was the architect on a portion of the project.

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

Applicant, Wes Hays, address on file, stated the reason they are waiting on putting in the electrical and piping was that they wanted to match what Wahoo's was installing.

Applicant, Mark Lebsack, address on file, stated the original photos showed PVC piping. Staff had an issue with PVC. Those had since been insulated and there was not anymore PVC but instead it was a white insulated material that would match the color of the chiller. The reason the fencing had not been completed was that they also wanted to wait until Wahoo's had completed their fencing.

Chair Cathcart asked if the issues that they were providing input for were on the façade and signage?

Mr. Ryan stated those were the unresolved issues. In speaking with the Building Official, typically piping should be installed close to the building and up the wall, not 3' out. There were some concerns about the location of the piping, the materials used, and the reinforcements used. They also needed to deal with whether bollards would be used for protection of the transformer unit from vehicles.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated the concerns from Staff were strong enough that they had a choice to either recommend denial or bring the proposal before the DRC for preliminary review in order to provide some clear direction for the applicant. They chose to bring the project before the DRC.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated they were fine with the façade treatment as proposed. The building looked nice and the paint job looked good. They agreed with Staff on the mechanical equipment that it would need screening.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the power pole would be removed once the transformer was installed?

Mr. Hays stated the power pole would come down and everything would come in underground, which was what Edison had planned.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was concerned as the piping was buried in the wall.

Mr. Ryan stated that would be removed with a cherry picker that would lift it right out.

Committee Member Woollett stated that would be okay and then the wall would be filled in.

Mr. Hays stated the piping and guide wire would go away. Once the transformer was up the bollards would be installed to protect the transformer and the chiller. A screen fence would then be put in place.

Committee Member Woollett stated the power to the transformer would be trenched and completed underground, then it would need to go to a meter. He asked where the meter would be installed?

Mr. Hays stated on the corner of the building.

Committee Member Woollett stated that was what he was worried about.

Mr. Lebsack stated that was why it had been recommended that they provide a space from the wall to where the chiller was presently located. There were some safety issues and they needed a specified space.

Committee Member Woollett stated the proper thing he felt would be to install a fence in order to have it hidden from view, instead of installing bollards. There could be a gate installed directly in front of the transformer and that would provide the required distance in front of the transformer. The whole area would be cleaned up. His suggestion would be to enclose it.

Mr. Hays stated it was his understanding that Wahoo's would have a fence along the back property line.

Mr. Ryan stated it would be along the sidewalk.

Mr. Hays stated his understanding was that Edison would provide the bollards.

Committee Member Woollett stated Edison would not provide the bollards. Edison was interested in protecting the transformer and would suggest those for protection.

Applicant, Jay Rutter, address on file, stated the issue of installing a fence-type enclosure was that it opened up a whole new clearance requirement with Edison; if a fence was used the fenced area would need to become larger. The transformer was lockable and he felt that Edison was not very concerned with vandalism or whatever.

Committee Member Woollett stated they were concerned with protection and that was with the use of bollards at the front of the transformer. The space requirement was 8' in front of the transformer and there was not room, unless they placed the gate in front of the transformer which would allow more than 8'. It would be worth investigating. His recollection was that the requirement for the sides and back of the transformer was 3' and it appeared that they had enough room. The idea would be to have a 5' enclosure with the top of the meter below that; there would be no visibility of the meter.

Mr. Hays stated he was not certain what the meter height was.

Mr. Ryan stated Edison would be installing a Smart meter.

Committee Member Woollett stated the next question would be what would the enclosure material be?

Committee Member McCormack suggested they match Wahoo's with a solid mesh. It was a paneled mesh with holes in it that could be installed to the back of a fence. Using Wahoo's fence detail would provide consistency.

Committee Member Woollett stated it would all appear much better and it was great to see the improvements being made.

Mr. Hays stated the original lot line was readjusted to maintain parking spaces in the back. Edison determined where the transformer would be installed and that would determine the chiller location.

Mr. Ryan stated they were looking at adding some landscaping and lighting in the parking lot.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans with Staff, and suggested some planting areas.

Committee Member Woollett stated there would be a hole in the wall where the pole would be removed and he wondered if they could run the pipes up through there and they would not need to place them on the outside of the building. They would need to be above ceiling level.

Mr. Hays stated there was a tank in there and that would determine the pipe height. It was inside the ice house structure. It was a tall tank with the tank entrance at the top.

Mr. Lebsack stated they had an ice house previously and when that broke down they replaced it with the chiller. It chilled the water with a 50% glycol mix. The water traveled through the pipes into the building to chill the air.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the chiller would work during the week to store the chilled water and then on Sunday, at their peak periods, to cool the space?

Mr. Hays stated yes.

Committee Member Woollett stated it appeared they had some flexibility and he suggested that they attempt to conceal the pipes.

Mr. Ryan stated the Building Division would want some type of steel for stability. He reviewed the plans with Committee Member Woollett.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that they add a tree in two areas, which he pointed to on the plans.

There were no further comments.

Mr. Lebsack asked if there would be a way that they could continue with the front portion on the project and then come back to the DRC to take care of the other issues.

Mr. Ryan stated the proposal would go before the Planning Commission and they would want to submit that as one complete package.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the proposal had been agendized as a preliminary review and the Committee would not be taking an action.

Mr. Hays stated they had not wanted to be in construction after Wahoo's had opened for business.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the time line would be based on how quickly the applicant could prepare a final proposal to be placed on a subsequent Agenda.

There was no further discussion.

The Item was presented for preliminary review only and a motion was not necessary.

(4) DRC No. 4579-11 – GRANEK RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a 5,694 sq. ft. single-family residential house, plus a 1,573 sq. ft. attached garage, a 1,501 sq. ft. detached garage/workshop, and a detached 640 sq. ft. guest house.
- 6050 E. Jack Pine Lane
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Ken Parsons, address on file, stated he was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he assumed Staff was concerned that the existing ancillary structure not be used as a residence.

Ms. Nguyen stated the space was allowed to be used in that manner. She was speaking to the shed that was attached. The storage shed, if counted in square footage, would put them over the edge according to Code. Having the shed remain as unfinished and unconditioned would not count in the square footage limitation for an accessory unit.

Committee Member Wheeler presented a handout of his comments/concerns to the Committee Members, applicant, and Staff. He stated on the back porch there was a roof that was called-out as 1 3/6 and 12 pitched and he asked what type of roofing material would be used?

Mr. Parsons stated it would have two layers of roofing paper with shingles. With the low slope they met the requirements.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the elevations, sheet PA6, he was interested in what the roof form was as it appeared to be a shed roof.

Mr. Parsons stated it was possible that it was not shown and it would be the same roof that was on the low slope.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was difficult to complete a modern interpretation of a Craftsman home, because detailing was very important. The outlookers were called-out as heavy, but there were not dimensions and the window trim was not called-out and the column dimensions were not called-out. If it was not done correctly it would appear weak. A Craftsman without a raised porch was an anomaly and it was always a problem. What concerned him most, unlike the other homes they had reviewed in the same area, was that the proposal before them

was a Craftsman on the front with stucco on the back. All the other homes in that same area had been very complete with detailing all the way around. The proposal was for the detailing to be applied on the front of the home without it being carried around to the back and seemed to suggest that the people living in the home were more concerned with the impression neighbors would get. On the guest house there was wood siding that just stopped at the corner.

Mr. Parsons stated he had not liked the approach either and it had been his preference to have a total trim package, but it was the age old issue of what the homeowner wanted to do and what their budget would allow. He had suggested reducing the overall project to accommodate the additional details, but they had not wanted to do that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was a big house and a nicely designed house, but the absence of detail in the back seemed to cheapen the design. He suggested having further discussions with the homeowners. He stated that Craftsman homes generally had exposed rafter tails.

Mr. Parsons stated they had considered that, but there was a bit of a fire code challenge. They could use a larger size.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the Orange Park Acres (OPA) Specific Plan provided for a feeling of openness when it came to fencing and it spoke out against solid fencing. To install a 6' solid vinyl fence along the horse trail would be odd looking and offensive to their neighbors. In sitting on top of a horse, riders would be able to see over the fence material. He suggested the use of another type of fence.

Ms. Nguyen stated the property owners had a concern regarding the fence material. They would have a pool with young children and had concerns with having an open fence. With the split rail it would not meet the code requirement for a pool enclosure; she had not discussed the use of wrought iron fencing. The property owners were not only concerned with people on horseback using the trails, but also with pedestrians on the trail and protection and privacy for their young children.

Committee Member Woollett stated Committee Member Wheeler had made some good points. The enclave of homes in the area of the proposal before them had sat apart and the DRC had basically allowed the home designs to go where they had wanted to go. There had not been a neighborhood for comparison purposes in the past, however, now there was a neighborhood. They had concerns with a new home going into an existing neighborhood and how it would be consistent with the other properties.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was not suggesting that the detail needed to go all the way around, but for some of the details to be carried to the back of the home.

Mr. Parsons stated it was a fairly easy thing to carry the details around to all sides of the home. His client had initially asked that the home be designed with the details carried all the way around the home. He would share the DRC's concerns with his client.

Committee Member McCormack stated he mirrored the concerns that Committee Member Wheeler presented. He reviewed the plans and where the fencing would occur. He suggested to

reduce the vinyl fence in an area he pointed to on the plans, and stated there was quite a bit of vegetation that would provide for screening.

Mr. Parsons stated there was not a pool fence requirement in the area Committee Member McCormack was referring to.

Ms. Nguyen confirmed they were speaking of the east end of the property to the pool barrier required area.

Mr. Parsons stated they could use a different type of fencing.

Committee Member McCormack suggested the use of wrought iron being painted black with plant screening that would just blend into the landscape. He felt a white vinyl fence was too loud and he would be in a position to condition that vinyl fencing not be used.

Mr. Parsons stated he was in a position to make those changes.

Committee Member McCormack asked how high a fence was at the front of the property?

Mr. Parsons stated it was a low 18" fence.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was no notation of irrigation for that area.

Mr. Parsons stated that was a low wall and he was not certain stucco would be the right finish for it and thought that stone would be a better material.

Committee Member McCormack stated the area would not need to be irrigated as he was noticing on the plans that the treatment for the space was gravel.

Mr. Parsons stated it called-out decomposed granite. He reviewed the landscape features with the Committee Members.

Chair Cathcart stated on the root barrier detail it was not noted if the trees were being placed close to something that needed a root barrier. It was generally noted on the plans. There was a Tulip tree being planted in the lawn, which was not inappropriate, however, there needed to be an area cleared with mulch to protect the tree from any weed-whacking. The irrigation system would need to be reviewed for property coverage in the many different hydrazone areas and he suggested that they limit the plant materials being used in consideration of maintenance and water use issues.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4579-11, Granek Residence.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Parsons asked if there were any issues with the buildings and their massing and size?

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was not an issue with the building size.

Chair Cathcart stated the sites in the area were for custom homes and he had not had an issue with the design, massing, or size of the proposed structures.

(5) DRC No. 4591-11 – PLAZA 149 CAFÉ

- A proposal for a new wall sign for Plaza 149 Café (formerly Henry's Grill).
- 149 N. Glassell Street, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the applicant for the proposal had to leave the DRC meeting prior to his presentation.

Chair Cathcart made a motion to continue DRC No. 4591-11, Plaza 149 Café.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Craig Wheeler
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4596-11 - MALONEY–INFILL GARAGE

- A proposal to construct a new two-car detached garage.
- 607 E. Almond Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Michael Williams, address on file, stated he was available for questions.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated that the project was very sympathetic and it was nice to see someone building a garage without an apartment over it. He agreed with Staff on the matching gable and the comment about the driveway, however, it was an existing driveway. A portion of the driveway was called-out as brick and he was not certain if that was existing brick. The project had not called-out for wooden garage doors, but he was assuming the doors were wood. It was a nice addition and a good project.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated the garage was simple and acceptable. He wondered if it was such a big deal to cut a strip down the driveway?

Mr. Williams stated the driveway had sand-embedded brick with concrete underneath.

Committee Member McCormack stated he believed they were speaking about two separate things.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was referring to the concrete in front.

Mr. Ryan stated that was done a long time ago. The property had always contained a driveway without a garage. At the end of the driveway there were pavers set in sand and cement.

Committee Member McCormack stated that was all behind the fence.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had not found anything wrong with the proposed project and it was very well done. He felt they needed to add a few conditions to clarify the materials. They should add the materials for the windows, doors, and such to be called-out on the plans. The structural details noted exposed rafter tails to match existing and he assumed that would match the size of the intermediate rafter tails and the applicant might want to look at that detail.

Mr. Williams asked if that should be nominal?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes, that would be acceptable. On the extended barge the construction should be in the traditional manner, and that should be noted. A condition could be added to allow 4 x 4 outlookers if that was needed to support the barge board.

Mr. Williams stated that should be a requirement.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the vents appeared to match the house.

Mr. Williams stated they would match.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the door and window trim they were using a 2 x 4 or a 2 x 6 trim board and that was simple and would be fine. The detailing on the garage could be simpler.

Mr. Williams asked if he was referring to the 1 x 6 around on the garage?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes, but that should be at least a 2 x 6. He agreed with Staff that a thinner window on the garage door would look better and on the diagonal bracing that the direction should be down toward the hinge.

Mr. Williams stated he was in agreement with only having one level of lights for the garage.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he really liked the fact that the applicant had proposed hinged doors and he would want to specify that the siding corners be mitered.

Committee Member McCormack stated if they would be incorporating the suggestion from Staff for the ribbon driveway, he would also suggest using a 2' wide mow strip. He reviewed the driveway area with the applicant.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4596-11, Maloney In-Fill Garage, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. The wood lattice to match existing.
2. The siding, windows, and window trim material shall be wood.
3. The siding to have mitered corners.
4. The barge board to be supported in the traditional manner without the use of 2 x 4 flat outlookers.
5. 4 x 4 outlookers may be added, choice of the applicant.
6. The garage door should have a single row of windows.

And with the following suggestions:

1. If diagonal braces are to be used on the garage door, that they point down toward the hinge side.
2. The concrete driveway be cut with a 2' wide planting strip.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(7) DRC No. 4597-11 – AMERICAN HERITAGE RECONSTRUCTION

- A proposal to demolish a non-permitted 839 sq. ft. addition, reconstruct, and restore portions of the former Southside Market building.
- 391 S. Glassell Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Meeting January 16, 2008 (Entitlement Expired)
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had a copy of the minutes from the last time the item had been presented.

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

Applicant, Stephen Hill, address on file, stated they were excited about the project as much as they had been when it was previously submitted. All the permits had been pulled and they had the sign people and awning company ready to go when it was locked in the court system. That had been cleared up and they were now back before the City wanting to begin the project. There have been some business owners on Glassell that had expressed interest in the building and they want to get the space back into a useable space.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated returning the project to its original form had been discussed. The building had changed quite a bit over time. He presented a photo and stated it was difficult to tell what type of material the building was made of. He had matched it up to the home next door and he reviewed the photo with the Committee Members. The front of the building had not appeared to be the same in the photos as it appeared today. Everyone was excited to see a change in the building. He lived around the corner and the graffiti on the building was constant, and the broken windows made the site a mess. The project before them was identical to the project that had been previously presented. They had met with the former owner, who then took the wrong path on his own addition. The garage that had been there was a detached, one-car bungalow and sat behind the fence, and that had been demolished. It would be tough to restore the building back to its original configuration. Just cleaning the property up would be well received. Everyone in the neighborhood was excited to see a change and having someone occupy the space would be good.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated there appeared to be some question as to how far back the site would need to be restored to.

Mr. Ryan stated a period of significance needed to be determined and when had the change to the building occurred. He was not certain if additional research would provide information on when

stucco had been added to the building. The Sanborn maps had shown where there was an offset in the front.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if that could have been a separate building?

Mr. Hill stated in looking at the trusses in the front they went all the way across. It was all dimensional lumber and all original from the inside.

Mr. Ryan stated the question was what period they would go back to?

Committee Member Woollett stated the prominent elevation was the south and west elevations and those had a lot of sun exposure. If siding was on there it would be a maintenance problem.

Mr. Ryan stated if a historic expert determined that stucco had been added 60 years ago, that would be a long enough period for historic significance.

Committee Member Woollett stated there was currently not a requirement to take the building back to a specific time period. If an action was taken to protect the siding, those were fully exposed elevations and that would become a maintenance problem. He wondered if the project was something the Economic Development Department would be interested in since it was in an important part of town.

Mr. Ryan stated they had some programs for property owners or tenants that could help them.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if the owner chose to restore it back further, that the project would need to come back before the Committee or the project before them could move forward as proposed.

Mr. Hill stated during their previous submittal the project had gone all the way to the Building Division with their approvals and that was when the project stalled with court issues. When everything was finalized in the courts in May or June they had lost the approvals as they had expired in January. They wanted to pursue the project in the City of Orange without the interference of the previous owner. They had some interest from existing Orange business owners in the site, but had not wanted to make the commitment due to the problems they had previously experienced. They had pulled the permits in the summer of 2009 when the project was stalled.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the drawings were the same ones that had been previously approved?

Mr. Ryan stated they were the same.

Mr. Hill stated they were the same stamped set of plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the previous set of minutes there had been a condition to have the blade sign retained and refurbished. He asked if that was still in the proposal?

Mr. Hill stated it was in their plans.

Committee Member Woollett stated with a previous project, Wahoo's, the applicant had taken advantage to restore that building and on the project before them he asked if the owners would be open to restoring the building closer to its original form?

Mr. Hill stated he lived in the Historic District, something that appeared to be what it was could take on the ambiance of what it was and he was not certain they wanted to take on the project just for the restoration of a site; they had looked at a lot of things and options. The building had been in excellent condition prior to the previous owner adding the un-permitted buildings. If they could get back in and restore the building to what existed and what it had been designed to be, that would be their desire.

Committee Member Woollett stated the original form was siding.

Mr. Hill stated they had discussed that, but in the front there were some subtleties with the windows and doors that they would not want to change, and they had wanted to use the same awnings which would be a problem if they removed the stucco that existed. The building was structurally sound.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4597-11, American Heritage Reconstruction, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

1. Exterior finish on the south and west elevations be replaced to match the materials on the north elevation.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, December 7, 2011.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Bill Cathcart, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.