CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

February 16, 2011

Committee Members Present: Bill Cathcart

Adrienne Gladson Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Cathcart opened the Administrative Session at 5:09 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated on the review of the Agenda on Item No. 6, the applicant, if he was present, was elderly and Staff was asking if the item could be moved up.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, stated the applicant was Ralph Shannon and he was 95 years old and it was not certain if he would be present for the item.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they had spoken previously about a new Staff Report format that would come forward for future meetings and the main reason for that was to include a section on findings. The Agenda format was similar to the Planning Commission's format, but not completely the same and the main change was that there would be a section on the findings of an application. The findings would be at the end of the Staff Report and the title to that section would be "Staff Recommendation and Required Findings." The findings would be the conclusion and generally the findings for the Planning Commission would be included in the Resolution; however, for the Design Review Committee it would be included in the Staff Report. The Staff's recommendation would also be included in that section as it was based on the findings.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she wanted to review what a finding was and in the Staff Report there was the same preamble that spoke to findings, what they were, and where they were from. She had learned from one of the City's Attorneys that there was a case, Topanga Association for a Scenic Community vs. the County of Los Angeles, in 1974 that set the precedent for how a finding was defined. She attempted to simplify the information so a reader could understand it and that the DRC could be more familiar with the information when the findings were met or needed to be changed. She had added that the court defined a finding as a conclusion that described the method of analysis that decision-makers utilized to make a final decision. The findings were a requirement in the Code, the Old Towne Design Standards, or the Design Guidelines. In the Old Towne guidelines there was a statement for building additions and

modifications that read: the proposed work would neither affect the significant architectural features of the building nor adversely affect the character of historical or architectural aesthetic interests of the building; that was the threshold or the standard. If the maker of the motion was approving a project, the reason that the project met the findings would need to be stated. The statements would be listed that Staff believed made the findings. The decision-making body would make the finding or draw a conclusion by identifying evidence in the record through testimony, reports, environmental documents, or a notation on the plans that would be a fact that would back up the findings, or to "show their work." The statements that supported the findings bridged the gap between the raw data and the ultimate decision. The findings would be the conclusion. The findings were the ultimate conclusion that must be reached in order to approve or recommend approval of a project. The same would hold true if a project was being denied; the reasons for why a project had not met the findings would need to be stated. Staff would write the findings down. If the DRC had not agreed with Staff's recommendation they would look to the DRC for some very specific reasons why the project had not met the findings. The record would need to contain the details. The next Staff Reports would include the new format.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the findings were already included in the Staff Report?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the findings were listed in the current format; however, the facts that supported those findings were not included. The new Staff Report would include that. When a motion was made, the statement that the project met the findings included in the Staff Report would support those findings; there could be additions or deletions to the findings. For example, if the findings listed that the colors were within the acceptable color palette and the DRC found that not to be the case, that would be indicated in the motion.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the findings would be listed first with recommendations after that?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated no, the approval or recommendation of approval would be made based on the findings that were included in the Staff Report and any additions or deletions. It would be clearly in the record.

Committee Member Gladson stated the nice part was that the plans themselves would be something they could draw from for the facts, such as in-kind materials or that the project was in compliance.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the Planners were used to writing findings in the Resolution for the Planning Commission; but that had not been done for the DRC. They would now be included in the Staff Report. If the findings were not found to be met; the reasons for that would need to be stated and that information would be contained in the minutes for the record. For Planning Commission, the Resolution would be re-written and the Chair would sign that document. She asked if there were any additional questions?

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the findings would need to be verbalized in a motion and the reasons why the findings were met.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated in a motion the statement could be made that the approval was based on the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from January 19, 2011. Changes and corrections were noted.

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

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

All Committee Members were present

<u>COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF MARCH 2, 2011:</u>

Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

Committee Member Gladson nominated Committee Member Cathcart to continue in the position as Chairperson.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Committee Member Wheeler nominated Committee Member Gladson to continue in the position of Vice-Chairperson.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There was none.

All matters that are listed as Consent Items are considered to be routine by the Design Review Committee and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of said items unless members of the Design Review Committee, staff, or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Items for separate action.

CONSENT ITEMS:

- (1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
 - (a) January 5, 2011

Committee Member McCormack noted corrections and changes to the meeting minutes of January 5, 2011.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 5, 2011 Design Review Committee meeting with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Bill Cathcart

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

(b) January 19, 2011

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 19, 2011 Design Review Committee meeting with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Joe Woollett

ABSENT: None

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for February 16, 2011 Page 5 of 27

Chair Cathcart stated there had been a request to move an item up in the Agenda and he asked if that request was still necessary?

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, stated Ralph Shannon was not present and the Agenda could remain as written.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4478-10 - RUBY'S RESTAURANT-LANDSCAPING & ACCESS

- A proposal to install new landscaping for a new restaurant in the Santa Fe Depot Station.
- 186 N. Atchison Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- Sign Program approved at January 19, 2011 DRC meeting
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Joe Campbell, address on file, stated Staff had done a good job.

Mr. Ryan stated the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance would not apply to registered State, Federal, or local sites.

Public Comments:

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had a concern with the proposed Orange trees and he had brought some citrus books. The trees proposed were fairly small and generally used for foundation plantings and small shrubs. The trees depicted in the plans were trees at age 20 and even with a 36" box, and with all that he had read on the trees, when they were grown in the nursery trade were smaller than most boxed trees. His concern would be that the trees be larger so that they would not be reverted to a shrub. A maintenance person could mistake the tree for a shrub with oranges on it. He would not want to lose the tree concept from framing the entry way.

Mr. Campbell agreed that he wanted trees and not a shrub.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had seen it happen previously that the person who decided whether it was a tree or a shrub was by the guy who held the pruning sheers. He would want the trees, if available, in 36" box to be on the larger side.

Mr. Campbell stated upon the approval he would engage a person who would be able to put trees in for him. Orange trees were a bit persnickety and he had not gotten the exact answers on how big and how much they were. He wanted a big tree. For what it was worth, he had a Ruby's in San Juan Capistrano with Orange trees and that they were available for transplanting and they were of all sizes. A hotel was going in and the property owner would love for the trees to be

taken for transplanting. The challenge would be that transplanting was very tricky; it could be done but it needed to be done the day of. The trees needed to be kept wet on the truck and a large hole would need to be dug and his intent was not to have the oranges be shrubs. He would not want trees too large that would obscure the entrance and he wanted a tree that would get to a certain size and remain there.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the concept; and it was just a matter of how they got there.

Mr. Campbell stated he would be in charge of the guy with the sharp sheers.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want the plans to reflect the photo simulation; currently the plan was different than the photo was arranged.

Committee Member Gladson stated for the non-landscape expert, she had seen the notes to Mr. Ryan from Stan Smith. There was a note for Fragrant Sour Orange Citrus tree and she asked if that was a common name and was the idea to get the fragrance too?

Mr. Campbell stated it was important and the flavor was less important than the fragrance. The sour was the flavor of the Orange and not the fragrance. He wanted the look and the smell. His intent was to have a blossoming tree that would emit the fragrance on a seasonal basis.

Chair Cathcart stated watering would be critical.

Mr. Campbell stated he was willing to bring in an expert in that regard and it was where Mr. Smith had come in. It would be nice to harvest some of the oranges throughout the year and use them for garnishes in the drinks.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the Orange tree's watering needs would be in conflict with the other plantings?

Committee Member McCormack stated to answer that, in five years from now "no." Initially to get the trees going would be to balance the watering in that area. The area could not be treated traditionally and it would need to be known that the Orange trees were a bit touchy, especially if they were field grown.

Mr. Campbell asked with the Orange tree having different watering needs than the shrubs, could they plant the Orange tree and put the other plants in boxes for two years and then once the tree was growing put the other plants in the ground?

Chair Cathcart stated he would hate to see that from the standpoint of someone visiting the site; he believed that a maintenance person who paid attention would solve the issue.

Committee Member Woollett asked what if the smaller plants were more drought-tolerant and would not require as much water?

Chair Cathcart stated he felt the same way as Committee Member McCormack had felt; that it was a good-looking plant palette and it was bullet-proof once established.

Mr. Campbell stated they might be in a position where the ground cover would need replacing once a year and that was the price he paid for that look.

Committee Member McCormack stated he could lessen the factors. There were three different plants on the ground plane and if they went with only one ground cover he would only need to deal with those two things.

Mr. Campbell stated he was at the mercy of Mr. Smith's recommendations and he was open to other recommendations from the DRC.

Chair Cathcart suggested going back to Mr. Smith and provide him with the information from their discussion to make a determination on the plantings.

Mr. Campbell stated he would want to move forward on the tree piece and to understand that there would be ground cover. He had not wanted to open the site without the trees in place.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4478-10, Ruby's Restaurant-Landscaping & Access, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report with the following additional conditions:

- 1. Field-grown Orange trees shall be provided.
- 2. To change the planting plan to match the photo simulation.
- 3. To adopt a maintenance plan that would provide for the viability and health of the field-grown trees.

Mr. Campbell stated they might need to remove some of the brickwork while completing the landscaping and he asked if that would be acceptable? The bricks would be replaced.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the applicant had mentioned that there may be a change to the ground cover plantings and she asked if the DRC Members would want that to come back for review as the motion stated the plantings should reflect what was in the photo simulation?

Chair Cathcart stated if the plants were changed, but still matched the simulation, it would be okay.

Mr. Campbell stated the simulation would be acceptable, but if there were changes he would return for their review of those changes.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(3) DRC No. 4511-10 - THE BLOCK-STYLONS

- A proposal for signage changes to the existing stylons at The Block at Orange.
- 20 City Boulevard West
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- Prior DRC Preliminary Review from November 3, 2010 meeting
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Blake Windal, address on file, stated they had responded to the comments from the previous presentation about the crisp colors and what they had attempted to do was to add more photography for the single-tenant use signs. The tenants depicted on the samples were not necessarily the tenants that had bought on to have signage, but examples. For a tenant that wanted to have their advertisement on a stylon their tag would remain in the same place on each stylon to maintain consistency. On stylons labeled C0101 and C0103, those were created based on the feedback from the DRC; however, they had not read very well and while they were included in the packet they would not be recommending that they used that type of layout. Primarily they were inconsistent with the rest of the messaging. The vertical copy had not read very well and the horizontal ribs cut through the copy and they would not be illuminated and at night they would cut through the copy and would not read very well. The other item he wanted to point out was that on the 90' stylon, labeled E0101 and E0102, AMC Theatre had indeed bought on to manage those and those would be changed out periodically by the movie studios. Currently at the AMC Theatre site there were signs that had become faded over time and they had been successful in negotiating with AMC that a different movie studio would manage a separate stylon; those would be Disney, Sony, and Warner Bros. It would result in very fresh signage all the time. The AMC stylons would change no less than quarterly or as frequently as the studios would be willing to change those out. The multi-tenant option would be the most popular and the mall would pay for those. The sample labeled E0103 with the hang tag theme would continue with the rest of the rendering that they proposed and were before them. Each panel would have a hang tag featuring a different retailer and the bottom panel would remain to identify the mall name, which had not been decided yet. The hang tags would be offset to present a less sterile environment and a more realistic dangling and the colors had changed. The idea was to cluster each of the four with their own colors, as referenced in the Staff Report. The colors would be reserved for a later determination and the samples presented gave an indication of what those colors might be. They were in the process of moving some of the stylons. The last thing he wanted to point out was that on the side of the stylons there was punched-out metal work and those read "The Block;" however, with the contemplated name change, those areas would be revised.

Public Comment:

None.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was pleased that the comments from the last presentation had been taken under consideration and he was pleased with what was presented.

Committee Member McCormack asked with the separate panels was it very labor-intensive to get those cut and pasted?

Mr. Windal stated the 90' stylons would be four pieces of fabric, but the smaller stylons would have only one piece of fabric with ribs that fit over the fabric and made the application easier. The larger stylons would present a more challenging layout.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked how the hang tags were laid out and they appeared that they were "blown around" with the exception of the H & M signage and he suggested that those be altered as well and to not have the tags appear to be blowing in the same direction.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be difficult to do with a round logo.

Mr. Windal stated the string would need to be moved.

Committee Member Gladson stated she appreciated that the applicant had provided the examples of the signage in a vertical orientation and she understood the challenge with that orientation and how the graphics came across better in another orientation. She also appreciated the sensitivity to the change-over and the fact that AMC would be consistently moving the signs. The concern would be that the signs could become tattered over time and the same copy would be there years from now; encouraging the changes would be refreshing and keep everything updated.

Chair Cathcart stated they had taken the suggestions and from him that was the colors; that they were crisper and a bit more modern. He was pleased with the results.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4511-10, The Block-Stylons, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following suggestion:

1. Copy on the smaller stylons with the hang tags to be tilted in different directions.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4514-10 & CUP No. 2811-10 - CRAWFORD GARAGE/OFFICE

- A proposal to demolish a 561 sq. ft. non-contributing detached garage and construct a new 1-1/2-story detached two-car garage with a craft room and bath on the second floor.
- 394 S. Orange Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Chair Cathcart asked why in similar situations had Staff requested the installation of a grass strip in the driveway?

Mr. Ryan stated a part of that was the 60% paving of the front yard rule; and in the past, historically, ribbon driveways were typical in Old Towne and the desire was to cut down on the amount of visible concrete and a grass mow strip accomplished that.

Committee Member Gladson stated she wanted to understand a little bit more about the 1940 date in terms of the assessment of the age of the garage and the non-conforming aspect of it.

Mr. Ryan stated for one with the information provided by the applicant that it had been constructed during a certain time period and he also conferred with aerials and the Sanborn maps.

Applicant, Robert Imboden, address on file, stated Mr. Ryan had covered the proposal fairly well. The only thing he might respond to was the request for the mow strip; he actually intended to provide one and it was labeled incorrectly on the plans. There had been a mow strip intended between the two driveways keeping them separate to break up the massing. As far as the doors were concerned he was open to discussion. He was available to answer questions.

Committee Member Woollett stated typically Old Towne residences would have a grass strip that would be on a single-car driveway. With the proposed project why had they not called for three mow strips?

Mr. Ryan stated due to the new construction they would not want to get carried away.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the applicant could elaborate on the design concept?

Mr. Imboden stated there were several things that led to the design. For the useable space on the second floor, if he had gone with a more formal two-car garage there would have been the problem of fitting the smaller room on top of that. In going with the more traditional Carriage house idea it allowed the proposal to be part one-story and part two-story. Would a building have been built like that historically? The answer was yes, and looking around Old Towne many of them had the longer additions that had been done to them. They were seen as serving a

utilitarian purpose and built with a simple design and simpler materials. He had taken a departure from the more formal Carriage house and having it read as an addition to the house was a better way to go. It also allowed the addition to be pushed closer to the rear property line to preserve the rear garden.

Public Comment:

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he had met with the applicant and they had gone over the project in depth. It was a great project and was a challenge in consideration of all the setbacks and how the addition would fit on the property. The project met the standards and the upper floor massing was very small compared to many of the projects that had come before the DRC. It was sympathetic. The largest FAR was .37 and a .42 would be the largest on the block and below the threshold of the Grand Street study. The materials were appropriate and it would be a nice addition to the neighborhood and it would not be visible from Orange Street. He agreed that there should be three mow strips.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he appreciated the Staff Report presented by Mr. Ryan and he shared the concern about the primary garage doors. He had not had a problem with a change in materials on the exterior. However, if the west garage had the same exterior finish as the other side, the building would appear less tall and narrow. The material change made the eastern garage appear taller and skinnier.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the manner in which it was currently designed was in keeping with a traditional Carriage house, it would be a narrow and tall structure. According to Russell Sturges, the term was not "parge" but "parget"; it was in his 1901 dictionary. His only real comments were that the project was very well done and he appreciated the drawings and it was very complete. On the elevation page 3.1 he was curious if the same sculptured out-looker would be used on the house?

Mr. Imboden stated he would use a simplified version on the secondary structure as the house had rather heavy detail and it would be more appropriate. As it was new construction it would not be an exact match.

Committee Member Wheeler mentioned that the house had a secondary head trim on the windows and asked if that would be duplicated?

Mr. Imboden stated he would want to keep it simple. That was a challenge in the design of the addition to not over-do the details and not to have it compete with the house, but to carry some of the elements so that it would fit.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the elevation there was a notation for shake, but the callout was for shingles and he asked if he was attempting to match the house?

Mr. Imboden stated it was his understanding that shingles belonged on the roof, shakes on the wall regardless of being split or sawn.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how would the eyebrows be supported?

Mr. Imboden stated they might need a bracket and he would look at a simple 45, with a beam set in on the 45.

Committee Member Wheeler liked the doors and would not suggest simplifying them.

Committee Member McCormack liked the project and they had done a really good job. Every architect that he had worked with during his career loved to place windows on the north elevation and he had not seen that with the proposed project. The light would be so nice to have in the laundry on the first floor and in the bathroom.

Mr. Imboden stated the only place they would gain light would be in the stairs and that would require a vertical window. There were several factors that drove that blind elevation and with a Carriage house most of the elevations would not have much fenestration at all and the north elevation was adjacent to a neighbor, and a neighbor with a lot of boys. Also from a security point of view, with the small setback areas that could become no-man lands and the property owner preferred not having openings on the building that could be accessed. The only walk in door would be to the walk in garden.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the ribbon driveway, he had one himself, and it would break up the concrete area. He would not want three, but to place the ribbon on the secondary structure and it would have more purpose, to add more ribbons on the west side would give a separation to bigger landscape areas. Another thing was the punch-out, keynote 11, by the main structure everyone would want to slice that space with a walk heading to the east and he suggested just continuing the walkway to connect with a nice panel of grass.

Mr. Imboden stated he had not shown the existing design for the rear yard and there was a small paved area that existed and he understood the length that Committee Member McCormack spoke to, but he would want to make a determination of what exactly they would be changing in the rear yard before he made a commitment to that. The aversion he had to the suggestion was that he was very opposed to running concrete along the run of a building as it created a desolate look to the way a building met the ground; he agreed with linking but how they did that would be determined. As far as a mow strip, he would not want to speak for the property owner. His initial preference would not to have mow strips and he was not fully convinced that mow strips were typical in Old Towne, they had existed, and he thought there were more mow strips now than what had existed historically. He was not opposed to having mow strips, but he had not wanted it to become a contemporary abstract landscaping with multiple rows of concrete. He would rather use gravel for the secondary drive and he was not certain that was allowed by the Code.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she believed the Code read paved and solid surface required.

Mr. Ryan stated there was a house on Grand that had decomposed granite for the drive surface.

Applicant, Joan Crawford, address on file, stated she actually liked the ribbon driveway. With having two it would not produce the image they wanted, she wanted it to look the best it could.

Mr. Imboden stated if the majority of the Committee Members felt that mow strips would be needed he could work with that and he liked the idea of having the second drive be secondary. The gravel was something he had not discussed with the property owner.

Chair Cathcart asked how Committee Member McCormack maintained his mow strip?

Committee Member McCormack stated he irrigated it with the rest of the lawn; he had side sprinkler strips in it so the concrete would not be sprayed. He had three-foot walks in the eightfoot driveway when there was not a car parked on the driveway.

Mr. Imboden stated the advantage was that the property had the driveways to the rear of the property and for the most part Ms. Crawford would use the driveway and she garaged her car.

Committee Member McCormack stated a 3', 2'and 3' worked the best. Having a 3' drive strip made it very negotiable for a car. He was a fan of the mow strip and it gave a less concrete look.

Ms. Crawford stated if the one to the major drive had wider strips and the one to the secondary drive was narrower would that be a consideration?

Committee Member McCormack stated if there were too many, as Mr. Imboden had stated, it would look too contemporary. He would not want them all and to go to the design approach of a primary and secondary and understanding if there were too many it would look to contemporary.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4514-10 and CUP No. 2811-10, Crawford Garage/Office, subject to the conditions and finding contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

(5) DRC No. 4518-10 & CUP No. 2813-10 – HARVARD HOUSE (NEW INFILL)

- A proposal to demolish a 617 sq. ft. non-contributing single-family residence and construct two new apartment buildings.
- 468 N. Olive Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Leason Pomeroy, address on file, stated it took a long time to sort out how to accommodate the two buildings on the site to meet the standards. They proposed the project with the garage at the end of the driveway, with the cars parked to the rear, and a courtyard area. They had dropped the height of the buildings for less of an impact.

Mr. Ryan stated through changes to the historic survey the building status had changed. Marie Nelson at the State office was currently working on the survey and it would be completed within 1-2 months. The State office would not make a determination on every project, but on the area as a whole and the property through Staff's analysis was non-contributing, and the demo was not in conflict with SHIPPO. The project could move forward with the agreement that the property was non-contributing based on the historic survey and de-listing of properties.

Public Comment:

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he was confused as it was his understanding that the property currently was still considered contributing until the official determination was made, especially since Mr. Yaghi was sitting out there waiting regarding his project on Washington and he was first. It was still contributing and he had to admit that it was difficult to determine what the original style of the property was as there was so much going on with the site. He understood a final determination would need to be made before anything occurred with the proposed project.

Mr. Ryan stated as he understood it the project could move forward, based on the comments that the building was a non-contributing structure and Marie Nelson was in agreement with that finding. That result would not change when the historic survey was accepted. The survey had been submitted, and in the age of survey it was not listed. The way he understood it with the information he had received, the property was non-contributing, and the survey would either be accepted or denied.

Mr. Frankel stated the manner in which he understood the process was that the State office would make a determination on each building that had been submitted for de-listing as those would need to be reviewed.

Mr. Ryan stated his understanding was that the survey was submitted to identify the change and additions whether reclassified or otherwise.

Mr. Frankel stated his understanding was that any property that was being reviewed for de-listing had to go before the State Historic Commission for their approval.

Mr. Ryan stated that had not been indicated to him.

Mr. Frankel stated the State Historian he had spoken with stated that would be the case. He understood that Staff still needed to contact the State Agency and speak with them.

Mr. Ryan stated what Mr. Frankel was speaking to was that in contacting the Staff office in regards to listing something or taking something off the National Registry and he understood that process would go through the State Historic Resource Commission and that could be true; however, during the same period there was a collection and an update of the survey which was looked at differently and looked at in mass. If there was a property that was up for de-listing it could be done on an individual request. They were currently completing a mass request on an area and the City would receive correspondence back to the effect that the State office agreed or disagreed with their findings and the difference of whether they would wait for the approval letter or to seek a specific determination on the building as to its contributing status.

Mr. Frankel asked if Staff felt they would need to wait for the States determination before the proposed project could move forward?

Mr. Ryan stated he felt there were problems with any State agency currently in dealing with available funds and personnel; his understanding was that Marie Nelson at the State office was only working three days a week. He had not felt the determination for the building in question would change at all based on the information provided and he was not certain how the property had become listed in the 1976 survey.

Mr. Frankel stated putting that aside he agreed that the particular block needed improvements, but there were things to consider. The FAR of the project, and if they remembered the Bahia triplex that had come before the DRC, had come back many, many times and they were told that the FAR needed to be reduced as they had a .41 to .42 FAR that hung them up for a long time. They had finally met the threshold and what was referenced was the Grand Street study and there needed to be some consistency. He had not understood how a .54 FAR could be approved and insist that another project, a triplex and not a duplex, would need to be a .41. He believed that the other project had come back with a .42 which was accepted. He also felt there were context issues on the block and they spoke about the bookend theory and the proposal was a complete opposite, it was confusing to him which way they were going – the bookend or the hump in the middle of the block. Most likely at the time people were not too concerned with the context as things had gone along, but currently they were looking at context and not only in historic areas. A lot of applicants that were denied certain aspects of their projects due to the bookend theory or because of the context of the block and if applicants were allowed to build two-story units in the middle of the block posed inconsistencies and he was not certain they could really relate to the historic context as he had not known what that was. They needed to look at a few of those things and he was not stating that the OTPA was opposed to the project, but rather that there were some things that needed to be looked at and any precedents that might be set. The design and model looked really good, however, it stood out in mid-block and the block had needed improvements. They needed to really look at the issues due to past projects and it could create problems with past applicants.

Chair Cathcart stated that Mr. Ryan had mentioned that the person who would be making a decision would not casually make a decision with him and then change their mind when the survey came through.

Mr. Ryan stated he knew that the agency had not liked to make comments on individual properties and he had pleaded his case based on the site as to whether the building was contributing or not. As it had not met specific criteria it was concurred that the building was non-contributing. That would not change at all; the question would be if they accept the survey in mass.

Committee Member Woollett asked if the DRC approved the project, could they have the approval subject to a confirmation of the decision from Sacramento?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the determination that the DRC was making on the project before them was a recommendation to the Planning Commission and it could be subject to the confirming information. It had been done in the past and was not the norm, but could be done. When she had read the email it was clear that the intent was not to hold things up just because the State could not get to certain matters. Otherwise there would be a moratorium on construction in Old Towne until the surveys were adopted, which was out of their hands.

Committee Member Woollett stated in making a motion he would not want to imply that the survey had not been accepted, but it was a concern.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated a motion could certainly be crafted in the recommendation to the Planning Commission that, for example, approval was recommended subject to the conditions and with an additional condition that the survey would need to be adopted prior to permits pulled and if the survey was not adopted by the state the project would need to be re-worked. The process would be different at that point.

Committee Member Woollett stated the issue would come up again at the Planning Commission level.

Mr. Ryan stated the item could be conditioned based on the State's determination.

Committee Member Gladson stated if it was the DRC's decision to make that finding and to craft a motion, they would need the backup and findings that Staff had given them to make that determination. The information had stated that the building was non-contributing and the proposed project met the guidelines for an in-fill project. They would have the ability to make the findings.

Mr. Ryan stated they had a current survey, and the State was in the process of adopting that survey, and the determination had been made that the proposed project met the architectural style and was appropriate. Whether the DRC made a determination as to the massing and context, those were items that needed to be discussed and determined. He was satisfied with the communication he had with the State that the building's status would not change and Staff was just waiting for an acceptance of the survey. He felt they were about a month or two months from that date.

Committee Member Gladson stated the de-listing was a separate issue.

Mr. Ryan stated if someone came in and stated they thought their building was non-contributing they would need to hire an architectural historian and go through the process. The fact that the City was in the process of updating their survey they had lumped all the changes together and had sent those to the State who would review the survey and make a determination. Mr. Frankel was not incorrect in that there was a process for de-listing, it was just a different manner based on the fact that the Historic survey was being updated and reviewed. The Bhalla property had been brought up and on South Olive there was R-3 zoning with 10' front setbacks and many two story with 10' setbacks and having a building with a 20' setback would present a juxtaposition on the street, so the applicant had asked for a 16' setback. The subject project before them had a 26' setback and the difference was that there was a much greater setback with a .12 FAR higher. That was the suggestion he had made with having a two-story building on a one-story block.

Committee Member Woollett stated he wanted to comment on how meticulous the Staff Report was by Staff and how helpful that was. The applicant and Staff had worked together very closely to work it out and the area was a difficult site to deal with. His hope would be that some of the really bad buildings in that area would get the hint and move in the same direction. There were other non-conforming buildings in that area. He appreciated the careful work done on the style presented and he also appreciated the comments about the height. He had been very outspoken about having two-story buildings in one-story neighborhoods. He thought the project approached that issue with a lot of sensitivity and in terms of what was occurring in that area it was a good solution. He wondered if there could be more trees around the building and he was concerned with the large areas of paving and particularly at the southwest corner of the lot.

Chair Cathcart stated he had a concern with placing Jacaranda trees along that narrow strip along the property line. The Committee Members and applicant reviewed the plans. He was wondering if a more vertical tree, closer to the building would work.

Mr. Pomeroy stated he welcomed the suggestions on plantings on the project.

Chair Cathcart stated he agreed with Committee Member Woollett that there could be more trees than just along the perimeter and there could be trees along the hardscape with cut-outs.

Committee Member McCormack stated when they looked at a project that was well thought out, as landscape architects and architects they tended to fall in love with it. However, then from a layman's point of view they might not have the same group with a project three doors down and he wondered how another group would approach it? He looked at the project as precedent-setting and his fear was the interpretation on what would be acceptable for future projects. He was concerned with the Infill Guidelines and the FAR of the proposed project. He loved the Prairie-style and how it fit in and how it came about. He wondered if the next project would push the FAR further and he wanted to put that out there. They were on the cliff looking down and they would either fly or fall and he wanted to ask the question.

Mr. Ryan stated he brought up good points and if they made very specific points as to why the project was approved and what the limits were and how those were addressed based on the neighborhood, which would set a barrier or a building envelope for future developments. There

were sufficient limits that had been designed into the proposed project that addressed bulk and mass, and that information could be noted. He had always wished that every project that came in was at a .38, but today that was not the case. In situations such as the Westenhofer project, it was not a question of lot coverage it was the two-story issue and they had to be careful when reviewing projects. When looking at the Grand Street study they looked at 1st and 2nd floor FAR, the 2nd floor FAR was a critical factor as Gable and Hip roofs were looked at and how those took up volume and space. Those were calculated into the FAR. A Prairie-style building would have less impact. If there were very specific findings on why a project was approved or not approved and what the limits were that would assist with future projects.

Committee Member McCormack stated what if an applicant had not wanted a Prairie-style and they wanted to sneak in a Craftsman.

Mr. Ryan stated they had.

Mr. Pomeroy stated it had not worked. In the findings, with a project that they had completed on North Glassell Street there was no parking in the buildings, it was all outside and there was a lot of pavement. What was interesting with the proposal was that the cars would be in the buildings and the amount of pavement was being reduced and ended up having a larger outdoor space which needed to be softer. Public Works would force them into using pervious pavement that got gum and oil into it, but there was probably a way to get trees in there and to have it be more of a courtyard, more of an auto court.

Committee Member Gladson stated in reviewing the Staff Report over the weekend a lot of questions had come into her head and Staff had read her mind on the whole issue of contributing and non-contributing and the back-up material. The whole time they had spent on the project was a perfect example of why the meeting and discussion was valuable in reviewing all the parameters that came into making a decision or recommendation and she had needed all that information to assist her in digesting the proposal. She was very conservative about demolition and she had to be convinced that it was a resource that could be removed. On the design part she liked the Prairie-style and how it would fit into the block, and she understood how the project had to go back and forth and was probably very painful in terms of a timeframe, but that was what every project in Old Towne would need to face if they were going to get it right. The projects would need to go through the same process to ensure it was the best. The proposal before them and the discussion could be a text book case study on what every infill project would need to go through.

Mr. Pomeroy stated on the Cleveland site the building sat there all by itself and all the rest was other architecture. The point that was being made was the clearer the standards or requirements were the decision would be made easier, instead of wrestling with each project from A to Z. If all the things were spelled out it would be easier for everyone.

Committee Member Gladson stated the tools that had been available through the process would have assisted the applicant, along with Staff's knowledge and it was a case study and gave her a sense of wow, the standards worked. She visited the site and she would be fooling herself to think the block was not going to change. The concept of a mid-block change and she understood how that could be a concern, but thought the block would have changes over time and other changes would need to be looked at on a case-to-case basis. She was generally okay with where

it was going and she appreciated having the height come down. The home on the north side was a very sweet little structure that deserved its status. She wondered about the utility lines?

Mr. Pomeroy stated the power line that came into the building was currently nailed to a Palm tree. The lines would be brought underground.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had some concerns as they had to make findings and one of those findings was that the proposal complied with the Design Standards of Old Towne. Under new construction for ancillary streets, new construction shall be complimentary to other residences on the block and specifically infill should be consistent to other contributing buildings on the street, those included massing and it had not quite met that, scale and shape and he felt that was a problem as it had not met the shape that was there. That troubled him. Another concern was with the floor elevations, the height was stated that it should be similar to neighboring properties; all the neighboring properties were raised floor. They would need to interpret that. Height and mass, and there was the 1-1/2 story rule and they would be going to the Planning Commission for that. The standard that all two-story residential construction shall be to minimize the privacy of adjacent properties, and the building proposed had a lot of windows on all sides. He suggested that the windows be moved up higher and that the egress and primary ventilation be moved to an alternate side of the building. There was a mention about porches, that all buildings must have a porch or front entry treatment or roof shape form of material and colors that were typical of the style and period of the building. He dared them to find a Prairiestyle home in Old Towne that had not had a defined front porch and columns. It was difficult to make all the findings and he had wished that they had been able to review the proposal a bit sooner to see if they could have done it with a 1-1/2 story that would provide a lower eave but perhaps a lower ridge. The mass of a two-story box would have more impact than a 1-1/2 story with a lower eave even if the ridge was higher. He was troubled as he felt the proposal was going a long way from Prairie-style. There was the one across the street that had so much more detail and he wondered if the project wasn't getting closer to a modified style, such as the Shaffer Street orange crate.

Mr. Pomeroy stated that was not it, he used the same photo that Committee Member Wheeler had presented and stated his model and elevations were drawn from that photograph.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared different and possibly he was misinterpreting the drawings. It looked like the model had a pop-out under the window on the second floor.

Mr. Pomeroy asked him to look at the front and stated it was the same building design.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the model there was a detail frame under the window, but he had not found that on the drawings. He stated the model looked more Prairie-style than the drawings had.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they were meant to be the same. The windows could be raised.

Committee Member McCormack asked how difficult would it be to get the typical raised foundation look?

Mr. Pomeroy stated it would be difficult with the garages, and it was the 21st century. He appreciated the thought and asked if they were certain the adjacent properties had raised foundations?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes, he had checked and the properties tended to slope to the rear and at the front the properties were close to grade, but at the rear they were raised.

Mr. Pomeroy stated much of the house that currently existed at the site was slab on grade.

Mr. Ryan stated what he noticed in Chapter 5, residential quadrants for new construction only and the findings for that on page 32; they were a bit different than the general standards. There was a bit more latitude with new construction.

Committee Member Woollett stated they worried about the raised floor when an addition was made to a building and its relationship to the rest of the site, but he was not as concerned with the proposal before them as it would not be connected to anything.

Mr. Pomeroy stated there was a wall that would create a private space at the front of the building, a porch.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was confused too and she wanted to ensure she had all the standards correct and she was comparing apples to apples. She wanted to understand what they were measuring the project against.

The Committee Members reviewed the Standards.

Chair Cathcart asked what occurred when a new Code came along and made one of the findings totally impossible to meet and still meet Code?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry asked if he had an example?

Chair Cathcart stated what if there was a Code that there needed to be more windows for some reason, for ventilation for whatever reason and was there flexibility?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there was on a contributing structure or a restoration. On new construction there was not; the typical UBC took over as opposed to a Building Code.

Mr. Ryan stated the State Historic Building Code allowed for flexibility. For new construction new Code took affect.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was speaking to conformance to the Old Towne Guidelines.

Committee Member McCormack asked how would they launch onto a better place. Some of the other structures on the street were contributing, but they would not be able to be as successful as a non-contributing structure.

Chair Cathcart stated for many of them who had lived in Orange for a long time, they knew of neighborhoods that needed updating, but what would be the incentive to have people do that to ensure they could do something without completely deviating from the Standards?

Committee Member McCormack stated the proposal was for student housing and that defined the use as being different from a residential use and how would someone match the project but in a more family residential use?

Chair Cathcart asked if he was saying that the property would need to comply with a certain use rather than a certain structural characteristic? They lived in Old Towne and they were run out of town by Chapman students and he would rather have them located in a consolidated area. They had infiltrated every area in Orange.

Mr. Ryan stated the findings could be made to the uniqueness of the neighborhood and how the project fit as an improvement for the neighborhood.

Mr. Pomeroy stated the area was primarily students and it would never be a single-family residential area again.

Chair Cathcart stated what he would want to state was that he could approve a proposal because it was unique, valuable, and it should be approved but he would not want to set a precedent for another party to come along and do something that had not had the thought process as the project before them had.

Committee Member Gladson stated with the concerns presented by Committee Member Wheeler if those items could be examined and clarified and dealt with, such as the issue with the windows and the slab on grade and come to a resolution she would be okay.

Mr. Ryan stated on an infill project the applicant had the ability to choose an architectural style that would fit, and he had chosen one. The next thing was bulk and mass; the style would override the massing issue as it was new construction and it did not have to duplicate everything else on the street. The other thing was that the overall feeling around the area of the University had changed over time with the balance of historic resources vs. non-historic and that was 50/50 and with all the Bungalows on the street half of those were non-contributing. The area had transitioned and people making investments would be developing properties the way that one would anticipate for the future and someone had to be first; someone had to take the risk.

Committee Member Gladson stated she wanted to ensure they guarded the last remaining contributing structures on the block on both sides and those needed to be protected.

Mr. Ryan stated the sites that were classified as such would need to go through that requirement process; an EIR and such and then there would be people taking the non-contributing structures and developing those.

Chair Cathcart stated those would get picked up by the survey.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the Committee needed to focus back on the project before them; the project needed to be looked at on its own merit and not focused on what might occur in the

future. There was the project before them and the design guidelines and not to what they hoped would exist out there in the future.

Mr. Pomeroy stated there were a few things he could do; the windows could be raised or obscured. The porch was way beyond the required setback and they could build the porch out and add columns and it would be a great space. Trying to raise the building would only make it taller and he would rather leave it at-grade and add onto the porch. They reviewed the model.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he thought the porch suggestion would be great and the columns with sculpted relief would be nice. That would go in the right direction. On the windows to just raise the sill and repeat the form that was below the window for continuity of design that was an important feature of the Prairie style. Of course as there were the awnings on the north side it helped too. Personally he was not certain how the floor line should be interpreted, whether it would be that there should not be a huge difference in floor height from one to the other and in the case of the proposal it was only about a foot on the streetscape and it might not be a big issue. Defining the porch would be a great way to go.

Mr. Pomeroy stated they could have the pad raised a bit at the porch.

Committee Member McCormack stated, regarding the landscaping, there are two structures and they are accentuating the forms and the long linear shapes with the trees because that's what the planting areas call for. In using "prioritization landscaping", everywhere a big tree could grow, then make it a big tree; that would be the primary focus. In areas like Beverly Hills, there are landscapes with just one tree like a huge Sycamore, Oak, or Elm; then the secondary shrub plantings. This contrast loosens up the formality of the two buildings and the landscaping starts looking like the Berkley area with dense landscape; it's really loose and has a bit less formality to it. This brings down the scale and starts softening its entrance into the neighborhood. It was sometimes appropriate to have one large tree with a flowing lawn and that was the Prairie landscape.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4518-10 and CUP No. 2813-10, Harvard House (new infill), subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following changes that would allow the findings to be met:

- 1. Slab on-grade design shall be sufficiently close to other structures in the area to comply.
- 2. Windows on the north and south sides of the building, that the sills shall be raised 60" to provide privacy to neighboring properties.
- 3. Extend porch on east side of the building, and shall be designed in keeping with the Prairie style and the exterior design of the building shall mirror the model provided and not the design shown on the drawings.
- 4. The Prairie style of the project met the criteria for massing and had the least impact to the neighborhood.

And with the following additional conditions:

1. Landscape shall be designed to create a less formal landscape approach and to have the landscape work with the required permeable paving. The use of larger trees to be

explored. Landscape plan following the recommendations discussed shall return to the DRC for review prior to issuance of a building permit.

- 2. A more clearly defined pedestrian pathway shall be provided to the rear building.
- 3. Prior to the project receiving a building permit, the reclassification to a non-contributing structure shall be confirmed.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

Committee Member Woollett asked Mr. Pomeroy prior to going before the Planning Commission would be incorporate the suggestions and conditions in that presentation?

Mr. Pomeroy stated yes, he would.

Committee Member Gladson asked if there was a desire to document anything about the survey from a perspective that it would establish the status of the building?

Mr. Ryan stated if the survey returned with a contributing status that the applicant shall return with all requirements.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would add that to the conditions.

(6) DRC No. 4530-11 - SHANNON ADDITION

- A proposal to demolish a 107 sq. ft. rear shed porch and construct a new 330 sq. ft. rear gable-roofed porch for a contributing Bungalow.
- 238 N. Orange Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Wade Shannon, address on file, stated he and his family lived in the home and the purpose was an effort to beautify the home. The house was not quite large enough and the washer and dryer were currently in the garage. The house had galvanized steel pipes and old wiring. With the exception of the kitchen the rest of the house was knob and tube and those were just basic problems with the house. The water came out rusty and smelly and they wanted that fixed. They wanted to remove the add-on porch as it was falling off and separating from the house. The wall was cracking on the inside of the house. The big thing for him would be to remove the asbestos siding and the house was painted lime green. They wanted to return the home to redwood siding and paint it a nice Bungalow color with lighter trim and to make it an appropriate house for Old Towne.

Public Comment:

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated it was refreshing to see a project that was sympathetic, small, and not visible from the street and there were no issues. The removal of asbestos was a plus and made all the difference in how the house looked. He agreed with the vents that they should be wood. The project was great, nice, and small and he was glad that it met the applicant's needs.

Chair Cathcart opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett asked on the north side of the house where new construction would meet old construction what sort of demarcation would be there?

Mr. Shannon presented the plans and reviewed those with the Committee Members.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could add a trim board to define that. With the removal of a bedroom window and also enlarging it he suggested that the applicant check for sufficient light and egress. He thought it was fine, but they might want to specify a fall-back position in case they had not met the requirements, such as adding an additional window.

Mr. Shannon stated on the north side was the bathroom and it was a high window.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was speaking to the bedroom window with the possibility that it would need to meet the current Code. On the exterior stair, the Code required that the area above the step needed to be filled in with a wood stringer on the outside of the stair to cover that

and that would cover the exposed modern hardware. He suggested adding a new layer of what was referred to as grabs or a wood member on the outside and a facing on the column to hide the hardware. They could add a new layer of 2x to hide it all.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4530-11, Shannon Addition, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- 1. If the Building Division required a larger or different type of window in the master bedroom that the project be returned to Planning for appropriate review.
- 2. The line of demarcation be added to the north elevation with a piece of 2" wood trim.
- 3. The exposed stair at the rear of the property shall have a new 2x facing stringer applied to the structural stringer and a 2x of equal depth applied to the deck portion of the stair and new grabs applied vertically to the face of the post to hide modern hardware.
- 4. New barge board to be applied in the traditional manner without the use of flat outlookers.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, March 2, 2011.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Bill Cathcart, Adrienne Gladson, Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.