

**CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL**

July 3, 2013

Committee Members Present: Carol Fox
Robert Imboden
Tim McCormack
Joe Woollett
Craig Wheeler

Committee Members Absent:

Staff in Attendance: David Khorram, Chief Building Official
Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager
Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner
Mark Schwartz, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:05 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Roseberry, introduced Marissa Moser, who will do historic planning case work on a contract basis for the City of Orange.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 5, 2013. There were no further changes, but the Committee had wanted to wait until everyone was present to officially approve the minutes.

The Committee Members reviewed the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 19, 2013. Changes and corrections were noted.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee meeting.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There were no speakers.

CONSENT ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- (a) June 5, 2013: Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 5, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

- (b) June 19, 2013: Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 19, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4669-13 – EIDENMULLER MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING

- A proposal for modifications to the rear of a 2-story medical office building previously damaged by fire, including removal & replacement of existing outdoor stairway, construction of a new 2-story elevator tower, plus the expansion of the 1st and 2nd floors.
- 615 E. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Anna Pehoushek, 714-744-7228, apehoushek@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Mr. Doug Ely, architect, address on file, and Mr. Gerald Eidenmuller, applicant, address on file, spoke.

Mr. Eidenmuller gave a brief history of his involvement with the City of Orange regarding buying and keeping the building at 615 E. Chapman. He also stated that he was asking for these modifications because there was a fire in the building, and he looked forward to using this as an opportunity to make the building better than it ever was.

Mr. Eidenmuller and Mr. Ely showed the Committee Members the original blueprints of the building, which are framed and kept in Mr. Eidenmuller's office. Mr. Eidenmuller also stressed four specific strengths of the property: (1) it is a free-standing medical building; (2) it is located on Chapman Avenue; (3) it is going to be a new building in an old skin, with improvements like insulation which weren't in the original; and (4) it has terrific parking.

Mr. Ely went through some of the details of the project plans. He first mentioned that there was a fire in the building, which is why this project was started. As part of the restoration of the building, it needs to be brought up to modern codes, including accessibility in line with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This necessitates adding an elevator and ADA accessible restrooms. There were a number of problems with putting the elevator in the middle of the building, as the floor plans with that elevator placement didn't flow well, and the elevator would have protruded above the existing roof. A second option for the elevator placement was to place the elevator on the side of the building, but that would have affected too much of the historic fabric of the structure. A third option was to have the elevator added separate from the existing building, with some railing connecting it to the building. Putting the elevator in a remote location is seen as an opportunity to remove some of the clutter of existing railings and opening up the view to the property from Chapman Ave. Also, the rear entrance would need to have a rear porch added to bring it up to the same elevation as the interior floor of the building, and a ramp would be added to provide ADA accessibility to the rear entrance. Part of raising the

floor would be adding wooden stairs on top of the concrete stairs that go down to the basement to keep all the surfaces at the same level.

Mr. Eidenmuller explained that the CT scan area would have its own entry point so that any tenant could have access to it.

Mr. Ely explained that the plan includes wooden posts with glass plates instead of wooden pickets between the posts on the railings, so that the view of the property from Chapman Avenue could be opened up. He admitted that it wasn't perfect, but it seemed to be the best option for keeping visibility. He also pointed out that the roof form for the elevator silo is taken from the sun room, not the main structure's roof. The elevator would also not be visible to traffic driving by on Chapman Avenue. The choice of horizontal wood siding was made because shingles would be competitive with the shingles on the house; the goal was to make it clear that this was an addition, but also to allow it to fit in with the overall historical feel of the property.

Chair Fox asked if there was anyone from the public to speak.

Public Comments

Jeff Frankel, address on file, from the OTPA, stated he believed the elevator would be visible from Cleveland Street. He asked for clarification as to why the elevator wasn't incorporated into the building itself, as he feels the elevator being separate is not likely to look good, and would be in favor of it fitting in with the existing building unless it removes character-defining features.

Mr. Eidenmuller stated that placing the elevator inside the building would take away a big portion of square footage from the floor plan.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Imboden asked Mr. Ely about the egress along the exterior balcony walkway and whether it will need a sprinkler.

Mr. Ely stated that he didn't know of any requirement for this area of the outside of the building to require sprinklers.

Chief Building Official, David Khorram, stated that if it wasn't over 3,000 square feet it didn't need sprinklers. For this project the square footage is under 3,000, so it wouldn't need sprinklers.

Committee Member Imboden stated that he felt like the plan was generally good, as it was a complicated project. He then asked regarding the flat wood cap on the planter areas, where there wasn't any reveal shown on the siding. He assumes that there would be a reveal of 1 inch or 1.5 inches, which would seem appropriate.

Mr. Ely stated that there was supposed to be a wood cap there, even though it wasn't visible on the plans. He mentioned that he agreed the cap should be larger than the wall.

Committee Member Imboden asked about the connection between the new building and the existing solarium, and wondered whether the existing rail met current height requirements.

Mr. Ely said it did, as it was 42 inches.

Committee Member Imboden commented that he liked the use of shingles, but in a different pattern, which provides differentiation between existing and new components. He stated that he thought the elevator probably could have been accommodated inside the building, but acknowledged that wasn't the project in front of the Committee, and the Committee's job is to evaluate whether the proposal in front of them meets the standards. He stated that he didn't have a problem with the way the elevator was designed. He also said he wasn't really convinced about the use of a glass rail, as this uses a lot of glass, and provides a relatively contemporary feel. It's a noble attempt at freeing up the view of the façade, but the reflection may block or distort that view.

Mr. Ely said he thought that was a great concern.

Chair Fox said she wanted to hear from the other Committee Members before Mr. Ely gave his full explanation.

Committee Member McCormack agreed that the pickets were distracting, and he agrees with the attempt to free up the view, but wanted to do so in a less contemporary way. He feels that the elevator would feel odd on the inside, and feels good with putting it on the outside. Those were the two items he was concerned about, and he's glad those features are being discussed.

Committee Member Woollett felt it was a very sensitive design in response to the situation. He likes the way this design provides a difference between original and remodeled features. The connecting glass could be a good thing, and could set a positive precedent in connecting new and old features for other designs. He was also concerned about the planters and the long-term challenges associated with planters. He asked what the planter was made out of.

Mr. Ely mentioned that he had done this kind of thing before, and that the planter was fiberglass inside, and had a good drainage system with a redundancy built in. He has faith that the applicant will take good care of it regarding any deterioration and required upkeep. He thought it was a nice way to soften the stair element.

Committee Member Wheeler pointed out the demarcation of new and existing construction on some walls, but added that there isn't anything spelled out on the elevation drawings.

Mr. Ely mentioned that the pattern was different on the siding, so it was clear what was new and what was old.

Committee Member Wheeler pointed out that if there was a difference in pattern between old and new, it might be too subtle unless there was some sort of demarcation of the transition.

Mr. Ely stated that was a good suggestion. He suggested that maybe there should be a trim board there that would separate the two of them.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if there would be any chance of a slight change in plane there.

Mr. Ely stated that they could do that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that he felt that would be better than just a trim board.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there was a tiny return there inside the room.

Mr. Ely stated that there was no return, and it was just a straight wall. He mentioned that was the ADA accessible area, and a return would perhaps be a good idea, perhaps 4 inches.

Committee Member Wheeler wondered if the shingles were considered for the elevator tower so as not to introduce another new kind of material to the project.

Mr. Ely stated that he felt that it looked too busy to do so.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that he felt it would be very logical to have all the new construction to be of the same materials. He also mentioned that the new gable in the back was blocking the view of some of the unique features of the roof.

Mr. Ely replied that the new gable was being added to provide an entrance for the bridge.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the addition could be removed and just a roof put over it, or at least an awning. That would keep the design from messing with a fascinating roof feature.

Mr. Ely replied that he did look at that, but eventually decided not to do that for some reason.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that the elevator roof design was borrowed from the sun room, and wondered if the shingles on the sun room could be replicated on the elevator roof as well.

Mr. Ely replied he could look into that.

Committee Member Wheeler agreed that the glass railing was a contemporary-looking feature to introduce into Old Towne. He wondered if a small size steel railing was considered, and wondered if there was a curb that could be put up to lessen the contemporary look of the railing.

Chair Fox asked what the need was for the area being added to the second floor. It does not go with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and is not respectful of the historic resource. The additions downstairs were to fulfill specific needs, but the area of the gable still seemed like a confusing choice. The window on the building had one continuous transom, and she didn't know if that was intended or not.

Mr. Ely stated that it was the intention, and on the model there are some limits to what can be displayed.

Chair Fox expressed concern that the historic features were being tucked in underneath the new roof. The pitches on the new roofs are not the same as the house, since they are trying to get under the windows when they connect to the house. The ridge on the house next door is coming up in a good spot for the elevator tower, and it's probably the best spot on the whole site to put the elevator tower. She stated that putting the elevator inside looked like it would remove too much of the historic fabric of the house. She liked the elevator placement, and liked the idea of using glass for the railings, as the more the renovations make the house visible, the better.

Chair Fox summarized and recapped the areas of concern for further discussion:

- Wood cap on stairwell walls should be 1 inch projection.
- Too much glass on stair rail: Committee Member Imboden stated that it should look more traditional and less contemporary by using smaller panes of glass. Committee Member McCormack agreed. Committee Member Imboden asked if there was a rationale to the placement of the posts, or if it was just dividing the length, since they don't really coordinate to anything architecturally. Mr. Ely stated that it was likely just an equal breakup of the space. Committee Member Wheeler suggested a fine wire screen as an option that would be transparent but not have the shiny contemporary look; possibly a welded-wire mesh. Committee Member Imboden wondered if that was really any less contemporary. Chair Fox also asked about the curb suggestion made earlier that would help break up the height. Mr. Ely stated that the curb would make the rails wider, which could cause problems. Committee Member Imboden also suggested a darker color scheme for the rails to help minimize their visibility.
- Chair Fox suggested that the posts on the opposite sides should be correlated. Committee Member Imboden agreed, and asked if there was a reason they don't. Mr. Ely stated that each of the spaces between posts were broken up equally, but a correlation could be considered.
- Shift in sten room walls to differentiate new and old features: Chair Fox suggested that the new walls added should have an offset to help make a distinction between new and old. Mr. Ely said he didn't have a problem with that.
- Siding on elevator tower vs. shingles on new proposed areas: Committee Member Imboden agreed with Committee Member Wheeler's comments, and stated that he believes the success of the feature would be based on how it was painted.

Mr. Ely felt that the design with brick to the shingles was more sympathetic to the design of the house, but the brick wouldn't work well, so horizontal siding to the shingles was a better fit than shingles to shingles.

Committee Member Imboden stated that he doesn't believe it's a structure that wants to be shingled.

Committee Member McCormack agreed, and thinks that shingles on the elevator tower would look odd.

Chair Fox stated that she would like to see the horizontal siding on the house additions rather than using a new shingle pattern.

Committee Member Imboden also agreed that that was a good option, as long as it was painted the same as the building.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the horizontal siding would have mitered corners.

Mr. Ely said yes, it would.

Mr. Eidenmuller stated that he would likely have to replace the original shingles, and wondered if the same pattern couldn't be done throughout the exterior.

Chair Fox stated that would be a problem, as it would try to make the "new" look "old."

Mr. Ely stated he was open to using horizontal siding.

Committee Member Imboden stated that the project involved extruding an existing roof, and wondered why the roof form wouldn't be dropped down below and taken back so that the barge face could be preserved and kept in a prominent position. The other suggestion was that the roof could be used with just a little shed coming off of the roof so the form isn't being messed with.

Chair Fox mentioned that there wasn't a specific need for the square footage in the lobby, and also said doing so wouldn't require the moving of the existing window.

Committee Member Imboden stated that the cantilevered outlookers would be lost, and he believes a re-thinking of the project would allow those character-defining features to be kept.

Mr. Ely mentioned that the thinking was that with raising the floor to accommodate the ADA accessibility, the other stairs would have to be raised, and the window system would need to be raised as well, so trying to keep that in place wouldn't work. There will have to be a lot of re-thinking to deal with all of the issues that have been raised by the Committee.

Chair Fox suggested a continuance on the item.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested additional study, and perhaps a shed, flat roof, or awning as options.

Committee Member Imboden stated the applicant could consider a flat roof as well.

Chair Fox gave a re-cap of suggestions and conditions for applicants to consider:

- Wood cap on stairwell walls should be 1 inch projection.
- Align the posts within the glass balcony railing.
- Shift new wall to differentiate from existing at sten room.
- All new additions have horizontal siding with mitered corners.
- Add black shingles to the top of the elevator tower.
- Keep the existing gable end at the rear elevation.
- Consolidate roof vents so there aren't a lot of penetration points in the roof.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4669-13 – Eidenmuller Medical Office Building.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on July 17, 2013.

SECOND: Robert Imboden

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT:

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:54 p.m.