CITY OF ORANGE
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES – FINAL

December 18, 2013

Committee Members Present:	Carol Fox Robert Imboden Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett
Committee Members Absent:	None
Staff in Attendance:	David Khorram, Chief Building Official Marissa Moshier, Contract Planner Anne Fox, Contract Planner Angie Ibarra, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Fox opened the Administrative Session at 5:07 p.m.

Chair Fox stated there was no Policy or Procedural information.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of November 6, 2013. Corrections and changes were noted.

Chair Fox stated that she was trying to create a shorter version of the past minutes to try to find a solution for shortening the minutes. She passed out copies of samples of what she had reviewed.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Regular Session – 5:45 P.M.

<u>ROLL CALL:</u>

All Committee Members were 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: November 6, 2013

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of November 6, 2013, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

(2) DRC No. 4707-13 – HERMAN RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a rear addition to a contributing building in the Historic District and to relocate a one-car garage on the property.
- 815 E. Palmyra Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Marissa Moshier, 714-744-7243, mmoshier@cityoforange.org
- Continued from DRC Meeting: November 20, 2013
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Marissa Moshier, Contract Planner, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

A proposal for a 177 square foot addition to the rear of a contributing building continued from the November 20th meeting and to address DRC comments from that meeting about the plate height of the addition.

The applicant studied shifting the addition to keep it centered on the north elevation of the property of building. This proposal would preserve the outriggers on the rear elevation of the building in that it created a 7' 3" plate height in that first addition and it created a jog in the west wall of the bedroom and based on that study, the applicant is again proposing an offset addition, gable roof and with the plate height 7' 7". The bedroom ceiling will be matched to the height of the addition. In this proposal the outrigger on the corner of the building will likely be resting on the roof of the addition, so, the application is proposing removal of that. The staff believes the applicant has studied the alternatives for the addition appropriately and has developed a proposal that balances the retention of materials with functionality of the addition. The applicant also addressed some issues with materials that Committee Member Wheeler brought up during the previous meeting and clarified the details for concrete slab foundation for the relocated garage. The staff recommends that DRC recommend approval to Planning Commission.

Public Comments:

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked why the addition is not the same width as the building. Mr. Williams stated that the last meeting was trying to address plate height and that we proposed to look at centering it so that would raise the height, but, that got back to the same issues with the garage as far as having 6' required distance from garage. Mr. Williams stated that he wanted to leave a 6' clearance because they didn't want to go too far back with the garage. They still wanted to keep it as far forward as possible.

Committee Member Wheeler asked about removing the outrigger on the existing northwest corner and moving to the new northwest corner of the addition so it will match. Also on the casement windows, he suggested, single leaf casement that would not have the vertical line and it would be much easier to replicate the appearance of double-hung window.

Committee Member Wheeler did ask Mr. Williams about the extended barges. Mr. Williams said that he would specify that the extended barges will be framed in the traditional manner.

Committee Member Imboden asked about the double hung window that is called out as a casement and it's shown as if it's hinged and split in the middle.

Mr. Williams stated that it is a casement acting like a double hung window not a double hung window acting as a casement. Mr. Williams was proposing that it be a double casement that when they closed they had non-standard mullions so it would look like a double hung window when it was closed.

Chair Fox said that it was just a cosmetic look.

Mr. Williams said that a standard casing could be a single casement; most casements are one big window. So the emphasis is on the bar in the center so that it looks like the rest of the double hung windows. Chair Fox said that you do have the casements on the west facing elevation, where you do have double hung windows.

Mr. Williams stated that the hinges are on opposite sides of each other not in the center, so that it's a big enough opening to get out in case of a fire.

Chair Fox stated that it's not drawn accurately because we don't see the style of the two parts of that casing. The drawings need to be corrected on the north facing elevation bedroom window. We need to see the center styles for the double casement.

Committee Member Imboden wanted to talk about the addition from the original structure and what are changes have been made to differentiate that.

Mr. Williams stated that he is staying with has what has been requested by DRC and of course the previous planner. The main thing is that we have a roof which is lower that the existing roof and we have that. Second, we have demarcation board which separates the existing from the new. Next is to offset the siding and that's the off-set because in the last meeting we were talking about different sizes of siding and in construction when I do these houses, we will typically remove siding and we will reuse it or use as much material as we have. So if we have the same exact siding taken off of the back, and we're going to use it on the side, we're going to either trim the bottom of that section of siding so it falls lower but all the lines don't match up. So the offset will stay the same all the way through.

Committee Member Imboden made the clarification that because the siding on the addition appears larger than the original in the drawings.

Committee Member Imboden wanted clarification on modifying the plate height in order to get this thing down to save the outriggers but it didn't come back that way.

Mr. Williams stated that it was for the look of the interior.

Committee Member Imboden stated that at the meeting the committee discussed that they wanted to see the out looker preserved if at all possible and the plate height brought down.

Mr. Williams stated that they explored that and that they were hoping not to have low inside the room.

Committee Member Imboden asked if he considered cove ceiling which is very typical appearance to the house.

Mr. Williams said that even so hadn't seen one yet in the years that he has been working here.

Committee Member Imboden said that he understood that Mr. Williams didn't want to bring the wall into the bedroom. He asked if Mr. Williams had explore at all removing the wall, maybe with a pop out, that would give that offset.

Mr. Williams stated that he didn't think he could because they were already within the 5' setback.

Committee Member Imboden stated that the plans show that you are at 7' and plus an architectural feature that leaves a certain limitation of the length of it.

Mr. Williams stated that is not now the setback it's actually the overhanging. At the end of the overhanging, we have to be within 5". It's no longer the wall of the building. He stated that new things have been proposed to him that when he relocates garages or building additions that it's no longer the wall that has to be within 5' of the property line but now is it's the end of the rafter tails.

Committee Member Imboden stated that he was troubled that a body would continue a project because we were concerned about the removal of character defining features, we concerned about offsets, we're concerned about all these things and it comes back to us without those revisions and we're still talking about moving forward. He stated that he wouldn't be able to approve this because didn't feel that the issue has been explored. He believed there are architectural solutions that could happen inside the space that could easily resolve this. That are true to the period and because there are architectural ways to solve these root problems, there are architectural way to solve the offset and they haven't been explored in my opinion. That was the reason that we continued this. These are small little things but when I start looking differentiations and different window patterns. We also talked about some constancies in the windows of the addition, that wasn't addressed was the outriggers still being removed. I think these problems are not being solved.

Committee Member Woollett stated we don't all necessarily agree. The applicant has come back and made changes. We don't normally require an offset for any addition. We allow them to put strip in there or change the siding, which is has been done. I think that on the back side of a building, we're trying to turn this building into a monument and its single family house, it's on the backside and they have gone a long way in a very sensitive way.

Committee Member Imboden stated that from his prospects are that we have standards in place and if they can be reasonably met, I think we should respect that.

Committee Member Woollett stated that an offset is an option and nothing in the requirements says that somebody has to offset. That is one of the options.

Chair Fox commented about the trim on the side not being there to show enough of the demarcation and if the window was a single casement with a single horizontal bar would be more successful than a double casement, as far aesthetically matching the other windows in there. When it come to the outrigger moving out in to the rear façade is a way of keeping and that we're not tossing in the trash and I'm feeling that the jog in the roofline is enough of a match change on that side of the house and in a very tight situation where you have a small area. Given the circumstance of this house, I am fine that being enough of a preservation of this corner and being able to keep those old and new elements distinct. I feel that what we're talking about right now is about relocating the outriggers to the new northwest corner and keeping the relationship of the two pitches of the two roofs where they're drawn and imposing an offset. My own opinion that is adequate for me. To relocate the outlooker on the northwest corner to northwest corner of the addition. To go to a single casement with a horizontal divider to match the existing to constructing the new extended barge of the addition in an official manner without hoppers.

Committee Member Wheeler proposed a motion to move to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4707-13.

<u>Conditions</u>:

1. A trim board to indicate the demarcation point between the original and existing to be added on the West side.
2. The existing outlooker of the northwest corner of the existing building to be relocated to the northwest of the addition.
3. That the window shown on the rear of the addition be changed to a single casement rather than a double casement with a horizontal muntin to follow the line of the existing double hung windows.
4. That the extended barge of the new addition be framed in the traditional manner without the use of flat outriggers.

Chair Fox made a motion to recommend approval of DRC No. 4707-13, to the Planning Commission subject to the Conditions contained in the Staff Report, with the following additional Condition shown below; and subject to the Findings contained in the Staff Report:

- XXXX
- XXXXX
- XXXXX

SECOND: C.M. Wheeler
AYES: Committee Members Fox, Wheeler, McCormack, Woollett
NOES: C.M. Imboden
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. DRC No. 4700-13 – STORAGE WEST

- A proposal to demolish an existing two-story office/storage building at an existing Storage West Establishment and construct a new three-story, self-storage building in its place with related site improvement.
- 682 S. Tustin Street
- Staff Contact: Anne E. Fox, 714-744-72-36, afox@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission
-

Anne Fox, Contract Planner, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Public Comments:

None.

Chair Fox opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

The architect, Shab Vakili, was present to answer questions. Regarding the number of trees, she stated that they had increased the size of the trees to justify the Variance request. She pointed out that they are limited on the area available to landscape due to the building placement, setbacks and the requirement to use infiltration basins for treating stormwater. The existing one story storage buildings are pre-fab and not true construction and it would be difficult to add or to put any weight or attach anything to them. They are open to painting them to make them consistent with new structure.

Committee Member McCormack thought it was a good idea to paint the existing buildings to match the new color scheme.

Chair Fox asked to see the actual color samples. She stated a concern about the interior doors being a factory painted color and the use of that color on the doors on existing single-story buildings.

Ms. Vakili stated that the color is a trade mark color of Storage West.

Committee Member McCormack stated that it was hard for him to judge the height of this new building and the height of the ramp on the freeway. The building has a clean roof except there are air conditioners and it's hard to tell how visible those would be.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he thought the existing building had clutter on the roof and he would be concerned about what would be visible with the new building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that he noted that there was inconsistency between the drawings on the depth of the tower element and he thought it should completely wrapped around the rear.

Chair Fox stated that she was curious about what might be within the display area besides the red doors. She was concerned about the display area and the windows being used for signage. She also asked if the doors were functioning doors. She also thought the new building was designed very elegant building and that the finishes were far from being your typical storage building.

The Committee Members then engaged in a discussion with the Ms. Vakili regarding the way the CMU and Split Face Block was to be used on the building's exterior, making several suggestions about lining things up, grouting, etc. Ultimately Ms. Vakili and Committee reached an understanding and a recommendation was made as to how to apply the material at the base.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what the Code requirements were for trees versus what is being proposed so that the Committee could determine the need for the Variance.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that the problem with the number trees and the need for a Variance could be resolved if there were better spacing of the trees and some planter areas were added to the building entrance.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval of DRC No. 4700-13, to the Planning Commission subject to the Conditions contained in the Staff Report, with the following additional Conditions shown below; and subject to the Findings contained in the Staff Report:

- Condition #10 to be modified to read "The existing single story structures on the easterly portion of the subject site shall be painted using a combination of the two of the three paint colors (#1, 2, & 3) used on the new building. The accent color, red cedar, may be used as an option in a level horizontal accent stripe, maximum 8" high."
- Add a Condition that "No signage letters or logos to be placed in the areas marked "display" on the plans."
- Add a Condition that "The front raised parapet should continue to the back side to create a completed tower element."
- The Committee does not find sufficient evidence to support approval of a Variance since the requirements can easily be met for the tree count on the site and the applicant is in agreement to modify the Landscape Plan.
- The Committee recommends, "Replacing the cultured stone called out at the base of the building with the same split faced gray and precision CMU pattern that is being proposed for the rear of the building instead and that the mortar joints be raked horizontally and quest vertically.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on January 15, 2014.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.