CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

April 18, 2012

Committee Members Present:	Carol Fox Robert Imboden Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:08 p.m. with a review of the Agenda. He stated that no additional packet information had been received on the Salem Lutheran item, and he asked if there had been any changes?

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, stated in the attachment the changes were noted.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would recuse himself from Item No. 6, Orange Senior Center, as he was the architect on the project.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, stated there were no changes to the Agenda.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of March 21, 2012. Corrections and changes were noted.

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

SECOND:	Tim McCormack
AYES:	Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were present.

Senior Planner, Chad Orlieb, stated that the City's Community Service Director, who was present for Agenda Item No.6 had another meeting to attend, and Staff was requesting that Item No. 6 be moved up in the agenda.

Chair Woollett stated they would hear that item first.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) Approval of Minutes: March 21, 2012

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled meeting of the Design Review Committee on March 21, 2012 with changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Carol Fox, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Robert Imboden
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4538-11 - SALEM LUTHERAN CHURCH & SCHOOL

- A proposal of a Specific Plan for Salem Lutheran. The Specific Plan provides for a redesign of the church and school campus with a new worship center that includes a sanctuary, conference and meeting rooms, and administrative offices.
- 6500 E. Santiago Canyon Road
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Review: March 7, 2012
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Mike Madden, address on file, stated he had no additional comments. He had two landscape professionals with him to answer any questions pertaining to landscape.

Public Comment

Christine Rosenow, address on file, stated she appreciated the Committee's insight from the last DRC meeting and the neighbors were truly appreciative of the landscape and architecture. In the 1998 CUP it was stated that the facility should be shrouded in shrubbery and a forest of green; and it was not. There were wire fences and things such as that. It was confusing for the residents as they were discussing the plan that was before them, they had plans and the applicant had plans and they had not known to what plan they were speaking to and who they should be speaking to. They were, what they had thought, in the midst of communication with the Salem representatives, but then the DRC meeting came about. She was requesting that no decisions be made until they could come back with the revisions. The applicant was revising the plans and she could not understand how a decision could be made on plans that were being revised. The entrance off of Santiago was a huge issue. She was on the OPA Board and now she was a very active member of the Real Estate Board and the Santiago issue was of great concern. The horse community was greatly concerned at having such a wide gap with 50 to 60 mile an hour traffic so near. Just last week there was a huge accident. She was also requesting to see a copy of the letter that had been submitted. She asked that any decision making be postponed until more information was received.

Chair Woollett stated there still appeared to be some confusion by public participants about the action the DRC was taking. The plans before them were not final plans, the plans were being submitted to establish some guidelines for design and when the final plans were prepared, the design plans, they would return to the DRC. They were currently dealing with the design rules and not so much the specific design and they were dealing with the rules that would guide the design.

Ms. Rosenow stated the confusion was that if the plans were changing weren't the rules changing? If a decision was made the project would move to the Planning Commission and it was a powerful signature that they would be sending, as representatives of the Community, which they approved of the plan as presented. Her concern was that with any stamp of approval, when the plans were not solidified, and there were many plans in the works and they were on plans 4, 5 and 6. They were not on the same plan. Salem had presented plans to the Salem community that differed from the plans that were being presented before the DRC. There was a plan that showed the relocation of Fowler House due to mold issues and a plan that had a Santiago Canyon entrance removed. They had been doing this for some time; the plans were continually changing.

Chair Woollett asked Mr. Garcia if he was aware that there were multiple plans?

Mr. Garcia stated he was aware that the applicant and applicant's representatives had met with the community, and they continued to meet with the OPA and OPA Board.

Liberty Grayson, address on file, stated he was a resident that was impacted by the Salem development. He was present to discuss the 7 objectives that the City had required of Salem and which none of the plans that Salem submitted had fulfilled. Salem needed to come up with a plan that encapsulated the minimum requirements the City encouraged Salem to presume and rightly so, Salem had a chance to positively work with its neighbors and lesson Salem's impact on the community and be an inviting place that brought together the equestrian, OPA and residential communities. Salem needed to tap its best resource, the neighbors. The project objectives under 2.2.3 The Salem School's Specific Plan Executive Summary were as follows:

1. Obtain the most suitable land use pattern for the campus with a functional and aesthetic relationship.
2. Ensure the quality appearance for Salem Church with consistent design and visual improvements and blending proposed facility with existing facility.
3. An efficient internal circulation system to alleviate unnecessary project traffic overflow onto adjacent streets while ensuring the functional needs of the campus.
4. Maintain comparative on site open space and recreational amenities of the campus while meeting the program's needs.
5. Provide a comprehensive well rounded master plan for the property that addressed environmental, water quality, circulation and public facility and services.
6. Create a water quality drainage system that minimized off site receiving waters.
7. Incorporate a sustainable design technique in the redesign plans for the campus.

In most cases Salem's plan had not met those objectives, but the neighbors plans met or surpassed the objectives, in many instances in phases that could be implemented quickly while keeping Salem operating. On April 19, 2012 the residents would be meeting with the Salem representatives for the first time in 5 years to discuss the resident's plan for east Frank Lane and the Salem development. If Salem worked with the community until the changes were implemented there would not be as much distain and opposition. Salem could have the best plan possible if Salem used its most valuable resource, the neighbors and community.

Chair Woollett asked where the 7 items had been pulled from?

Mr. Grayson stated they were from Salem Lutheran's Specific Plan Executive Summary, on pages 2-3, section 2.2.3.

Tom Grayson, address on file, stated he was a resident of Frank Lane. He stated he was addressing the issues of the plan, based on his 35 years of experience as a Project Manager of Cal State Fullerton, he just recently retired. He had observed many issues about safety and liability. He would address some of those issues with the Salem plan. One of the main objectives of any project would be to implement in its design a facility with minimum liability to the University, minimum liability was what he wanted to address in the Specific Plan. The Salem Lutheran Church and School was not a community church and school, it was a commuter church and school and there were 500 vehicles that went in and out of the site. With any facility there was functionality that needed to be built into the design. His 35 years of Cal State Fullerton experience dictated that the design needed to be incorporated into the physical elements into the function. The purpose of that was to leave it up to human programs or human management that had not worked. In a very short time all good intentions would go out the window and liability emerged. Cal State Fullerton developed policies to build into each project a functionality element that would minimize the reliance on human management for issues that concerned liability. The resident's plan had gone to considerable lengths to eliminate liability. He and his wife had been taking photos and sending them to City Staff and they were very concerned with what went on at Salem. One could not rely on good intentions and that had been shown with Salem not working with the residents. Salem needed to function independently with minimal impact to the community. Salem was not able to function within its own boundaries. The resident plan would go a long way in creating an environmental optimal envelope for the Salem school, the commuters, the community, the horses and residents. Please postpone any decisions until the residents were able to present their plan to the Salem representatives.

Laura Thomas, address on file, stated she was president of OPA and they had met with the Salem representatives and they would continue to do that. Recently between those meetings the neighbors had gotten together and created a project concept. When they met last time with Salem representatives they asked for a meeting with the neighbors as they had a thoughtful plan. The timing presented itself with some members not available and the meeting was set for April 19, 2012. She was asking for a postponement of any final decision or vote on the proposed Salem project before them. She had read through the minutes and she felt it was worth the time to step back and allow the community to work together and understand the ideas. It was an opportunity for the neighbors, Salem, and OPA to work together to bring something that would make things right.

Linda Cunningham, address on file, stated she concurred with the previous speakers and she hoped that the DRC would postpone any decisions on the proposed projects until they met with the Salem representatives with their plan; it was a beautiful plan that addressed every issue that had been out there for several years and would be a win-win for everyone.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion. He asked Mr. Madden to address the upcoming meeting to be held with the residents and the plan that had been brought up during the Public Comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Madden stated in 2008, before he was involved, there had been meetings with several residents and from that meeting an email memo was put together with the concerns and issues. The last plan that had been presented to the DRC in 2006 or 2007, and the memo that subsequently followed raised some issues. There was a request for access to Santiago, request for physical separation on Frank Lane, to review the circulation and parking, to review the location of the worship center and from that memo concept diagrams were put together that were in the Specific Plan. Those addressed step by step how the issues and concerns would be addressed. The concept plans moved forward. The team decision, in conversations with Salem and the neighbors was to move forward with the concepts that were in the plan being proposed to the DRC. At some point in time the Specific Plan and EIR had to move forward to allow the process to begin. For the design and entitlement processes there were reviews, comments and recommendations; the NOI and draft EIR had gone out and they received comments from the neighbors and they had been meeting with the neighbor groups, the OPA groups and they had met in November to speak to the plan. There were ideas about the Santiago entry and it might not be the best idea as there were concerns about the horses and impacts to the horse trail. There were other alternatives proposed. There was discussion about demolishing Fowler House and moving the preschool. There was discussion regarding Frank Lane. There were many opinions and they took the comments and had met in November, February and on March 29 and they took the ideas and discussed how the concerns would be addressed. Input as they received from all sources would be taken into consideration and the plans were reviewed with the groups and they were pleased with the plan, they met with City Staff to review the issues that they were addressing with the community and some of the ideas presented. At the March 29 meeting with the OPA there had been indication that the neighbors had put together a plan and they wanted to meet to review that plan. That meeting would take place on April 19, 2012. As new ideas were presented the process would continue to move forward with all the information received and in the end they would have a plan that satisfied the most people before they went before the City Council. The final plan would take into consideration the input from City Staff, community meetings, through DRC and Planning Commission recommendations and eventual recommendations from the City Council. During the process the plan would change with conditions that would apply and it was part of the process.

Chair Woollett stated the plans before them represented Salem's response to their own objectives and with what had been presented to them by the community in the past. He asked if the Salem representatives had met with any community groups since the last DRC meeting.

Mr. Madden stated no.

Mr. Garcia stated Staff had reviewed the resubmitted plans that responded to comments made at the previous DRC meeting; they had the environmental documents and a Specific Plan that was before them. The plan was conceptual and there could be changes to that plan. They were reviewing the standards and guidelines of the Specific Plan, the written documents and not the drawings, the documents that set the guidelines for the plans. Potentially there could be changes to the plans, however, they would still need to comply with the standards and guidelines. They were moving along with the process.

Committee Member Fox stated the DRC was evaluating the draft EIR, Specific Plan and a conceptual site plan. She asked if they could present a forward motion on the draft EIR and Specific Plan, separate from the conceptual plan?

Mr. Garcia stated as a Planner they would be reviewing the plan to ensure that they complied with the written documents.

Chair Woollett stated there could be other drawings that complied with the written documents, plans that could differ from the plans that were before them.

Senior Planner, Chad Ortlieb, stated that was correct. They could parse out their recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council in any manner that they chose.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC's action would be based on what was before them.

Committee Member Fox stated on any revisions or modifications to the plans that the applicant might have based on the meeting with the neighbors, those would go back through Staff review for traffic circulation issues.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct, any subsequent plans would be reviewed to ensure that they complied with the language in the Specific Plan and the environmental documents.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if the plans changed considerably and the Specific Plan would no longer apply what would the next step be?

Mr. Garcia stated an amendment to the Specific Plan would be required with the plan being brought back to the DRC for their review.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could discuss the conceptual plan before them with the understanding that as the plan evolved with any significant changes that it would return to the DRC for review.

Chair Woollett asked the community members if the plan that they were proposing to present to the Salem's representatives would change any aspects of the Specific Plan?

Mr. Grayson stated he was not familiar with the language of the Specific Plan. The proposal to the neighbors would alter traffic patterns, impact on the community, the existing structures and their proposal was a phased plan. There were plans that he had reviewed from the Salem representatives that could be incorporated into what the neighbors proposed.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC would be going through the process for the Specific Plan for Salem Lutheran and there would be more highly developed drawings at a future date. The purview of the DRC was only for a portion of the Specific Plan which was primarily for aesthetics. There were other issues that would be dealt with at the Planning Commission level. They wanted to be responsive to the community's concerns, but also to the task before them and the process.

Committee Member Fox stated the Specific Plan had many objectives and language that was very good and she believed the plan that was being presented was not a good match with the objectives of the Specific Plan. For her there were many issues with the plan; but there were smaller issues in the Specific Plan and possibly they could come together on some agreement to making changes to the Specific Plan and not the site plan.

Chair Woollett stated there were site plans included in the Specific Plan.

Committee Member Fox stated she was not ready to approve the Specific Plan as presented, but it was closer to where they needed to be. The objectives were clear it needed good circulation and separation on Frank Lane and there were many objectives that were very clear.

Chair Woollett asked if there were some specific changes she wanted to address?

Committee Member Fox stated there was a modification to the preschool going from a 32' to 26' height and she agreed with that. There were some changes that had been made to color choices and those had been handled well. There were other issues that the applicants had not agreed with and those needed to be discussed further. The issue on chain link, the height limit of the worship center and there were some landscape issues.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a landscape menu, but not a plant selection. In specific areas there was one candidate that would be head and shoulders above the rest.

Committee Member Fox stated there was also the issue on the Frank Lane median and she was not in favor of the wording that was proposed. The part that was not acceptable was that in reading the proposed language it would appear that enhanced paving and Bott's dots would be acceptable as a combination.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had the same concern, however, he realized that the plan would be returning to the DRC with that specific design. The information before them was setting the standard and guidelines of what could be used. They would review a final design.

Mr. Garcia stated the plan would come back for a Staff review and not necessarily return to the DRC.

Committee Member Fox stated if that was the case then the language needed to include the requirement for split rail fence and that should be in the Specific Plan.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would propose a condition that the plan needed to return to the DRC.

Chair Woollett stated in the Specific Plan there were items listed and the applicant often would take the attitude that they could choose from that in any manner that they wished; the view from the DRC was that there could be a requirement for specific items.

Committee Member McCormack stated that would be the case if all items were equal, but many times that was not the case. With the plant palette, most of the choices were equal and picking one tree over another could work.

Chair Woollett stated with Bott's dots they could choose just to use those and none of the other choices listed for the Frank Lane separation elements.

Committee Member McCormack stated there needed to be a hierarchy of what needed to be installed, such as the split rail fence which needed to be there and they could add enhanced paving and Bott's dots if they chose those.

Committee Member Fox stated they could condition that a split rail fence be used with breaks as needed and the use of Bott's dots and enhanced paving for those areas; and with the majority to be split rail with the opportunity to use other elements for emergency access and such.

Chair Woollett stated in their action they needed to be specific.

Mr. Madden stated on the design and separation of Frank Lane it carried many opinions. Some of the comments that they had heard were that the residents wanted the separation, others wanted openings and others preferred just the Bott's dots. There were notes regarding previous meetings and the general consensus was that there should be options for providing the lane separation. As the plan came together with all the input for the design of Frank Lane; personally he believed there should be the split rail fence with some openings, but the ultimate design for that area would be a combination of one or all of the different materials of split rail fence, enhanced paving and Bott's dots.

Chair Woollett stated that particular issue would be one that the DRC should reserve any final action on.

Committee Member Imboden stated in light of what the applicant had just stated it was within the purview of the DRC to make a determination such as an approval of the project would include split rail fence, with additional materials as determined and the details would not need to be left open.

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct.

Committee Member Fox stated the height of the worship center was also an issue and she believed 39' was too high and that 36' was a better height limit. It created a hierarchy for the sanctuary, but not such a looming mass. She thought possibly a setback might be imposed where the peak would be allowed to avoid having a 39' peak right up against the property. It might be a way to layer in a condition to avoid having the mass right up against neighboring residential properties.

Committee Member Wheeler stated his primary issue was the chain link fence. He presented photos of where the fence posts had been welded together to add an additional 6' to the fence. In his calculation, the fence worked at 6', but at 12' the fence would not work structurally and with vines, as proposed, added to the 12' mass it would create a safety hazard and having the fence

fall over in a heavy wind. He was opposed to the chain link fence, visually, and the other fences in the neighborhood appeared to have been there for quite some time. There were some new colored ones around tennis courts and so forth. To approve chain link because others existed in the neighborhood was not a good argument as the DRC had not approved any of the existing chain link fences in that area. They would not have approved a chain link fence in Orange as it was against the rules. The fence needed to go. Another argument that had been presented by the applicant in favor of having the chain link fence was to have a boundary for the ball play field areas. At the last meeting he had suggested the use of tubular steel fencing, except where ball control was needed, and for those areas to use rectangular pre-coated fabric fences. There were many around Disneyland and Knott's Berry Farm and those would provide for ball control and be much more attractive. That type of fencing might not comply with the OPA guidelines, but it was a much better choice than the use of chain link. He was prepared to offer a condition as follows: That the applicant not install new chain link fencing at the north end of the property, but instead to install new 8' maximum height steel tube fencing in that area and that all existing chain link shall be removed and replaced with maximum 6' height square tube fencing, except in the area where ball control was necessary, those areas could have welded wire fabric fencing with a maximum height to be determined by the zoning code with the color of the mesh to match the steel tube fencing. He believed the 12' height was an existing non-conforming condition.

Mr. Madden stated with the school kids at play there was a lot that could be done with tubular steel and he was not certain why the 12' height had existed. In terms of the vine on chain link, that was seen everywhere and it was done successfully. The issue of seeing through the fence or not seeing through the fence, there were hedge rows along Santiago Canyon in front of the fencing. There was ground cover and vegetation along Orange Park Acres. The other thing that was important was along the equestrian facility was that there was a 30' plus drop there and if the fencing had to be changed along that area that it should be secure fencing. There was a visual and a far less visual edge. If the fencing needed to be changed he would want a recommendation be added. The chain link that existed had been there for a long time and served a purpose in keeping kids safe. The 12' stretch could be taken down and if the Committee felt strongly about the condition of that fence they could make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Fox stated she would not approve the proposal with the chain link fencing.

Mr. Madden stated Committee Member Fox had asked for some examples of where the chain link fence occurred and there was some with Bougainvillea across the street and it was fully covered.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a code that dictated no chain link fencing.

Mr. Garcia stated the Specific Plan allowed for chain link fencing.

Committee Member Imboden stated he agreed that the 12' portion of fence had to be dealt with, and he was not certain as the fence existed that it was a safe condition for the children. One of the vines that had been chosen for the fence was Wisteria and that would not be an appropriate vine, it would not be attractive in the winter and would rip the fence apart in a matter of a few

years. It would not be a proper vine treatment for that fence and should be removed from the plan language. There was discussion about a masonry wall on page 7 of the Staff Report, that discussed the height of the masonry wall of 6' to 10' high, it was in the minutes, the Specific Plan it stated a maximum height of 8'. The Specific Plan only referenced a portion of the wall and would they want to limit the height of all walls in the Specific Plan language. If the Specific Plan remained silent on a height limit, would the City ordinance need to be followed as it pertained to height limits of fences?

Mr. Garcia stated that was correct, with a maximum height being 6'.

Chair Woollett asked "maximum for low side and maximum for high side?"

Mr. Ortlieb stated "high side 10', low side 6'."

Committee Member Imboden asked Mr. Garcia if Staff was under the conviction that the proposed plan complied with the City standards?

Mr. Garcia stated yes.

Committee Member Imboden asked as the Specific Plan remained silent, the City standards would need to be adhered to for any new fencing?

Mr. Garcia stated yes, they would need to be at a 6' maximum height.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wanted to ensure that the applicant understood that. He was not clear on exterior lighting, and he understood the plan before them was conceptual. The lighting was noted as being submitted for Site Plan Review, which was an administrative process and those details would not go back to the DRC for review. There was another area that it was noted that the plan would return to the DRC and he was wanting clarification on the process.

Mr. Garcia stated the lighting would go through a department Site Plan Review and also to the Orange Police Department for their review. The details for lighting would not typically return to the DRC.

Committee Member Imboden stated on the issue of lighting, the language for parking lot lighting stated it shall avoid spillage of light and he would prefer the word prevent be used, rather than avoid; as the word avoid would indicate that spillage might still occur and prevent would mean it would not occur. On reconstruction, in the event of a calamity; and that language was used a number of times; should Salem Lutheran choose to demolish a building and build a new one there was no provision for that and the language should cover other situations. With the items that came back that had not been in agreement with what the DRC had recommended he would leave those issues up to the other DRC members, as he was not present for that initial discussion. He had agreed with the comments that had been made and he agreed with having some control with the height limits and the fence issues that had been discussed.

Committee Member McCormack stated from a landscape perspective he had been anxious to review the plans and he was having trouble with the Specific Plan; on the cross section there was

a statement that there was a 4' shoulder and 16' double lane, and he understood that a fire lane was 25'. In the initial Staff Report it called for a 26' paved traffic surface and was there a discrepancy on where the split rail fence was intended to be installed per fire requirements? Unless there was a hardship, the fire access could go to 20'. He was coming up with some discrepancies when he reviewed the daily flow for the school. He pointed out a tree that would not be able to remain with the proposed daily church circulation and he wondered why they had not received the rest of the plan. The plan for Frank Lane was not complete and in reviewing the turn around area there was not complete information for that.

Mr. Madden stated there was not a proposal for a turnaround. In entering the preschool, there was a hammerhead turn around for the Fire Department.

Committee Member McCormack stated there were in-bound lanes and 2 out bound lanes, the traffic came in and there needed to be some type of turn around lane.

Mr. Madden stated as it was a preschool those parents would need to park. The Fire Department emergency lane was on the north side and explained in exhibit 4.14. The Fire Department had reviewed that access.

Committee Member McCormack stated the edge was an asphalt and fence edge without a landscape edge to it. There was nothing to mitigate the fence and the Specific Plan had a notation for mitigation of fencing.

Mr. Madden stated they were asked not to touch that edge.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was not certain how the Specific Plan would be applied to that situation. His biggest concern was about the field and getting bigger trees there and the ground plane treatment. The plan was difficult to read. There was a 5' tree well and another 18" on each side. With that space for a Sycamore tree, he was hoping to get a little more of a ground plane gesture, which was not so urban. There was a tree well, then the concrete and there was 41' of asphalt before the architecture. There might be some other landscape treatment for the edges. The Sycamores and Eucalyptus trees were the prominent natural landscape aesthetic. There may be something more that could be done around that paved area. The trees would need to be maintained and the ground plane needed some relief.

Mr. Madden stated there was criteria for a student play area in the parking area, and those would also be used for sports courts and there was the multi purpose area with the play field that was also used for parking. They attempted to incorporate the flavor of the entrance along Santiago to wrap that around the parking lot to create separation between the parking lot and play courts. It was a less formal arrangement than initially presented, but to still respect the parameters of the play court area. At the conceptual level they wanted to set the tone for what the landscape would need to be.

Committee Member McCormack stated if they chose not to green up the ground plane further, he suggested for the large trees where the roots were forced under the concrete to use structural soil. It was a proprietary element developed at Cornel University. The material was a soil that would allow the tree roots to migrate under the concrete to find their water source.

Mr. Madden stated those were recommendations that could move forward.

Committee Member McCormack stated with turf planted in sand there needed to be a lot of water to keep the turf alive. With the water use calculation, he suggested that the turf not be labeled as moderate water use, but a high water use. The playing field was needed, but the amount of water that was needed for the turf area as proposed would be high.

Mr. Madden stated they had prepared a preliminary water usage report.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was suggesting that they review the report to understand that the water usage would be extremely high. The Sycamores should be those chosen from column A. The only other change that he suggested was on the bio retention areas, the plant choices were good, but it lacked the most important plant that would reside at the bottom of the retention area. The choice would be for a plant that could withstand being under water, his choice would be Leymus. He had stood at the Fowler House and there were some big pipes and he wondered where the water would go; he assumed that area would have a significant revision.

Mr. Madden asked if he had reviewed the hydrology plan and analysis in the EIR? Some of the water was put into zones with other areas captured in storm water and piped out. All of that had been taken into consideration and was included in section 4.5 of the draft EIR.

Chair Woollett stated he wanted to address the comments already brought forth.

Mr. Garcia stated in Chapter 7 of the Specific Plan it addressed the implementation and administration of the proposal, specifically section 8.4.4 and the site plan review submittal process. There was a list for required information and items that would be added to encompass such items as the Bott's dots and light standards; those could be recommendations for additions to those lists if the Committee chose to do that.

Chair Woollett stated he understood that after the Site Plan Review process the plan might not necessarily return to the DRC.

Mr. Garcia stated after the Site Plan Review it would come back to the DRC. They could add anything additional that they wanted to review, such as a comprehensive sign program.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC had a choice to attempt to put together their various comments in an action or to continue the item with a request by Staff to compile those comments; and he felt per the discussion that no Committee Member had taken issue with the concerns that had been brought forth.

Committee Member Fox stated she still had an issue with the massing and height issue on the worship center and she was wanting to discuss mitigation measures for that height. The elevation and site plan presented had not mitigated the height as there had been some large trees added to one side of the building. It affected her ability to approve the Specific Plan with the height limits proposed.

Chair Woollett stated he had previously stated there were good reasons for the 39' height based on the type of building it was. Since that time there had been a review of another project, the Chapman University's Performing Arts building where the floor of that building had been lowered to mitigate the appearance. If the height of the building was lowered from 39' to 36' the floor could be lowered and it would not necessarily change the interior space.

Committee Member Fox stated they were pleased with the alternate plan that had been presented at the last DRC review; the building had been placed closer to Santiago and in that situation the height would be more appropriate.

Chair Woollett stated the proximity of the building to Santiago, as he understood it, was a huge neighborhood issue. The neighbors on the south side of Frank Lane would see the height, but the neighbors on the other side were concerned with seeing the building from Santiago.

Mr. Garcia stated that had been an issue in the submittal back in 2006.

Committee Member Fox stated the problem could be solved for both of those issues with a height reduction.

A member of the public spoke, Ms. Cunningham asked if the DRC was aware that the Salem property was already elevated and the height would actually be closer to 40-something feet.

Chair Woollett stated they would need to review where the measurement was taken from. If the building was on a mound it could be higher. There would be a site plan submission that would return to the DRC at a later date.

Committee Member Fox stated the Specific Plan would remain with the project and the site plan would change, especially in light of the meeting that would be held with the community. It would be helpful to nail down recommendations for the Specific Plan.

Mr. Garcia stated that was what Staff was looking for.

Chair Woollett stated there were issues that had been raised by the neighbors and many of the issues such as traffic were not within their purview. The DRC had a choice, to provide a recommendation with some specific requests related to the design issues that related to the Specific Plan and not the conceptual drawings. They could address some specific items and move the project to the Planning Commission, understanding that the plan details would return to the DRC. There were some items that would be left more open than they might want them to be, such as the fencing and division of Frank Lane.

Committee Member Fox stated there were several little parts.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC could review their notes and the issues that had been presented and attempt to put those comments together as conditions or recommendations with further discussion to ensure that all the components of the project and the concerns raised were addressed.

Committee Member Fox stated they would be making a motion on the Specific Plan and the draft EIR and not the site plan?

Chair Woollett stated the site plan was included in the Specific Plan.

Committee Member Fox stated they would need to make recommendations that would be acceptable to them, understanding that the site plan would return.

Mr. Garcia stated the recommendations would need to be tied to the Specific Plan in order to move the item to the Planning Commission and they needed to avoid getting too caught up in the conceptual plan.

Chair Woollett stated any comments that were gathered from the community meetings would be shared with the Planning Commission.

Committee Member Fox stated there were several items in the memorandum from Salem, such as the chain link that the DRC would be rejecting.

Mr. Madden stated it was a Specific Plan and the site plan was referenced in the documents of that plan; they spoke about the fencing, building height and landscape and it would be very helpful to put their concerns or requests into a recommendation to the Planning Commission with language that would cover what the DRC was desiring.

The Committee Members reviewed and discussed their comments and concerns to put together a motion.

Mr. Garcia stated, for the applicant's clarification, the DRC would also want to see a comprehensive sign program that would include way finding and the aesthetic elements of colors and materials. He asked if that would want to be brought back with the site plan review or in a separate presentation?

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want to see it as it pertained to other elements, such as if there would be signage on the split rail fence. It would be a big design element.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Wheeler made motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4538-11, Salem Lutheran Church and School, subject to the conditions in the Staff Report and subject to the findings in the Staff Report with the following conditions as recommended to the Planning Commission:

- First, that the height of the worship center be reduced to 36'.
- Second, that the separation on Frank Lane that was shown to be made up of split rail fencing, textured pavement, Bott's dots with the final details of that separation to be submitted to the DRC as part of the Site Plan Review.
- The applicant shall not install new chain link fencing in the northwest portion of the property and instead install new 6' maximum height square tube fencing in that area and that all existing chain link fencing to be removed and replaced with new square tube 6'

fencing, except where ball control fencing in the athletic field is required and that to be pre-finished rectangular welded wire fabric fencing with a maximum height of 6' with color of welded wire fabric fencing and support posts to match the new steel tube fencing.

- Next recommended condition that exterior lighting design to return to the DRC as part of the Site Plan Review.
- Next item reconstruction of any structures on the property can be for reasons other than calamity.
- Next item that the sign program for the project to be resubmitted to this Committee at Site Plan Review.
- Mr. Garcia stated on the sign program to be a comprehensive sign program to include way finding, directional and those details to include that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would include that. And in addition to those recommended conditions they had some other recommendations:

- one that structural soil be employed at the

Committee Member McCormack stated that should be a condition.

Chair Woollett stated:

- where trees would be planted adjacent to pavement.

Committee Member Wheeler stated all right, with the following recommendations:

- that the Sycamore to be the major tree.

Committee Member McCormack stated that should be a condition.

Committee Member Wheeler stated okay up that to a condition:

- on the plant material, add that one at the bottom of the retention basin.

Committee Member McCormack stated:

- the plant material at the bottom of the retention basin to be Leymus.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there was any other?

Mr. Garcia stated they had spoken about the Wisteria not being used.

Committee Member Fox stated they would not have that as there would be no chain link fence.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had no aversion to Wisteria; he had an aversion to Wisteria on a chain link fence.

SECOND: Carol Fox
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4528-11 – LOTUS WELLNESS CENTER

- The applicant is proposing modifications to the exterior elevations of an approved proposal by the DRC on August 3, 2011 for the expansion to an existing commercial building for a chiropractic and acupuncture center.
- 900 E. Lincoln Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Previous DRC Review: August 3, 2011 & April 4, 2012
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Doug Ely, address on file, stated he had taken the comments provided at the preliminary review to heart. They had taken everything into consideration and Committee Member McCormack had provided suggestions on chains and roof drains and Committee Member Fox had input on a holistic approach. He further developed the design with more natural elements. He reviewed the changes that were incorporated and reviewed the proposal with the Committee Members. He pointed out the changes on the plans before them. He presented some 3 dimensional views of the plan. He pointed out where additional landscape treatment would be placed. He stated the existing roofing would not be concealed, but rather there would be a blend of roofs. The Committee Members reviewed the plans and changes with the applicant. The roof drainage was reviewed and there would be a chain that tied into a scupper. On the parking lot side of the project they created window frame trellises with brackets set out from the wall with a bit of room for pots and plants that would grow up into those window frame trellises and he had integrated the design elements around the entire building.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett stated it was a very sophisticated response and sophisticated enough that people would miss it. It was subtle, honest and meritorious. It could be submitted for a design award and it was an outstanding proposal. He opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Fox stated she would take the risk in making a motion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the area where the shed roofs extended past the parapets he suggested to allow the roof to flow around those a bit.

Chair Woollett stated that had been done in some of the areas.

Mr. Ely pointed out where that had been done.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the trees had been incorporated in the landscape plan.

Mr. Ely stated he had colored the landscape plan and had added some trees.

Mr. Garcia stated there was a tree requirement that would need to be met.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was an area that was noted as landscape area, but it pointed off site.

Mr. Ely stated those were previously approved plans.

Committee Member Fox stated that appeared to be a landscaped area between the fences.

Mr. Garcia stated that was the original submittal that was approved with the trees along the perimeter and that plan was still applicable.

Mr. Ely stated there would be two additional trees added.

Committee Member Imboden stated there was a 10' setback shown and he asked for clarification.

Mr. Garcia stated that was noted to show that the 10' setback requirement had been met.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would not want to loose any trees based on the setback requirement.

Mr. Garcia stated that would not be the case.

Committee Member McCormack asked what the chains would end in?

Mr. Ely stated on the parking lot side that would be pots with some sort of drainage. On the other side there would be some type of crushed rock with overflow to the planting areas.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4528-11, Lotus Wellness Center, based on the findings of the Staff Report and with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Committee Member Imboden stated he appreciated the applicant and the designer and he believed it was a situation where the process had made for a better project and it required both sides of the table to have made that happen. It was a very nice project.

SECOND: Tim McCormack
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4616-12 – MICHA RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a detached 628 sq. ft. accessory unit, relocate a one-car garage, and provide two open parking spaces on a site with a contributing 1926 Provincial Residence and garage. Project includes a Variance to exceed 50% lot coverage over the existing residence and a request for relief from the construction of two enclosed parking spaces.
- 545 E. Jefferson Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

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

Applicant, Doug Ely, address on file, stated he could go through all the issues subject by subject. The property owners bought the property with an existing unit behind the garage and they received a letter from Code Enforcement that the unit was not permitted; they were happy with the way the unit existed. He presented photos of the unit. The challenge was to respect the historic nature of the primary residence and the garage and they had looked at several different site arrangements. They had met with Mr. Frankel and with City Staff to look at alternatives, and they found that the best way to preserve the existing characteristics of the house and garage would be to stay away from them. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards stated goals should be met by not touching the existing property; and if that was not possible to touch it minimally and to be compatible with the existing characteristics. All the alternatives that they explored required moving the garage. He presented photos of the garage. He wanted to leave the garage as close to the street at they could and in one scenario the garage would be shifted 20' to allow for cars to be parked and space that would be attributable to the primary residence. He initially looked at requesting 2 variances, one being the 50% rule, and what was legal by the current residence was to add additional square footage to the primary residence, however, that was something the property owners had not wanted to do. From a design standpoint the changes he proposed were all respective of the primary residence. The roof of the house had a very steep roof pitch. There were comments in the Standards regarding additions and what was recommended was in designing an addition to clearly have what was existing and what was new be identifiable. He proposed to separate the addition and to design the unit with a lower plate height with slab on grade, and he had chosen not to replicate the high pitch roof. He proposed an 8 and 12 pitch roof. The design he proposed was representative of the time, and a present day home was designed around a kitchen and a great room and he had incorporated that concept into his design. The garage would take prominence on the site with the addition being subservient to that. He presented a site plan that everyone had seemed to be in favor of. There was also an existing tree on the property and the challenge was with the garage arrangement and taking steps to preserve the tree. He presented some photos and explained the placement of the different components on the site.

Mr. Ely also stated the addition would be 2 bedrooms with 1 bath and 628 square feet, he pointed out the placement of the tree and the other details of the addition. There were windows that were around the corner and closer to the corner and Mr. Ryan had pointed out that the windows were not an Old Towne feature, but the application was a current day application. The trim around the window was identical to the existing residence. The Staff Report stated Mr. Ryan had not know what type of design to call the proposal and that was what he was trying to achieve, he had not wanted it to look like a Craftsman or a Bungalow. The drawings had not shown the rafter tails and he was proposing exposed rafter tails.

Applicant, John Micha, address on file, stated he had bought the property when his son was a student at Chapman and there was the second little studio in the back and it had been purchased through the Ricci Group and everything was fine and then they received the notice from the City. It was disappointing as there was a functional unit there. They would tear it down if they needed to and would design a cottage that would fit in.

Applicant, Vicki Micha, stated the house was a doll house and she wanted to still have the doll house. The other thing that concerned her was moving it back and having more concrete. She wanted to keep the current feel of the property.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated as was mentioned, he had appreciated that Mr. Ely had brought them on early on to review the project. It was a complex project as far as the Staff Report was concerned and a lot of recommendations included in that. What was driving the project was the garage and the tree; it if was up to them the garage should not be moved as it changed the relationship of the buildings on site. The OTPA would want the garage to move at the minimum and although he loved Avocado trees, if he had to choose between the garage and tree he would loose the tree. If the building could not be accommodated on the lot the size of the unit might need to be reduced. He had not agreed with the comment in the Staff Report that stated most garages were at the rear of properties in Old Towne and moving the garage to the rear would be inappropriate. The foundation should be a raised foundation and the accessory structure should reference the main building, but not mimic it. The roof pitch would be hard to replicate. All materials should be in kind materials. He had met with Mr. Ely and with the City and it was an ongoing project.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion. He asked Committee Member McCormack what the cost would be to replace an Avocado tree that was bearing fruit?

Committee Member McCormack stated he believed that could not be done. Another tree would need to be moved and he had not seen an Avocado tree in a 36” box. He had seen a tree in a 24” box and getting a big huge tree in a box would require a lot to get the right one in aerated soil.

Chair Woollett stated he wanted some more information on the existing non-permitted unit. There were no retroactive requirements on the design.

Mr. Ryan stated he had to duck somewhere inside the unit. If an accessory structure had been approved in the past there would have needed to be parking for the unit. Sometimes people

constructed a rumpus room next to the garage and then eventually a bathroom and kitchen would get added, and those units were easier to change into an accessory unit.

Chair Woollett stated the parking could be met without building a new unit and in order to provide a new parking space the garage would need to be moved and in moving the garage the existing unit would need to be moved and he was trying to understand what was wrong with the existing unit that was driving them to tear down the existing unit and build new?

Mr. Ryan stated the unit was substandard due to the construction height and minimum floor area.

Mr. Micah stated it was a 1960's building, but all the plumbing and electrical had been upgraded.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was a non-permitted second unit and it needed to be brought up to code to be legal.

Mr. Ryan stated the parking needed to be upgraded and there was no place for that with the current placement of the buildings. He and Mr. Ely spoke about moving the building back 3' which would allow for open space on the site.

Committee Member Fox asked what the required separation was for buildings on the site, when they were not attached?

Mr. Ryan stated 10' in front of the entrance door and they were asking for 6' eave to eave and the code was 6' building to building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if the owners were happy with the existing 300 square foot structure why was the proposed new unit so much bigger?

Ms. Micah stated they were investing a lot of money and she would not want to move her son into a little thing and at that point they wanted something nicer.

Mr. Ely stated they had looked at a 450 square foot addition, but to have the bedrooms and layout as proposed he could not get to that.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if he had looked into a 1 ½ story using the attic space for a 2nd bedroom?

Mr. Ely stated to keep away from having a higher roof; they had not wanted to compete with the home's roof form. They had used a different roof pitch and the slab on grade to keep the plate height low.

Chair Woollett stated it would be helpful to discuss the reasons for moving the garage all the way to the back of the property.

Committee Member Fox stated she would suggest keeping it closer to its existing location and that 20' was the maximum amount that should be allowed to move it back. The garage movement was fine as proposed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed and suggested to move it back as little as possible.

Committee Members McCormack and Imboden stated they agreed with those comments.

Mr. Ryan stated at one point he felt moving it back would allow for more open space.

Mr. Ely stated he thought one of the dimensions of open space was 10', but not both length and width had to be met at 10'. He asked Mr. Ryan to review the open space requirements?

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could move the parking space back further without moving the garage and the design could be a more contemporary design with a low sloped roof, slab on grade and treat the addition as a more modern addition. Slab on grade for that approach would be appropriate; but if the design would be incorporating matching elements to the existing residents, a similar roof pitch and same siding then to him it should feel compatible with the way it was done in the past with a raised floor especially with a porch.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had not had a problem with the building being slab on grade; it was a contemporary building that stood next to another building that was slab on grade and would not create a negative impact on the historic resource that existing on the site. He agreed that placing it on grade would be a better response if the overall design was treated differently.

Committee Member McCormack stated he took it from the perspective of what would he do if it was his addition. It was next to another building that was slab on grade, but that building was a garage and it had to be slab on grade. He would not do a slab on grade. He would dig down deeper and have the crawl space be deeper.

Committee Member Imboden stated the net result would be the same. With a raised foundation that was so close to a slab elevation he would question why they would want to do that, they were not gaining anything.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the most problematic issue was the complexity of the proposal, with all the gables and it seemed so busy for an accessory unit. He felt the main house should be the star and it was a relatively simple form which was part of the beauty of it.

Committee Member Fox stated it upstaged the main property and she felt that slab on grade was fine and it would stay subordinate to the main structure by doing that. The roof forms completely went against that by creating an incredibly complex roof system on the addition and there was a line of sight that would have the addition be visible from the street. She thought the massing that was initially proposed was much better; it was a balance of space and subordinate to the main house. She felt the layout was unusual and if the living space was more forward the other criteria might be met. She agreed with having a front door closer to the front to help emphasize the unit as an accessory structure.

Mr. Ely stated he had started with the other design and the roof pitch was too tall and they had attempted to narrow it, also the living space was closer to the tree.

Committee Member Fox suggested turning the gable on the roof the other way.

Committee Member Wheeler presented a photo and suggested they use the form that had already been there for 60 years and to keep a low sloped single pitch roof.

Mr. Ely stated he had not considered that, he was looking at a more current day approach and that had not been done recently in Old Towne.

Chair Woollett stated one of the things they found was applicants often presented proposals with preconceptions of what the DRC would accept and what they would not accept. He believed Mr. Ely had a little more freedom in the approach and the main building was a one of a kind of building in the City and it would allow for a lot more freedom in the design for the accessory unit.

Committee Member Fox stated she would advocate for a roof that hit the mark of the roof that was in the front if the gable went across and way behind the garage. She reviewed the plans with the applicant.

Mr. Ely stated in reviewing the Staff Report there was a different direction and he just wanted to know what way he should interpret the Old Towne design standards and the historic standards, there was room for doing something more contemporary and he was not certain how far to push the envelope. He asked why the entrance needed to be at the front?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he personally had not felt it needed to be there and it could be anywhere. As a floor plan issue, and if the focus was the tree, he would move the living spaces and get rid of wasted hall space.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was an important project, with the changes that were taking place in zoning in Old Towne, the DRC would be charged more and more with determining how large accessory units could be and still remain secondary to historic resources. They were dealing with many of those issues in the proposed project and he agreed whole heartedly that the alternate design would net them a better project as the initial one presented was far too complex. He was not convinced that one plan over another would preserve the Avocado tree and the building would be approximately 3' from the tree trunk. He was okay with the garage moving just slightly, but the issue of the garage and the tree was forcing the design to create problems. He had previously seen so many projects come through the City where a tree had driven a project and before the project was complete the tree would be gone and he wanted to avoid seeing that and he would condition that a tree remain or if it was removed that a new tree be replaced, as he had not wanted applicant's to use a tree to drive a design component. He was not certain the tree could be preserved. He suggested that they explore the design and the desire to keep or not keep the tree.

Ms. Micha stated she loved the tree and the idea of looking out at a tree and not just a patch of dirt.

Committee Member Imboden stated if the building was too close to the tree they would not be looking out at a tree, but at the trunk of the tree.

Committee Member McCormack stated, pointing to the tree's drip line on the plans, the structure should not be there. He asked if the structure could be smaller?

Mr. Ely stated it led to a more complex design.

Committee Member Imboden stated what he was hearing was that the Committee Members were less concerned with the building height and with the house having so much detail and there were options. The ordinance of the front door facing the street was created for a main house that faced the street; and was it something that they wanted to consider as a reasonable requirement for an accessory unit? He also questioned the need for a front porch on the new unit. If a porch got under a certain size it would become unusable as a porch and why would they want to add more bulk and mass with a porch that would not function as a porch and would it just become a token obligation.

Committee Member Fox stated she was not certain that would drive more of the mass.

Mr. Ely reviewed the drawings and the details of the porch area.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would not want to encourage a porch just for the sake of having one if it was not a useable porch. If sitting in a chair on that porch and the edge of the porch was at your toes it would be as if you were sitting on the sidewalk. The existing house had a covered entry.

Committee Member Fox stated it was a covered entry.

Ms. Micah stated if they got rid of the porch, she had not wanted that to create problems if that was something they needed to have.

Mr. Micah stated one of the things about Orange was that every building was different with different shapes.

The Committee Members discussed the view from the street.

Committee Member Fox stated the Secretary of the Interior's Standards made reference to additions not competing with the historic structure, regardless of whether it was visible from the street. To not upstage the house would be important.

Chair Woollett suggested Mr. Ely take what he had and simplify the project and especially the roof.

Mr. Ely stated he had not felt as strongly in that if the complexity was not visible then it would not be an issue. It was a current day structure and it could not be perceived. When inside the unit the openness would be felt. The roof design would integrate the new structure on the site.

Committee Member Imboden stated the reason for review was to gain feedback from the DRC and the consensus was that the proposal was too complex. Dormers could be used.

Committee Member Fox stated she had no problem with the dormer in the back that faced the tree. Dormers were not a blanket no. There were 4 ridges on the smallest mass on the project. It was an aesthetic balance issue.

Mr. Ely stated the unit was a representation of what was occurring inside.

Mr. Ryan stated in building something that was too complex it would take away from the existing unit and one of the problems he had initially had. The decision needed to be made to have the unit be more similar with the same architecture of the front unit or to deviate with another concept.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was a bit nervous about doing things "ut of sight" as there were neighbors that would see it. It needed to be complementary.

Committee Member Fox stated rotating the ridge 90 degrees would also give license to giving the unit a different roof pitch.

Ms. Micah asked what if they simplified the design with a more contemporary roof?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would be fine and to even consider using the forms from the existing non-conforming shed.

Chair Woollett stated he believed they had provided sufficient input to the applicant.

Mr. Ely asked if the front porch was required?

Committee Member Imboden read from the guidelines: Each main building must have a porch or entry treatment with a shaped roof form in materials and style typical of the style and period of the building.

Chair Woollett stated that would not apply for the accessory structure.

The item was presented for preliminary review and a motion was not needed.

(5) DRC No. 4620-12 – JOHNSON RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a new rear porch roof on a 1912 Victorian residence.
- 714 E. Maple 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, Glory Johnson, address on file, stated she would be using wood and she had gone to great lengths to remove anything artificial.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated they were okay with the project and the OTPA supported the project. The rear porch was typical of the style for that era.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the new porch was shown with a gable end and it was an unfortunate situation with the suggestion of an open pediment, but it was such a low slope and a totally different detail. He suggested to have that be a hip roof to mimic the hip of the front porch.

The Committee Members reviewed the proposed plans.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the material for the porch ceiling would be?

Ms. Johnson stated it was wood.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a flat ceiling to match the ceiling of the front porch. A nice bead board could be used.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4620-12, Johnson Residence, in accordance with the conditions in the Staff Report and in accordance to the findings in the Staff Report, and with the additional condition:

- that the new rear porch roof be a hip form rather than the gable or shed form shown.

And with the recommendation:

- that the new porch ceiling be a flat ceiling with bead board or similar material.

SECOND: Joe Woollett
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4623-12- ORANGE SENIOR CENTER

- A proposal to convert a 278 sq. ft. patio into a rummage/storage room
- 170 S. Olive Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

This Item was heard as the first item on the Agenda.

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

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

Community Services Director, Marie Knight, address on file, representing the City of Orange, stated it was a very straight forward project. The expansion would assist with increasing fundraising.

Public Comment

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Fox stated it was an appropriate project and it matched the existing building.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the existing south elevation the drainage was shown as existing, but on the proposed drawings the drainage area was proposed new.

Ms. Knight stated it was being relocated.

Verbatim text:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4623-12, Orange Senior Center, patio conversion with the findings and recommendations from Staff.

SECOND: Carol Fox
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on May 2, 2012.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler
AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.