



DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE: JULY 3, 2013
TO: Chair Fox and Members of the Design Review Committee
THRU: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager
FROM: Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner
SUBJECT: VAR NO. 2229-13 AND DRC NO. 4669-13 – EIDENMULLER MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING ADDITION

SUMMARY

The applicant is proposing modifications to the rear of a fire damaged 2-story medical office building. Alterations include removal and replacement of an existing outdoor stairway and balcony/walkway, and construction of a 2-story freestanding elevator tower to achieve accessibility requirements for the second story of the building. Small building additions are proposed at the rear of the historic structure on both the first and second floors. The proposal includes a Variance request to allow for the height of the elevator tower.

RECOMMENDED ACTION – RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Staff is requesting that the DRC recommend approval of the proposed project to the Planning Commission.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant/Owner: Dr. Gerald Eidenmuller
Property Location: 615 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Orange Historic District
General Plan Designation: Old Towne Mixed Use (0.6 FAR; 15 du/acre) (OTMIX-15S)
Zoning Classification: Old Towne Mixed Use-Spoke Street (OTMU-15S)
Existing Development: Two-story, 1914 Craftsman Medical Office (adaptive reuse of historic single family residence)
Property Size: 6,057 square feet
Associated Applications: Variance No. 2229-13
Previous DRC Review: None

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public Notice for the proposed project will occur in conjunction with the Planning Commission hearing for the requested Variance.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities) as the project involves rehabilitation of a damaged structure and the installation of an elevator to meet current ADA standards.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project site is developed with a 2-story (29'8"), contributing c. 1914 Craftsman residential building that was adapted for use as a medical office building in the 1970s. Portions of the building interior were damaged by a fire in late 2011. Interior alterations include repair of fire damaged areas as well as floor plan modifications to better accommodate present-day needs of medical office tenants.

The proposed modifications to the historic 2,628 sq. ft. building include the addition of a 2-story elevator tower to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. This tower would be constructed 5' north of the northeast corner of the existing structure on a portion of the lot that is presently occupied by a storage shed, screen wall and hardscape features. The existing exterior stairway, balcony and wood railing would be removed and reconstructed to be integrated with the elevator tower. The reconstruction has been designed in a manner exposes almost the entire north elevation of the historic structure, including portions which have been obstructed from view by the existing contemporary exterior stairway and balcony.

In addition to the elevator tower, the proposed project also includes a 107 sq. ft. addition to the first floor to accommodate a radiology room (59 sq. ft.) and expanded operator (48 sq. ft.). A 37 sq. ft. expansion of the second floor entry area on the north elevation (rear) of the building is proposed in conjunction with the elevator tower and reconstructed balcony/walkway. An ADA access ramp is also proposed at the ground level leading from the parking lot to the building entrance.

The proposed building modifications and elevator tower are located at the rear of the subject property. The elevator tower would be visible from Chapman Avenue over the roofline/rooftop deck and to the east of the single-story brick wing of the first floor (east end of building). It would also be visible at an angle from the intersection of the alley running behind the building with Cleveland and Harwood Streets. The tower will not be visible to east- and westbound traffic on Chapman Avenue given its position behind the historic structure and next to a taller architectural element and roof form on the adjacent property to the east.

EXISTING SITE AND AREA CONTEXT

The property is located on the north side of the 600 block of East Chapman Avenue. It is flanked by two single-story non-contributing contemporary commercial buildings. North across an alley from the subject property is a historic single-family residential neighborhood. Houses

immediately adjacent to the alley facing Cleveland and Harwood Streets, respectively, are single story bungalows.

Structures across the street to the south are primarily single story with the exception of a 2-story contemporary office building. The single story structures consist of a contributing Streamline Moderne medical office building (c. 1930), non-contributing contemporary office building, a 1½ story contributing Craftsman residential structure (1912) adaptively reused as an office, and a contributing single story Mediterranean Revival residential structure (c. 1925) also adaptively reused as an office.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Orange Municipal Code:

Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Section 17.10.070 establishes the general criteria the Design Review Committee should use when reviewing the project. This section states the following:

The project shall have an internally consistent, integrated design theme, which is reflected in the following elements:

1. **Architectural Features.**
 - a. The architectural features shall reflect a similar design style or period.
 - b. Creative building elements and identifying features should be used to create a high quality project with visual interest and an architectural style.
2. **Landscape.**
 - a. The type, size and location of landscape materials shall support the project's overall design concept.
 - b. Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of required addressing nor shall it obstruct the vision of motorists or pedestrians in proximity to the site.
 - c. Landscape areas shall be provided in and around parking lots to break up the appearance of large expanses of hardscape.
3. **Secondary Functional and Accessory Features.** Trash receptacles, storage and loading areas, transformers and mechanical equipment shall be screened in a manner, which is architecturally compatible with the principal building(s).

Old Towne Design Standards:

The Old Towne Design Standards call for building design on the East Chapman Spoke Street to maintain the residential character of the area. With respect to materials, the Standards require residential buildings to incorporate traditional materials and details.

Secretary of Interior Standards:

The Secretary of Interior's Standards call for new additions to be differentiated from the historic structure and to be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property. Additions are also to be undertaken in a manner that maintains the essential form and integrity of the historic structure.

ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

Issue No. 1 – Elevator Tower and Exterior Stairway/Balcony:

The proposed 2-story elevator tower measures 21'4" in height, and positioned on the site to the east of the primary structure to maximize visibility of the north elevation of the historic structure. The existing 119 sq. ft. storage shed would be removed to accommodate the elevator tower and related stairs (150 sq. ft. footprint).

The development standards for the OTMU-15S zone limit the height of new construction to 32' or 2-stories, whichever is less. New construction is further limited in height, in that it may not exceed the height of adjacent buildings. Given the single-story development on properties surrounding the project site, a Variance is needed to accommodate the elevator tower.

Given the applicant's need to address ADA compliance and the footprint of the historic structure, the proposed detached elevator tower was selected as the preferred Code compliance option. Alternatives explored by the applicant included integration of an elevator shaft within the interior of the building and an attached addition at the rear of the historic structure. Under these options, the applicant determined that an internal elevator shaft resulted in a floor plan condition that was not entirely practical or functional for contemporary medical office operations. It was also concluded that an attached addition would be impactful to the otherwise largely intact north elevation of the historic structure.

Consistent with Secretary of Interior Standards, the proposed elevator tower is differentiated from the historic structure through the use of 6" horizontal wood siding to contrast, but be harmonious with, the shingle and brick exterior of the primary structure. The tower and associated stairway and balcony/walkway have been designed to allow for greater exposure of the historic north building elevation from the alley and properties to the north than presently exists. The proposed open clear laminated glass railing treatment is intended to maximize the view of the historic north elevation. The wood clad balcony supports and railing are of a simple design that is compatible with, and does not detract from, the character defining features of the primary structure.

The design of the elevator tower roof responds to the angles of the historic structure's roof and the roof form of the brick building element at the east side of the ground floor, and would be finished with composition shingle to match the primary structure's roof.

Both the design and siting of the tower function to make it subordinate to the primary historic structure. Given the utilitarian nature of the elevator tower, and high level of integrity of the primary structure, staff believes that the proposed physical separation of the elevator tower from the historic structure and its design are appropriate and consistent with both the Old Towne Design Standards and Secretary of Interior Standards.

The simple form of the elevator tower does not detract from the character defining features of the historic structure. The use of horizontal wood siding in contrast to the shingled exterior of the primary structure functions to differentiate the old from the new. As noted above, the tower's position on the site, and transparent balcony railing allow for greater exposure of the north elevation and character defining features of the structure. Although the railing design incorporates glass panels, the simple, open design of the wood vertical and horizontal members,

again, differentiate the old from the new and allow for a clear view of nearly the entire north elevation.

The tower's 63' setback from the rear property line and alley minimizes its presence from abutting neighborhood residences whose side and rear yards are adjacent to the alley. The proposed tower is oriented to a portion of the site that is adjacent to a projecting architectural feature on the building to the east, resulting in a condition where the vertical building elements are concentrated on a relatively contained footprint of the block that is visible from the alley. The residential side and rear yards adjacent to the alley are heavily landscaped and oriented in an east-west direction. These residential properties also have accessory structures built along the alley that further block potential line of sight to the elevator tower from the residences and back yards.

Issue No. 2 – Building Additions:

The building additions proposed on the north elevation occur at both the first and second floors. These additions would have a wood shingle exterior finish of a different shingle pattern and exposure from the historic building materials as a means of differentiating the historic building from the addition, with the exception of the gable end of the second floor addition. Here, the shingle pattern and exposure below the eave would match the historic shingles.

The existing historic windows would be reinstalled in the new walls on the first floor. A shed roof element would be added to the rear elevation over the CT Scan area in conjunction with the first floor building additions. The pitch of the roof would be similar to the pitch of the historic structure, and echoes the shed roof element of the entrance to the building on the south elevation (facing Chapman Avenue). The pitch of the new roof warranted slight adjustment in order to avoid impacts to the historic windows immediately above the point where the roof meets the wall.

Also in this area, an existing entry door and two windows would be removed to accommodate the addition. In addition to the reinstallation of the historic window, a new fixed window will be installed in an existing damaged window opening to the west of the CT Scan addition.

At the second floor, the proposed addition functions as an entry area to the building from the elevator tower and stairway. The addition features a clipped gable roof that responds to the pitch of the existing clipped gable roof element that it would tie into. Proposed roof material would match existing. A new wood divided light window will be installed on the west elevation of the addition, while the original historic window will be restored and reinstalled on the north elevation of the addition. A new wood panel door with four divided lights to match the existing historic door facing the parking lot at the ground floor would be installed.

The proposed building additions have been designed in a manner that differentiate them from the original historic structure, but are compatible with its character defining features. The window and door placement in the additions largely maintains the original building fenestration. Where new openings are being created, this is being done in a fashion that responds to the scale and rhythm of historic façade elements, and utilizes existing historic windows or new windows and doors compatible with the historic architecture.

While the simple form of the shed roof and second floor entry change the appearance of the north elevation, the building will retain a high level of integrity with project implementation.

These modifications provide for the necessary ADA access to be accommodated and result in a more formally defined point of entry to the building from the parking lot.

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REQUIRED FINDINGS

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

The Findings are applied as appropriate to each project. Based on the following Findings and statements in support of such Findings, staff recommends the DRC recommend Planning Commission approval of the project with recommended conditions.

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

The proposed project addresses the *Old Towne Design Standards* through the use of building materials, roof forms, and fenestration that are compatible with the historic structure. While the building occupancy is medical office, the significance of the structure is attributed to its historic single-family residential character and physical relationship to both Chapman Avenue and abutting neighborhood to the north. The proposed alterations preserve the historic residential character and contextual relationship of the original structure, and allow for greater visibility of the north elevation. The simple design of the tower and building additions is compatible with, and does not detract from, the historic character defining features of the primary structure. The Planning Commission will consider the requested Variance for the height of the elevator tower.

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

The proposed elevator tower, building additions and handicapped ramp are in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines in that they have been designed to be compatible with, yet differentiated from, the original historic building. Where additions are proposed, the original historic windows would be reinstalled in a similar position to their original placement on the north elevation. The scale and extent of the modifications for purposes of ADA compliance do not detract from the property’s

character defining features, ability to be recognized as a historic residential structure, or relationship with its surroundings. Furthermore, the siting and design of the proposed elevator tower and associated stairway and balcony/walkway allow for greater exposure of the historic north building elevation from the alley and properties to the north than presently exists.

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

The design of the proposed elevator tower, building additions, and handicapped ramp comply with the Old Towne Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The design of the new elements is simple, yet references the historic residential structure in a manner that allows for clear lines of sight to the historic structure and interpretation of the historic relationship between the subject property and neighborhood to the north. The aesthetic values of the community are upheld through the siting of the elevator tower in a manner that has limited visibility from nearby side streets. While the tower will be visible from Chapman Avenue, the exposure will be limited. It is positioned on the site in a manner that the line of sight is interrupted by the one-story element of the historic structure and an existing mature tree when viewed from the south across Chapman Avenue. The tower will also not be visible to east- and westbound traffic on Chapman Avenue given its position behind the historic structure and next to a taller architectural element and roof form on the adjacent property to the east.

4. *For infill residential development, as specified in the City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines, the new structure(s) or addition are compatible with the scale, massing, orientation, and articulation of the surrounding development and will preserve or enhance existing neighborhood character (OMC 17.10.07.F.4).*

The proposed project is not an infill residential project, and is therefore not subject to the *City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines*.

CONDITIONS

Staff recommends the Design Review Committee recommend Planning Commission approval of DRC 4669-13 subject to the conditions listed below and any conditions that the Design Review Committee deems appropriate to support the required findings and ensure the preservation of community aesthetics:

1. All construction shall conform in substance, and be maintained in general conformance, with plans labeled Attachment 2 (dated June 20, 2013) and as recommended or modified by the Design Review Committee.
2. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all of the applicable Development Impact Fees in accordance with the most current fee schedule. Building permits shall be obtained for all construction work, as required by the City of Orange, Community Development Department's Building Division. Failure to obtain the required building permits will be cause for revocation of this design review permit.

3. Prior to building permit issuance, construction plans shall show that all structures shall comply with the requirements of Municipal Code (Chapter 15.52 Building Security Standards), which relates to the use of specific hardware, doors, windows, lighting, etc (Ord. No. 7-79). Architect drawings shall include sections of the Ordinance that apply under "Security Notes". An "Approved Products List 1/08" of hardware, windows, etc is available upon request.
4. These conditions shall be reprinted on the second page of the construction documents when submitted to the Building Division for the plan check process.
5. Subsequent modifications to the approved architecture and color scheme shall be submitted for review and approval to the Community Development Director or designee. Should the modifications be considered substantial, the modifications shall be reviewed by the City's Design Review Committee.
6. The applicant agrees to indemnify, hold harmless, and defend the City, its officers, agents and employees from any and all liability or claims that may be brought against the City arising out of its approval of this permits, save and except that caused by the City's active negligence. The City shall promptly notify the applicant of any such claim, action, or proceedings and shall cooperate fully in the defense.
7. The applicant shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, including all City regulations. Violation of any of those laws in connection with the use will be cause for revocation of this permit.
8. Design Review No. 4669-13 shall become void if not vested within two years from the date of approval. Time extensions may be granted for up to one year, pursuant to OMC Section 17.08.060.
9. Except as otherwise provided herein, this project is approved as a precise plan. After any application has been approved, if changes are proposed regarding the location or alteration of any use or structure, a changed plan may be submitted to the Community Development Director for approval. If the Community Development Director determines that the proposed change complies with the provisions and the spirit and intent of the approval action and that the action would have been the same for the changed plan as for the approved plan, the Community Development Director may approve the changed plan without requiring a new public hearing.
10. In conjunction with construction, all activity will be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction activity will be permitted on Sundays and Federal holidays.
11. Prior to Building Permit issuance, the applicant shall pay any outstanding monies due to the City of Orange for Planning Division entitlement activities related to this project.
12. The term "applicant" shall refer to the entity that requests approval of this action or any successor in interest to this approval.
13. Plans submitted for Building Plan Check shall comply with the California Fire and Building Code as amended by the City and as frequently amended, and in effect, at the time of application for a Building Permit.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map and Site Photos
2. Plans dated June 20, 2013

cc: Doug Ely
DSE Architecture
145 S. Olive Street
Orange, CA 92866

Dr. Gerald Eidenmuller
10641 Rockhurst
Cowan Heights, CA 92705