CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

August 21, 2013

Committee Members Present:	Carol Fox Robert Imboden Tim McCormack Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	Craig Wheeler
Staff in Attendance:	David Khorram, Chief Building Official Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner Jennifer Le, Senior Planner Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Mark Schwartz, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:08 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Roseberry, announced that item 6 has been pulled from the agenda.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of July 17, 2013. Some changes were noted.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 5:28 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members present, except Committee Member Wheeler.

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: July 17, 2013

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee Meeting of July 17, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4584-11 – BONHAM GARAGE

- A proposal to modify and reduce an existing 495 sq. ft. two-car unpermitted garage into a smaller 250 sq. ft. one-car garage.
- 575 E. Van Bibber Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Leslie Roseberry, 714-744-7220, lroseberry@cityoforange.org
- Continued From DRC Meeting: March 20, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Zoning Administrator

Planning Manager, Leslie Roseberry, stated that this item was continued from March 20, 2013, and the applicant has addressed all the areas of concern that were mentioned.

Chair Fox asked if there were any additional comments from the applicants.

Karl Bonham, applicant, address on file, said he just wanted to get it done, and that he believes he has done everything recommended at the last DRC meeting.

Public Comments:

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing OTPA, stated he had met with the applicants several times, was satisfied with the changes made, and would support the project.

Chair Fox opened the discussion up to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Imboden said he thinks it looks much better, and the only concern is the hyphen that has been used to inset the breezeway. The hyphen shouldn't be higher than the existing historic structure. Page A 2.1 shows the hyphen. He asked if there was a reason it couldn't be brought down.

Mr. Bonham said he wanted to get the most room out of what is a small structure, and the rise isn't visible from the street. He said he was hoping to keep it.

Committee Member Imboden said he doesn't think that fulfills the point of making a hyphen if it's taller than the existing structure. He said he looks at all sides of the building, not just whether it's visible from the street.

Efrom Kalsman, address on file, explained that on sheet A 2.0, the original had a step, and that has been made straight in the new design.

Committee Member Imboden asked if that meant that the existing garage was being changed with the new design.

Mr. Kalsman explained that it originally made three steps, and the new design brings it down to two steps in the back.

Committee Member Imboden stated it wasn't very clearly indicated on the drawings.

Chair Fox asked if that step were to stay, then it would be about the same height as what is being added.

Mr. Kalsman said yes. He felt it was too busy with the step.

Committee Member Imboden asked if this new design was adding to the height of the existing garage.

Mr. Kalsman said no.

Committee Member Imboden asked then why was the step being eliminated.

Mr. Kalsman said when the roof was re-done years ago, the step was added. The two steps bring it back to its original state. If the Committee requests that the whole roof be brought to the same height, the applicant would be willing to do that.

Chair Fox asked if the small pop-up was added during a renovation to the roof, and it's being pulled back down to be original again.

Mr. Kalsman said yes. The new design actually fills in the low spot.

Committee Member Imboden asked if that doesn't make the existing garage taller.

Mr. Bonham said yes.

Committee Member Imboden said the point is that it needs to be clear what is being done. He asked if the parapet height on the original garage was being raised, since that wasn't included on the drawings or staff report.

Mr. Kalsman said it was in the drawing right below it, A 2.1, existing east elevation.

Mr. Bonham asked if the question was whether the parapet was being left at the same height or being brought up.

Mr. Kalsman said the drawing below showed that the new roof was not being lowered, because it's the ridge board of the cantilever that's being taken off.

Mr. Bonham said because it was slanted it looked higher.

Mr. Kalsman said it is still going to be the same height.

Chair Fox stated that Committee Member Imboden was trying to clarify whether the existing structure was being made taller or whether the cantilevered area was being pulled off.

Committee Member Imboden stated that there are changes being made to the historic garage that aren't clear in the drawings. Also, the hyphen is still higher than the older structure. Typically, when new and old are brought together, you keep the new subordinate to the historic.

Mr. Kalsman asked if the whole roof, including the hyphen, should be the same height.

Committee Member Imboden said that if the hyphen is to work effectively, it should be lower than the existing historic structure. The other issue is that the historic structure height appears to be being raised.

Chair Fox said the request is not that the entire roof and hyphen be the same height, but that the hyphen should actually be lower than the existing historic structure. She asked what other comments Committee Members had.

Committee Member McCormack was just confused with the roof height issue, but didn't have any other issues.

Chair Fox said that it seems like the hyphen came up to make it even.

Mr. Kalsman said yes.

Chair Fox said that was necessary to clarify what was being proposed.

Mr. Bonham said the suggestion that Committee Member Imboden was making seems reasonable.

Mr. Kalsman asked whether the bottom of the hyphen would then also need to be lowered.

Committee Member Imboden said he didn't want to design the building for the applicant, but suggested that if the bottom stays where it is when the top is lowered, it would be a little thin.

Chair Fox asked if everyone was in agreement on the hyphen height. All the Committee Members seemed to agree.

Committee Member Woollett asked about page A 2.0, which shows the track for the garage doors to remain. In order to remain there, it will need to stick out on the west side. He wondered if that was going to work. EF explained that a different elevation shows that it will be removed, as was the Committee's recommendation from the previous meeting. The existing yard storage area was not part of the original building, and it will be removed as the project is completed, since this area is not connected to the garage door track.

Chair Fox asked if the Committee was ready to make a motion.

Committee Member Imboden said the condition he would include would be not to add any more height to the parapet. Anything that is added cannot be higher than what is there now. The existing historical condition should be kept as much as possible. The condition is that the increase to the parapets on the original garage will not exceed that of the existing garage.

Mr. Bonham asked for clarity on the process.

Chair Fox affirmed that after this meeting, the applicant can draw up plans that reflect this condition and present them to the City.

Committee Member Imboden made a motion to recommend approval to the Zoning Administrator for DRC No. 4584-11, Bonham Garage, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

- The covered breezeway area proposed between the front and rear garages top out at no less than 4 inches below the existing garage.
- The rear parapet portion of the new garage top out at no higher than the existing parapet at the front of the existing garage.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(3) DRC No. 4665-12 – MARYWOOD PUMP STATION

- A proposal to demolish the existing Marywood Pump Station and construct a new pump station building, emergency generator/enclosure, and electrical transformer/enclosure on a 5,228 square foot City easement (currently a landscaped hillslope).
- 1815 E. Villa Real Drive
- Staff Contact: Jennifer Le, 714-744-7238, jle@cityoforange.org
- Continued Without Discussion From DRC Meetings: May 1, 2013 and July 17, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the City Council

Senior Planner, Jennifer Le, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report, and introduced Son Tran from the City's Water Division, and Bob Seeman from Stantec Consulting.

Public Comments:

None.

Chair Fox opened the discussion up to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Woollett stated it looked like a very competent engineer designed the project, but not an architect. He wondered if it might look more compatible with the setting if the walls were sloped instead of stepped.

Committee Member Imboden asked if there was any cap treatment on the walls.

Mr. Seeman said there would be simple, rounded concrete caps.

Committee Member Woollett wondered if a sloping, flat cap could be added to the walls rather than having them be rounded. The slope should be to the inside so the water and other debris don't run down the outside of the walls.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the caps should be cast in place.

Committee Member Woollett said the mortar would be laid on the top of the wall.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the slope is made by hand.

Committee Member Woollett said they would use a trowel, and make the mortar thicker on the outside (approximately 1 inch) and thinner on the inside (approximately ½ inch).

Committee Member McCormack stated his concern was that the mortar would be exposed to sunlight and water, and it might crack over time if it is really thin.

Committee Member Imboden said the mortar would be thicker this way than if it were domed.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that forming a cap and sitting it on top of the wall might be easier, although it would be more expensive. He also thought the level of craftsmanship needed to slope the top of the walls would be really high.

Mr. Tran said he would be willing to do the sloped cap.

Committee Member Imboden said the labor involved in forming the sloped cap might be the same expense as placing a pre-cast cap on the wall, so he didn't think it was necessary to prescribe one specific method in the conditions.

Chair Fox said she was fine with the suggested discussion on the mortar cap.

Committee Member McCormack thought a pre-cast cap would be better than a free-formed sloped mortar cap.

Chair Fox suggested that the condition be that either option could be considered.

Committee Member McCormack asked about the trees. In the report, there was a note that seven trees were being removed, but only four were being added. He wondered what the reason for that was.

Ms. Le said the trees were proposed around the perimeter.

Mr. Seeman added that the ones being removed are taken from inside the site, while the ones added would be added to the perimeter. Trying to fit three more trees around the perimeter didn't seem feasible since the land is sloped. There are bushes in the existing landscaping.

Committee Member McCormack said he thought two more trees could be fit around the perimeter. He stated that having more trees in the landscaping could help hide the pump station. He would leave it as a suggestion to add two more trees. He also asked if there were any fuel modification issues with the landscaping.

Ms. Le said no, no issues.

Committee Member McCormack also gave a compliment to whoever did the irrigation system. He also asked about the master valve on the irrigation system, since it didn't seem to show up on the plans. If there isn't one, he suggested adding one.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council for DRC No. 4665-12, Marywood Pump Station, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

- No dome or curved cap should be used on the top of the walls; either a formed mortar slope or pre-cast sloped cap would work.
- Two more trees should be added to what is shown on the plan.
- Recommendation to find the master valve and/or put a master valve on the system.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) 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
- Continued From DRC Meeting: July 3, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Doug Ely and Gerald Eidenmuller, addresses on file, spoke as applicants, and mentioned that they wanted to add sides to the awnings to increase their sun-blocking potential, which isn't reflected in the drawings but is part of the proposed plan.

Public Comments:

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing OTPA, stated they liked the new design. He enjoys the preservation and restoration of historical features. The OTPA would have preferred the elevator be inside the building structure, but the project brought forward is probably the most sympathetic approach to an elevator being in its own tower. The OTPA supports the Committee's recommendations, and the applicant does appear to have addressed all of them.

Chair Fox opened the discussion up to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Woollett said he could see why the awnings were added, and why the sides were added as well. He feels the sided awnings are actually appropriate to the style of the building. He asked how the roof was to be weather-proofed if the shingles were removed.

Mr. Ely stated it would be similar to the way it was likely done above the solarium. It appears to be a solid piece of wood, over which the shingles were applied. He said they propose to peel the shingles back to see if the original roof is in a preservable state, and to treat it with good quality paint.

Committee Member Woollett said the shingles may have been added as a solution to deterioration, but there are other solutions available now which would look better and last longer, including perhaps exterior grade plywood with a good finish.

Mr. Ely said he would make sure that there was something used that would stand the test of time, and didn't want to put any flashing over it.

Committee Member Woollett said the way the rail was handled was very responsive to the Committee's earlier concerns.

Committee Member Imboden asked about pulling the asphalt back from the roof, and examining the state of the original roof. He wondered if the new roof would match the tower regardless of what is found when the shingles are removed.

Mr. Ely said the tower will be the way it's specified in the plans regardless of what's found when the shingles are removed.

Committee Member Imboden said he was in favor of that.

Mr. Ely said if it is in a state where it can be finished, they may be able to bring the solarium back to what it once was.

Committee Member Imboden then asked about the column to the rear porch, which sits on a low brick stem. It's not centered, and he wondered if that was on purpose.

Mr. Ely said it was because the column is tying back into the building, while the porch is extending beyond the column.

Committee Member McCormack wondered if the distances could be made equal.

Mr. Ely said he thought that could work.

Committee Member Imboden stated that the house is symmetrical, so the asymmetrical elements should be fixed to make them symmetrical.

Committee Member McCormack asked about the steps going up to the building, and suggested that all the steps should be brought up to the same elevation.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the side steps on the front are a step lower than the highest steps, and this plan is trying to do that same thing on the back.

Mr. Ely said that was the idea, but he sees how there's a little conflict in terms of how it's drawn.

Committee Member Imboden said if he wanted to do it that way, he was fine with it. He feels it should be the architect's choice. He also said he wanted to see the ends on the awnings.

Committee Member McCormack said he was also fine with the awnings.

Chair Fox said she was fine with them as well.

Committee Member Imboden said the rear elevation roof form and the way it's maintained is so much better than the last time. He also appreciated the addition of the faux door.

Committee Member McCormack asked about the faux door, wondering why it was necessary instead of a window.

Mr. Ely explained that it was to help match the door that used to be there historically. It would be a real door, but it would be fixed in place. From the inside, it would seem like a window, but from the outside it would look like a door.

Chair Fox said it was a good choice, since if someone else bought the property, they would be able to change out to an operable door if they wanted to. She also stated she is thrilled to see this project going forward, and the improvements really helped the project since the last time it was in front of the Committee.

Chair Fox made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission for DRC No. 4669-13, Eidenmuller Medical Office Building, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

- Pilasters supporting the column should be symmetrical around the column.
- The awnings can have end caps as requested.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4672-13 – ROXSTROM RESIDENCE

- A proposal to convert a front loaded one-car garage into a porte-cochere (drive-thru) and construct a 227 sq. ft. addition to the existing residence, construct a 1,293 sq. ft. attached one-story second unit, and 437 sq. ft. of new enclosed parking for a non-contributing residence.
- 215 N. Clark Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Continued From DRC Meeting: May 15, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Tony Roxstrom, applicant, address on file, stated he thought that many of the recommendations made last time were good, and this plan responds to them.

Farshad Azarnoosh, project architect, address on file, stated that 250 square feet were removed from the project since last time.

Public Comments:

None.

Chair Fox opened the discussion up to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was much happier about the project this time than last time that the project was before the Committee. He also asked questions, specifically about the amount of grasscrete (a combination of concrete with grass growing through it). He believes it works best when it is seldom used, and it seems to be overused here. It is a solution to the problem of too much concrete, but it might not be the best solution.

Committee Member Woollett felt the revised plans are very responsive to what was asked for previously, and is a good fit with the neighborhood. He expressed concern about the grasscrete as well.

Chair Fox said she was thrilled with the new solutions overall.

Committee Member McCormack discussed the grasscrete. In the current driveway configuration, backing out of the driveway directly would be the simplest way to leave the property, and would wear on the grasscrete the least. This depends on the driver, however, and might not be done all the time. The options for a driveway include grasscrete, traditional turf block, plastic, and grass pave (a ceramic product). Another option would be to have the pavers in a pattern where most of the driving would take place so the tire path doesn't wear out the grasscrete. The best solution here would be precision block, which comes in 4, 6, and 8 inches tall. He recommends the 6 inch. These concrete blocks in a pattern that pulls off the symmetry would be good.

Mr. Azarnoosh asked if other types of pavers would be allowed.

Committee Member McCormack said he was fine with that, and either the turf block or precision block would work. The point is to protect the grass when the wheels of a vehicle are turned on it. He also wouldn't put grasscrete next to the Italian Cypress trees on the south edge. He also mentioned the tropical Japanese Fiber Banana tree. He had never heard of that tree before, and was impressed by it.

Mr. Roxstrom explained the tree was an existing tree on the property. A picture of the tree was shown to a landscape architect, and that was the name he used to identify it.

Committee Member McCormack recommended making sure the turf block was installed properly, as proper installation is essential to having it work well.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission for DRC No. 4672-13, Roxstrom Residence, subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

- Re-align the grasscrete or turf block to the limits that were drawn on the plan, and put a traditional concrete driveway or pavers on the area most likely to be damaged by auto traffic.

Committee Member Imboden clarified that what was being approved was not a drive-through, which the staff report still showed from last time. It should be revised in the report.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4685-13 – PALM AVENUE HOUSING

- A proposal to relocate and reconstruct a barn with a 26 sq. ft. addition as a studio unit, construct a 604 sq. ft. garage, construct a 1,899 sq. ft. one and one-half story second unit with garage, and provide access to the rear units from N. Clark Street.
- 730 W. Palm Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Marissa Moshier, 714-744-7243, mmoshier@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to Planning Commission

This item was tabled.

(7) DRC No. 4687-13 – AVONTI SALON

- A proposal to adaptively reuse a 2-story historic residential structure as a beauty salon. The project includes removal of an existing 702 sq. ft. contemporary addition at the rear of the historic structure, and construction of a new 1,451 sq. ft. addition at the rear of the structure. Site improvements to be undertaken as part of the project include establishment of a parking lot for the property and landscaping.
- 206 W. Almond Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Anna Pehoushek, 714-744-7228, apehoushek@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report. She asked specifically for a determination on the dormers, with them either being eliminated or re-designed to fit with the roof design better. She explained that the applicant believes these dormers to be essential to the project, as hair salon customers will need to see the results of their treatments in natural light. Staff has included removal or redesign as a condition of approval. She mentioned that the project's relationship to the streetscape is also an issue the Committee needs to address, including whether additional landscaping should be required to offset the property's proximity to Almond Avenue. She mentioned that the applicants are willing to add to the landscaping, and Staff is seeking approval from the Committee to accept the landscaping plan being proposed. She mentioned that the south elevation is only 3 feet from the property line, so there is an issue about how many windows can be in the building. The building code requirement is for no more than 15% of the building being windows when there is less than a 10 foot offset from the property line.

Guy Pizzarello, project architect; and Raymond Gall, owner, addresses on file, spoke as applicants, stating that they have responded to the recommendations. However, the former Staff Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, that the applicants had been working with had not brought up some of the regulations which Ms. Pehoushek had recently brought to their attention.

Mr. Pizzarello explained that there were new developments in the last 24-hours, and the applicants haven't necessarily had time to fully react to those developments. They also felt they had presented other options that the staff report didn't consider, including a hip roof rather than a roof with dormers. He also expressed the necessity for natural light in the salon (i.e. keeping the dormers), as that is essential to the functioning of the business. He stated that Mr. Ryan had encouraged the applicants to design the addition in the form of a carriage house, as that would be in keeping with the Old Towne Historic District feel. He also mentioned that the glazing on the windows would be restricted to 15%, which he wasn't previously aware of. He explained that the applicants were looking for permission to have more than 15% glass on the rear wall, as it wasn't visible from the street, and it was essential to the effective operation of the hair salon.

Public Comments:

Jeff Frankel, representing OTPA, address on file, stated he wasn't too thrilled with the dormers either, although he admitted he hadn't seen what was presented tonight. He also questioned why the two steps on the west elevation were being removed, as they seem to be original and

therefore defining features of the building. He also mentioned the setback, and whether it was consistent with the existing streetscape. He wanted assurances that historic doors and windows would be repaired rather than replaced.

Chair Fox opened the discussion up to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Woollett asked about the distance from the street on the south side, and how that affects the glazing requirement on the windows. As he understood it, there needed to be at least a 5 foot setback for the glazing requirement to be in effect.

Chair Fox pointed out that the percentage of glass on each wall can't be more than 15% unless the wall is set back 10 feet from the street. She also mentioned that the plans being discussed tonight almost can't be judged, since they mention a reduction in glass, but don't have detailed drawings showing that reduction.

Mr. Pizzarello stated that Mr. Ryan didn't mention a lot of the restrictions being brought up now regarding the glass, so the drawings without those restrictions were submitted, and nobody mentioned that it was going to be a problem.

Chair Fox said it was the design professional's responsibility to know the building codes, which haven't changed since the plan was drawn up. She also stated that the design professional shouldn't rely on a city planner to know the code. The issue is that the design is drawn with lots of windows, and only a fraction of those windows will be allowable based on the building codes.

Mr. Pizzarello asked what that percentage would be.

Chair Fox stated that since she wasn't the designer of the project, it wasn't up to her, but she would expect that all drawings that come before the Committee should meet the code.

Mr. Pizzarello said the dormer aspect should be accepted, which would then allow for an increased amount of windows to allow in the proper amount of natural light.

Committee Member Woollett mentioned that the dormers were fine, but there were too many of them, and they went all the way up to the ridge, which means they wouldn't fit in with Old Towne designs.

Mr. Pizzarello asked if there could be a single longer dormer on a shed roof, that would help compensate for the loss of glazing on the south side.

Committee Member Woollett also mentioned that the carriage house idea wasn't a bad one, but some of the unity the applicants want to achieve would be much more difficult to pull off with a carriage house.

Committee Member Imboden said he had no problem with the north-facing dormer with a shed roof. The carriage house is not a bad idea, but will likely get lost when putting a lot of glazing on it. Carriage houses typically don't have a lot of glazing on them. The detailing on the proposed addition looks "too fancy" and should be simplified a bit. He also thought that this

amount of glass will actually be counterproductive, as it will allow too much natural light. His opinion is that this is too much glass, especially facing the adjacent residential property.

Mr. Pizzarello asked if there were concerns about the east and west elevations, or just the south.

Committee Member Imboden said the overall glazing is too extreme, especially the exaggerated bay windows. It is just trying too hard to rise to the level of the original house, and it should be subservient in its design to the main house, since it is an addition. The addition has far more glass than the original house, and it shouldn't.

Mr. Pizzarello said the intention was to make an addition that fit in with the overall design of the original house.

Committee Member Imboden said he doesn't think it does.

Chair Fox agreed with the idea of a carriage house, although this seems more like a conservatory. In some respects, the addition seems to be upstaging the original historical building, and the Committee is designed to weigh in on these kinds of design flaws. The design needs to have some modifications to have it meet the fire code, and the design will have a different character once that happens, but it's hard to judge the design without those changes being made, and will likely have to come back to the Committee. She also wants to make sure there is a clear separation between new and old, which is part of the way buildings are typically designed in Old Towne. She also mentioned that there is a ramp on the design going up to the door, but the door is not really as high as it is drawn.

Mr. Pizzarello said the ramp is actually going to be removed, and the east elevation shows two handicapped entryways.

Chair Fox said in other parts, the ramp appears to be blocking the windows.

Mr. Pizzarello said the windows will be adjusted as needed.

Chair Fox said the drawings should show exactly what will be going in the building, and it's not currently clear what is going in the ramp area.

Committee Member Imboden also mentioned that the steps being proposed would hide the arroyo stone that is original to the building, and that should be revised as the drawing is updated.

Committee Member McCormack stated that the plans seem extremely diagrammatic, weren't detailed and thought through well enough yet; "it's got all the ingredients for the soup, but the soup isn't cooked yet." He said it's a good first effort, but more work needs to be done. One of his biggest issues is that the eastern elevation has a 14 foot setback, which is too little, and isn't consistent with the existing streetscape. The setback needs to be consistent so there's a sense of a neighborhood. The setback being too close makes it stand out as an addition.

Ms. Pehoushek said the two different zonings were part of the problem, since there's a single-family zone that would require a setback, and a mixed-use zone that wouldn't require one.

Committee Member Imboden said the nature of the Historic District dictates that the setback should be consistent with the other houses on the street.

Chair Fox said she thought the 3 foot setback on the south elevation was the biggest issue, but asked if the rest of the Committee felt that the 14 foot setback on the east elevation was a bigger issue.

Mr. Gall asked what an appropriate setback would be.

Committee Member Imboden said there isn't a specific number to give, but the building needs to have the same look as the rest of the properties on that street.

Mr. Pizzarello said that 15 feet was the narrowest setback on the street, and Mr. Ryan had no problem with 14 feet either.

Committee Member Imboden said that regardless of what Mr. Ryan might have said, this is the Committee that has to approve the design, and he disagrees that this maintains the consistent character of the street.

Mr. Pizzarello asked if that meant the setback should be the average of the existing buildings.

Committee Member Imboden said he wouldn't give a specific figure, since it's not prescriptive design.

Mr. Gall asked how they would know what figure to use in drawing up the plans.

Committee Member Imboden said there's not an exact figure, but if the design is in the ballpark and within one or two feet of average, that's a good starting point.

Mr. Gall was upset that no one had brought some of these issues up at any point in the process so far, either on the city side or his architect side.

Chair Fox said the building code issues are in the building code, and architects should know those before designing the building.

Mr. Gall said there was originally an 8 foot setback on the south elevation, but the hyphen being proposed pushed it back out.

Chair Fox explained that Staff isn't required to administer all the building codes, but they give applicants a sense of what the Committee is likely to approve.

Ms. Pehoushek wanted to confirm that there is some variation in terms of an ideal setback, so the goal is in how it looks from the street.

Chair Fox pointed out that the building itself would influence the ideal setback as well, since different things would look different from the streetscape; it's a massing issue.

Committee Member Imboden said the mass itself in terms of how it sits on the lot isn't troubling, but as it is currently designed it impacts the view of the streetscape.

Committee Member McCormack said the issue regarding the handicapped ramp was to make it look like it wasn't just added, and ideally it should work in with everything else rather than standing on its own.

Mr. Pizzarello noted that the ramp was placed there based on the location of the sidewalk, which is not something the applicant can change. This location was approved by the City.

Chair Fox said the Building Division had to approve it.

Committee Member Imboden said typically the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible entrance should be located immediately adjacent to the closest entrance. Sending the handicapped ramp all the way around to the side of the building probably wouldn't be something the City would approve.

Chair Fox added that the railing would now be visible from the front, so that could pose a problem as well.

Committee Member Imboden said the handicapped ramp should be located in the rear of the building rather than the front, since it is contemporary in nature, and it changes the sense of the building and doesn't keep it historic. There is a lot being proposed to add in the back, and it would make sense to also add the handicapped ramp as well.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that putting a curb in instead of wheel stops would be better, and would provide additional room.

Chair Fox said the stoop is too big, and should be pulled back a bit. The elevated landing is very modern, and also covers up the historic stone.

Committee Member McCormack added that if the curb was put in, there could also be some landscape added. He mentioned that the Orange Library has a similar setup.

Committee Member Imboden said the trellis concept is fine.

Committee Member McCormack said the historic structure often features foundation planting, so having the walkway right up against the building doesn't fit with that.

Mr. Pizzarello said this is a commercial property.

Committee Member McCormack pointed out that it is an old house, and it is still in a residential neighborhood.

Committee Member Imboden said that the elevation shows the revision, but it also shows arroyo stone, and probably shouldn't. He also noted that the west side would be the best place for the handicapped ramp.

Chair Fox said the stoop should be kept in, since that is a historic part of the building.

Committee Member McCormack agreed that the large concrete slab should not be used to level things off, since it covers the historic stone.

Chair Fox said that the history of the house is an asset, and the design can build off of that. Not raising the slab would save money and make for a more even grade change.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the hyphen piece was a third level that necessitated a second ramp area.

Mr. Gall explained that the new area is still a foot higher, so there would still need to be a second ramp.

Committee Member Imboden clarified that the ramp location is flexible, but the execution of the idea needs to be better, with the railing less pronounced, for example.

Mr. Pizzarello mentioned that there are many people coming and going in a business like this, and the narrow stoops don't always work for that, since only one person can move through them at a time.

Chair Fox said that stoops that don't block the stones can be removed, thus increasing the width. She encouraged the applicant to go back to work, with the historic nature more in mind. The addition should be subordinated to the historic building.

Mr. Gall asked if the handicapped ramp should be moved to the back.

Chair Fox said the placement isn't that different, but the main issue is that the railing needs to be changed.

Committee Member Imboden said the arroyo stone on the drawings needs to be accurate, since some areas that don't actually have it appear to have it on the drawings.

Committee Member McCormack confirmed with Mr. Gall that the handicapped access location was flexible.

Committee Member McCormack suggested then that the maze of walkways on the plan should be simplified and tied into the landscape, thus making the handicapped ramp just a part of the garden.

Mr. Pizzarello said that was the idea.

Committee Member McCormack said he saw what the applicants were trying to do, but didn't feel that it was accomplished very well so far. He suggested that if the concrete walkway had to be removed to make a plan that works, that should certainly be considered, especially since the concrete is right up against the building.

Chair Fox asked the Committee to weigh in on the dormers issue. She said the idea of dormers is fine, and she would prefer the hip dormers. The roof pitch change on the plan is not acceptable at this point, so the drawings are hard to judge. The gable is already on the original building, and the addition should not have any dormers that suggest it is more prominent than the original building.

Mr. Gall said the slopes are consistent in different parts of the roof.

Committee Member Imboden said even if they are consistent, it doesn't look like it's consistent based on the placement of the two buildings.

Committee Member Imboden said the hip dormers are preferred over the original planned dormers. The concern is about the amount of design going on, so anything that can be simplified, including a single long hip dormer, would be a better option.

Committee Member Woollett said that the hip dormer also communicates that the rear portion of the building is an addition rather than an original part of the building, which is the idea that should be communicated.

Committee Member Imboden said that on a new building the original dormers would be fine, but since they are being used on an addition, it is overshadowing the original building.

Committee Member Woollett said that the original brick is quite unique, so maybe bringing brick into the plans for the addition wouldn't work too well since it can't be matched. He also wouldn't bring the stone. Shingles or siding would appear to be viable options.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the differences between the original and the addition would be so pronounced that it would look like two different structures.

Chair Fox said that bringing in the shingles would help make it feel like a conservatory.

Mr. Gall agreed that the brick probably couldn't be matched very well.

Committee Member Imboden said not to feel obligated to try to match it.

Committee Member Woollett pointed out that the Eidenmuller medical building also tried to use different kinds of the same material (shingles) in the old and new, and it didn't work too well. The plans were revised to have two different kinds of materials used, which seemed to work better.

Committee Member Imboden said using different materials would be fine.

Mr. Gall asked how the carriage house would have been built in the original times in Orange.

Committee Member Imboden said it would have looked like a barn.

Mr. Gall asked what specifically a barn would have looked like.

Committee Member Imboden suggested driving around to see what the ones that are still around look like.

Mr. Pizzarello pointed out that there are some residences nearby with carriage houses, and they are mirror images of one another.

Committee Member Woollett said it doesn't have to be that way, but conceded that those do exist.

Mr. Gall asked for clarification on the glazing requirement.

Chair Fox explained that that requirement is not a design issue, but rather a building code issue. Looking at the building codes will provide all the guidance necessary.

Mr. Pizzarello stated that that requirement was just presented to the applicants that day.

Chair Fox stated that a qualified architect would know the building codes.

Committee Member Imboden said the Committee couldn't approve a project that didn't meet the code.

Chair Fox said that the Committee is actually helping the applicants because they would run into the problem when they get to the Building Division, and then have to come back to the Committee anyway. The Committee's job is not to enforce the building code. She apologized for getting emotional about this issue, but said she felt strongly that this should have been taken care of before the design plan got to the Committee.

Committee Member Imboden brought up some smaller items to note. There are a few openings that exist in the arroyo stone base, and they should be shown. The plans as currently constructed don't show whether they are going to be filled in or not. If they are to be filled in, there should be a plan for how that is going to happen. Also, the pickets on the second story balconies are inconsistent on the different elevations, and they should be the same on every drawing. He also suggested that the applicants have a color material palette when they come back to the Committee. Finally, he made a strong recommendation that the columns which used to exist on the house should be brought back if it's economically feasible. This home is an important one to the Historic District, and anything that can bring it back to its original state would be good.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that the landscape plan could be simplified and be driven by a central concept when the plan is presented to the Committee again. Picking plants that are hardy enough to take a west and east exposure would be a good start. Since the house is on the corner, the landscaping should look a little more formal and unified.

Mr. Gall asked when it would be possible to come back before the Committee.

Chair Fox said that would be something the applicants would have to coordinate with Staff.

Committee Member McCormack moved to continue this item to a future meeting, where revised plans could be presented to the Committee.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

(8) DRC No. 4704-13 – HUDSPETH RESIDENCE

- A proposal to demolish an existing 344 sq. ft. garage and construct a 2,265 sq. ft. building for a new unit and garage.
- 143 S. Citrus Street
- Staff Contact: Leslie Roseberry, 714-744-7220, lroseberry@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Planning Manager, Leslie Roseberry, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Public Comments:

None.

Chair Fox opened the discussion up to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Woollett said he was concerned with the mass of the proposed building. He thought it would look like a really strange building, and there would be vertical surfaces that would appear quite stark. Doing something with a sloped roof or other techniques might help make it look not quite so stark. In this neighborhood, that doesn't really fit in.

Committee Member McCormack agreed that it was too big, and wanted to hear about the other options to mitigate the size.

Committee Member Imboden said he didn't have a problem with a second unit on the property, or a 2-story unit, but the way this is designed, it doesn't look like it would fit the neighborhood. Similar buildings in this area might exist, but they were built before this Committee was founded. The building seems to have an unusually high lower plate on the building, which doesn't help the massive appearance. The home on the front of the property is a simple structure, and he understands the idea of making the second home simple as well, but there are a number of ways to break up these large facades. Similar buildings in the area have used these techniques to help them seem not so massive. The garage doors look like the Craftsman style, but the shutters are inconsistent with the Craftsman style.

Committee Member Imboden also stated that in his opinion, the plan just hasn't reached the required level of being compatible and friendly to the neighbors. It's also a really big structure.

Chair Fox said she went to look at the property, and the front house has an 8 or 9 foot bottom floor, while this proposed property has a 13 foot bottom floor. She stated that the Committee is being asked to accept this design, as well as the extra 4 or 5 feet, and that is what is pushing this design over the edge. Many of the two-story dwellings on the block have much smaller 2nd story units, whereas this one is almost as big. The result is that this structure is very vertical. The height and the lack of facades to break up the height are a problem.

Brian Scott, address on file, mentioned that the City planners require the deck to be on the front, rather than the back, of the property. The roof that was originally on the front would have broken up the height, but wasn't allowed. He stated that Ms. Roseberry corrected that at the last meeting with the City; Staff said it was fine if the deck was in the back.

Committee Member Imboden said he didn't think that the two are mutually exclusive. The deck can be at the front, and there can still be a roof to break up the height. He also stressed that the size of the building is what is driving most of the problems with the design. It is difficult to fit a building this size in this space, and it will require a more diligent design to make it work.

Chair Fox said that if the size of the building were smaller, then the deck would also be smaller and the mass would not be such a problem.

Mr. Scott explained that the owner, Terry Hudspeth, likes to work on historic cars and wants a bigger garage to help him do that.

Chair Fox said that if even just a part of the structure had that roof, that might help to make things workable. She would not be able to make the findings on the infill guidelines, which was requested in the staff report.

Mr. Scott explained that a pit might work in order to keep the height down.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the height couldn't be just in a part of the garage where it was needed rather than the entire building.

Mr. Hudspeth said he would be willing to bring the height down from 13 feet to 10 feet if that will expedite the project. He didn't want a lift to keep the project from moving forward. The lift wasn't for working on cars, but it just needed to be enough to get the cars off the ground to change the tires and other small changes.

Chair Fox stated that the height of the garage was just one of the issues. The "box" feel of the garage was a real problem, with no windows or other features to break it up. The other Committee Members agreed.

Chair Fox suggested that a pitched roof would help to break up the mass, and the portion under that pitched roof could be where the 13 foot height is.

Ms. Roseberry clarified that the open space has to be directly accessible to the unit. The stairwell had to be accessible to someone who parked in the garage, rather than having them have to walk all the way around the house to get to the stairs, so locating the open space in the back would work.

Mr. Scott said the front door would need to be located right in front of the unit to be accessible to the open space.

Committee Member Imboden said that generally there shouldn't be a lot of steps for people to have to take to locate stairwells and doors. Because of the size of this project, there are very

limited options on where things can go. He also said he is concerned that the total volume of paving might be too much for the code. Visually, it just looks like a lot of paving.

Committee Member McCormack said he looked at the project as if he were the applicant, and he would probably step some of the features back so the look would be broken up a bit, including exposing the stairwell to the second floor.

Committee Member Imboden cautioned that exposing features is advised against in Old Towne. It's fine if it's internal to the project, but when it is visible to the neighbors, it becomes a problem.

Chair Fox asked if the steps up to the second floor would then cause people to run into the deck.

Mr. Scott said they wouldn't if the first floor was 13 feet tall, but if it drops to 10 feet, there may be a problem.

Chair Fox said there needed to be some articulation to break up the design.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the applicants considered not having the second story over where the high area was.

Mr. Scott said that because this was going to be a rental unit, they wanted it to be big enough to be a 2-bedroom rental for college kids. This design was chosen because it would be attractive to these renters.

Committee Member Woollett confirmed with Mr. Scott that the garage doors were only 15 feet wide. He then asked if cars could get into a garage with doors that narrow.

Mr. Scott said it was a structural issue. The applicants had it laid out with two garage doors originally. When the entrance door to the unit was moved to the front, the garage door had to be made narrower.

Chair Fox clarified that at 15 feet, that wouldn't be considered a 2-car garage.

Committee Member Imboden asked how many people would park in the garage.

Mr. Scott said that there would be 2 spaces inside the garage, and 2 spaces next to the garage.

Ms. Roseberry stated that the first round of plans showed two 2-car garage doors there. With the open space required, the front unit didn't have enough space to back up. The requirements are for 2 cars per unit, and one of the spaces could be uncovered. She mentioned that there hadn't been any discussion about working on cars inside the garage so far, and that will have to be discussed.

Committee Member Imboden said he was concerned whether this plan could get approved without the required parking available.

Ms. Roseberry said that the door would have to be enlarged to 16 feet, which would then allow for two cars to park inside.

Committee Member Woollett said people could have a garage door, and if one of those spots wasn't required, it wouldn't be a problem. He said if there were two cars required, for example, four cars could be parked in there, and only two of them would need accessible doors.

Committee Member Imboden stated that there still needed to be 25 feet to back up.

Committee Member Woollett said if it wasn't officially a garage, then that requirement wouldn't apply.

Committee Member Imboden said he didn't want to enter into discussions about how to beat the City's building codes.

Chair Fox said that several of the issues, including the size of the garage doors, are related to the project simply being too big. The unarticulated mass, the difficult parking situation, and the open space requirement are all related to the building being too big. She recommends reducing the square footage of the garage, which would allow for more wiggle room to address these other problems.

Mr. Hudspeth asked if the reduction would affect the upstairs rental as well.

Chair Fox said that reducing the size of the garage would allow for more open space on the ground level, which would make it less of a problem on the second story. The second story structure would not likely have to be reduced in that scenario, although the second story would have to be articulated to reduce the "boxy" feel of the project.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the reduction should be in terms of footprint, or in terms of articulation, or both.

Committee Member Imboden explained that he didn't care where the reduction came from, as long as the design could function as it should. He said he didn't have preferences because it wasn't his project, but it was too visually big and bland. Basically, "it's a big stucco box."

Chair Fox shared the infill development guidelines, which asked if the project created a structure that is compatible with the scale, massing, orientation, and articulation of the surrounding development. She said she couldn't say that this project does that, even if the garage height is dropped 3 feet. Also, there is no internally consistent integrated design theme. Based on not being able to say yes to these findings, Chair Fox said she personally can't approve the design. She asked if she were speaking for the group, and the other Committee Members said yes.

Chair Fox said the Committee could deny the project and have the applicants appeal it to the Planning Commission, or continue the project where the applicants come back to the Committee with a refined design based on the comments that have been given. She doesn't think the Committee can approve the project as is.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that Ms. Roseberry explain to the applicants what the different options mean.

Ms. Roseberry said that if the project is denied, within 15 days there can be an appeal to the Planning Commission, and that decision can also be appealed up to the City Council as well. Alternately, the project can be continued, where the plans come back to the Committee after being revised. The date for that would have to be set after discussion with Staff.

Mr. Hudspeth explained that there are other structures in the neighborhood that are also "big stucco boxes."

Chair Fox stated that there are other stucco structures, but most of them aren't that big. She said she didn't think that there needed to be a huge amount of change to make the plans fit the neighborhood. The 2-story houses being referenced aren't this tall, and aren't this big. Many of them have roofs and other features that break up their appearance.

Chair Fox stated that the two findings that need to be met are the aesthetics, which need to hold to community aesthetics and have an internally consistent integrated design theme; and the infill development guidelines, which state that the project be compatible with scale, massing, and orientation. This project doesn't meet either of those findings.

Mr. Hudspeth showed some comparable nearby buildings with similar features.

Committee Member Imboden said that there are some stucco boxes nearby, but at some point the City created a panel of people to review projects to make sure development stays within what the neighborhood can handle, and that is what this Committee is charged with doing. The project proposes something similar to the other stucco boxes, but is already 3 feet higher than those. There are several reasons that people can't just point to a structure in the neighborhood and say "we want to do that." That would be one thing, but this project proposes to do even more than that. This is one of the reasons why the Committee is having a hard time saying yes to the project.

Mr. Scott asked that if the garage were lowered, would it "pass."

Gaye Hudspeth, applicant, address on file, stated that the original design was to match the front house, and it looked good, but then they were told they needed the open space. Originally, the intent was to match designs between the front and back houses. The shutters, for example, were added to the back house because they were in the front house.

Chair Fox explained that the open space was a code requirement, and if it could be met somewhere else, the two houses could still look very similar. The site is completely paved at this point, and there is no room for that.

Committee Member Imboden stated that the design requirements are clear and available to all designers, and all those requirements have to be met if the project is to be approved. Saying that this is a good design, but it doesn't meet the open space requirement, is not good enough.

Mr. Scott said the deck on the second floor meets the open space requirements, but they were told by the Planning Division that they needed to change things.

Chair Fox said that the project needs to be able to do all the required things.

Mr. Scott said he believes the property meets all of those requirements. The development standards are black and white, but the criteria of the Committee seem very subjective.

Chair Fox explained that the Committee is there to uphold the City ordinance. Infill, for example, has to be compatible with the neighbors, and a structure this big and this tall isn't compatible with the neighbors. All designs need to meet the zoning code, and also meet the ordinances.

Mr. Scott said he believes this meets the criteria of the neighbors because the big white box behind it is basically the same building.

Committee Member McCormack mentioned that "compatible with the neighbors" also means it has to be compatible with the neighbors who don't have big stucco boxes on their property. The overall guiding principle is to keep neighborhoods from gentrifying into a bunch of big stucco boxes. The intent is to protect the people who don't have big stucco boxes and keep the neighborhood intact.

Mr. Scott expressed frustration that he had to meet the requirements of the big stucco boxes, but not actually build a big stucco box.

Committee Member Imboden asked why the structure had to be this big and this bland.

Mr. Hudspeth said it was that way because that's what he wanted. He had to live there.

Committee Member Imboden said the height still has to fit within the requirements.

Mr. Hudspeth said it was difficult to know where to go with revising the design, since it sounded like the Committee wanted the applicants to match the other stucco walls.

Committee Member Imboden said he doesn't believe anyone on the Committee had said that they wanted this project to match the other stucco walled structures.

Chair Fox said that the other photographs that were presented had much smaller second story units with lots of roof around them. It doesn't work to say that this project is a 2-story unit just like those, since the design is not like them. There are ways to meet the massing requirements, but the open space requirement still has to be met. Reducing the size of the building will allow for meeting the open space requirement in front of the building. The code and the Committee are designed to keep people from maxing out all the available room they have to build on, which would increase the density of the neighborhood.

Committee Member McCormack gave an example of someone who had a project that was a 2-story pre-fabricated big box. The group suggested ways to articulate it and break up the appearance. After revising the plans and meeting all the criteria, it was approved. He mentioned

that the house is in his neighborhood, and it looks big, but it is articulated in such a way that it looks like it fits. There is often a struggle with these things, and it is difficult at times.

Mr. Hudspeth explained that the project is likely dead if it isn't approved tonight because the funding agreement will expire within two weeks.

Chair Fox said that because the findings weren't made here, Staff had adequately informed the applicants of what was needed.

Mr. Hudspeth said he believes he made every effort to make the changes Staff wanted.

Ms. Roseberry pointed out that the massing was discussed, but had never changed. She also mentioned that the application can be denied or continued.

Committee Member Imboden mentioned that the appeal may not necessarily be heard right away, but it would still be a possibility.

Mr. Hudspeth mentioned that he didn't really want to pursue fruitless efforts on this. His lenders were very clear that there was another two weeks, and then the funding wouldn't be available.

Committee Member Imboden suggested that if the application were continued all the options would still be available.

Chair Fox asked Ms. Roseberry whether if the design met the infill guidelines it would have to come back to the Committee.

Ms. Roseberry said that because it was a single-family home, it would have to come back.

Committee Member Woollett moved to continue this item so the applicant can address some of the issues raised tonight.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on September 4, 2013.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.