

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

August 1, 2018

Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack - Chair  
Anne McDermott – Vice Chair  
Mary Anne Skorpanich  
Carol Fox  
Robert Imboden

Staff in Attendance: Bill Crouch, Community Development Director  
Anna Pehoushek, Assistant Community Development Director  
Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner  
Kelly Ribuffo, Associate Planner  
Simonne Fannin, Recording Secretary

**Administrative Session – 5:00**

1. Chair McCormack opened the Administrative Session at 5:01 p.m. and inquired about the Policy/Procedural Information.
  - Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner stated there were no changes to the agenda.
  - She explained the procedure for Eichler Design Standards study session with Members of the Design Review Committee, members of the public and staff. This will be a study session only and not require a motion or vote.

Committee Members provided edits to the July 18, 2018 minutes.

Committee Member McDermott made a motion to close the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee meeting.

**SECOND:** Skorpanich  
**AYES:** McCormack, Imboden, Skorpanich, McDermott, and Fox  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

**MOTION CARRIED.**

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

**Regular Session – 5:30 p.m.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Committee Members McCormack, Imboden, Skorpanich, McDermott and Fox 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: July 18, 2018.

Committee Member McDermott made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of July 18, 2018 as emended in the Administrative Session.

**SECOND:** Fox  
**AYES:** McCormack, Fox, Skorpanich and McDermott  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT :** None  
**ABSTAIN:** Imboden

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

**New Agenda Items:**

(2) DRC No. 4906-17 – 10 Plaza Square

- A request to modify a previously approved project, based on conditions uncovered during construction. The Design Review Committee approved the project to remodel a non-contributing building in the Plaza Historic District on June 7, 2017.
- 10 Plaza Square, Plaza Historic District
- Staff Contact: Marissa Moshier, (714) 744-7243, [mmoshier@cityoforange.org](mailto:mmoshier@cityoforange.org)
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner provided an explanation of the project consistent with the staff report.

Chair McCormack invited the applicant to present.

Victor Corona provided a photograph of the concrete shear wall requiring the changes to the storefront design.

Chair McCormack opened the meeting for public comment.

Jeff Frankel, Old Towne Preservation Association stated it looks like there are a lot of doors on the elevation and asked if the Gas Company can explore more options for location of the meters.

Chair McCormack closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Committee comments and questions:

- Committee Members would like more information on the gas closet that is on the front façade. Mr. Corona explained that due to the increased demand of restaurant uses, the gas lines need to be increased. The Gas Company stated there is no room to add another vault in the public right of way; therefore it will have to be recessed on the Plaza side of the building with proper ventilation. Ms. Moshier stated this situation is more difficult because the building is land locked and has no access to any alleys.
- Committee Members are concerned about placing utility doors on the front of a facade and asked if they considered the Committee's prior recommendation on the electrical room. Mr. Corona responded that they tried to provide an access door to the side of the recessed storefront, but it was not sufficient because of the amount of ventilation required.
- Committee Members discussed the pros and cons of louvered doors and expressed that louvered doors would be preferred over the doors proposed.
- Committee Members asked if the applicant considered placing the meters in the patio. Mr. Corona stated they did, however, it has to be accessible to the Gas Company.
- One of the Committee Members stated it is not up to the Committee to override the decision of the Gas Company due to safety requirements. Mr. Corona stated the Gas Company requires double doors in order to provide enough room for access.

- Some Committee Members would like to see the doors blend in and disappear; it should not look like entry door.
- Some Committee Members suggested that the doors could be replaced with a decorative grille.
- Committee Members asked if the Gas Company will require any signage on the doors. Mr. Corona responded that he did not believe signage was required; however, he did not specifically ask the question of the Gas Company.
- Committee Members asked if the vent could be positioned higher in the wall and Mr. Corona stated yes.

Mr. Corona stated he can reduce the height of the door, eliminate the trim, and place the louvered vent higher on the wall. However, he feels the doors currently create a rhythm with the storefronts and other doors. He feels placing louvers on the wall seems lost.

- The Committee expressed a variety of opinions about whether the doors were appropriate for the façade and whether the cabinet should be decorative or more utilitarian. Some Committee Members were pleased with the rhythm of doors and windows on the elevation. Other Committee Members believed the cabinet should be simplified or relocated.
- The Committee Members were satisfied with the paint colors and agreed the utility doors should be painted the darker color.

Chair McCormack asked the applicant if he wanted to continue the item in order to explore more cabinet options.

Mr. Corona responded that he feels the storefront is consistent and works well even though the doors are visible; he would like a vote this evening.

The Committee Members shared concern over utility doors on the façade and agreed that they cannot approve the doors as proposed; they agreed the remainder of the project is acceptable and they would be willing to approve the project with the condition that optional treatments for the utility cabinet doors will be brought back to the Committee for final approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4906 – 17 - 10 Plaza Square based on the conditions and findings in the staff report, with the additional condition:

- The utility cabinet design shall return to the Design Review Committee for final determination prior to issuance of a building permit for the revised design.

**SECOND:** Skorpanich  
**AYES:** Skorpanich, McCormack, Fox, Imboden and McDermott  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

**MOTION CARRIED**

(3) DRC No. 4900-17 Chapman University Villa Park Orchards Association Packing House and West Residential Village – Sunkist Sign Restoration

- A proposal for reconstruction of historic era “Sunkist” painted signage on the Villa Park Orchards Association Packing House.
- 350 N. Cypress Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Kelly Ribuffo, (714) 744-7223, [kribuffo@cityoforange.org](mailto:kribuffo@cityoforange.org)
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Kelly Ribuffo, Associate Planner provided an explanation of the Sunkist sign design consistent with the staff report.

Chair McCormack invited the applicant to present. The applicant, Tim Rizuka did not present, but stated he was available for questions.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the sample of the crate label provided in the staff report is being used as an example for the type of font that will be used or if the sign will look like that. Mr. Merrin stated it is only there as a sample for the color and font that they intend to use.

Chair McCormack opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Jeff Frankel, Old Towne Preservation Association spoke in support; however, he would like more information on the lighting.

Chair McCormack closed public comment.

Committee comments and questions:

- A Committee Member asked how the size of the sign was determined. Mr. Merrin explained they tried to replicate the sign from historic photos as well as past recommendations from the Design Review Committee. He also indicated that the logo needs to fit within in the parapet zone.
- The Committee Members discussed various logos of the 1930s and 1940s time period. Kris Olsen, Chapman University, added they are not trying to re-create the graphic as much as they are trying to create an homage to the building’s history.
- The Committee Members inquired about the sign's lighting. Mr. Rizuka explained the lighting will have an even, soft low glow with no breaks and showed the Committee a sample fixture.

Committee Member Skorpanich made a motion to approve DRC No. 4900 – 17 - Chapman University Villa Park Orchards Association Packing House and West Residential Village – Sunkist Sign Restoration with the conditions and the findings in the staff report.

**SECOND:** McDermott  
**AYES:** Skorpanich, McCormack, Fox, Imboden and McDermott  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**RECESS: 6:32 - 6:41**

**Item No. 4 – Study Session on Draft Orange Eichler Design Standards will not be heard prior to 6:30 p.m.**

(4) Study Session on Draft Orange Eichler Design Standards

- A study session to review the Draft Orange Eichler Design Standards (OEDS). The OEDS have been developed to accompany designation of the three Orange Eichler tracts as local historic districts.
- Orange Eichler Tracts – Fairhaven, Fairhills, and Fairmeadow
- Staff Contact: Marissa Moshier, (714) 744-7243, [mmoshier@cityoforange.org](mailto:mmoshier@cityoforange.org)
- DRC Action: Study Session – no action required

Committee Member Fox recused herself from this item due to the fact that she lives in an Eichler home. Per the City Attorney, she is able to provide comments as a member of the public and a homeowner.

Committee Member Imboden recused himself, because he is an Eichler property owner and serves as member of the consultant's team that prepared the standards, and left the room.

Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner introduced the Page & Turnbull consulting team who drafted the design standards. She explained the process that has transpired to prepare the draft document and historic district designation. Input was obtained from the Eichler residents, community workshops and an advisory committee which consisted of nine Eichler home owners.

Ms. Moshier noted that the goal of the study session is to obtain comments and recommendations from the residents and the Design Review Committee. Once a final document is complete, the Design Review Committee will make a recommendation to the Planning Commission who, will in turn, make a recommendation to the City Council for final determination.

John Lesak, Architect and Flora Chou, Architectural Historian from Page & Turnbull provided a visual presentation of the following:

- Their qualifications as consultants
- An introduction on the history and purpose of design standards and historic districts as outlined in Chapter 1. Mr. Lesak reviewed the five core principles of the design standards.
- A brief explanation of how design standards are used as outlined in Chapter 2.
- Guidelines for repairing and replacing original materials and standards for original features as outlined in Chapter 4.
- Standard features and guidance for additions, second stories and accessory structures as outlined in Chapter 5.
- Standards for setting and common landscape as outlined in Chapter 6. Mr. Lesak stated no original community landscape design has been found for the tracts and noted that the driveway relationship to the garage/carports creates rhythms within the neighborhood, and the tracts have a pattern of open space so that the houses are not obscured.

Mr. Lesak explained the various topics that were discussed at the workshops. Many residents who attended the workshops were generally in favor of preserving the character of the homes through design standards and creating a historic district designation. However, some residents were concerned about having too many limitations placed on them.

Ms. Chou stated the design standards would only apply when there is a proposed project; they are not retroactive and would apply to contributors as well as non-contributors.

Ms Chou asked the Committee for feedback on the context of the following terminology used throughout the document:

- "shall" - a required standard
- "should" - guidance or recommendation
- "appropriate" - would likely be approved by staff or the Committee because it meets standards; provides clarifying points about how something might meet a design objective
- "encourage" - is something that is not required but is a recommendation from a preservation perspective, such as restoring an altered feature
- "consider" – a suggestion, something to think about

Mr. Lesak encouraged the Committee Members to review the charts on pages 33 through 35 that describe common project types and the level of review that would be needed for projects.

Chair McCormack opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Douglas Wade, 723 E. Palmdale Avenue, an attorney, member of the Eichler Advisory Committee, and Eichler owner home. He stated it is time to recognize the Eichler homes as historic districts; design standards should be adopted in order to preserve the historic nature of the neighborhood. He feels the standards that have been proposed are an excellent document.

Tom Armbruster, 1288 N. San Remo Place, stated his home burned down in 2000 and he rebuilt it. He stated they went through all the approvals and inspections and everything was approved until the Police Department had to sign off. They would not approve the design because of the amount of interior glass which made the house difficult to protect if there was an intrusion. They eventually signed off on it, but he hopes other people don't have similar problems in the future.

Carol Fox, 741 E. Glendale Avenue, stated she has been a part of the workshop process and has done a thorough review of the document. She feels the document is very well done, however there are a few inconsistencies in the document such as existing contributing structures versus additions and new infill. She feels second-story additions should be prohibited because they will destroy privacy. She feels cementitious board siding or composite materials should not be allowed to be viewed in the public realm; they should only be allowed in the semi-private realm or atrium areas. She also feels glass blocks should be prohibited, especially in the public realm and they are not mentioned anywhere in the document.

She submitted her edited document to staff which contained other recommendations and typographical/grammatical corrections for their review.

Gordon Adams, 1720 N. Woodside Street, feels the City should go beyond the standard six-foot back fence and allow them to build fences up to nine feet for more privacy.

Bill Salamandrakis, 760 S. Oakwood Street, lives in the Fairhaven tract and submitted his comments in a document to staff. He feels the review time was not appropriate and would like to see another revised draft with more time to review along with another public comment session. He says there are many logical inconsistencies in the document especially with the use of shall versus should.

He stated people never signed up to have regulation of materials inside the house. The standards need to provide guidance and not get too pervasive into the home.

Marinus Welman, 5111 Elsinore Avenue, has lived in an Eichler for 42 years. He stated he does not feel outside people, who do not live in one of the homes, should be creating the design standards. He stated he has a large tree in the front and does not intend to remove it because it provides shade inside the home.

Chair McCormack closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Committee observations and comments:

- Eichler homes have a definite unique style and need protection as historic districts
- It is good that residents are allowed to do what they want in the interior of the home
- The draft document is superlative and functional with very few major issues
- It is important to avoid tall landscaping and not block the architecture
- The residents want privacy in their own residence
- Even though the houses are similar, there is no common landscape. One Committee Member expressed that the landscape section should have more "shalls" and the document needs more landscape detail. Residents can use their atriiums and backyard to satisfy their landscape preferences, while the front yards should reflect Modern landscape design principles
- As requested by the public, the review time should be extended
- The document should specify that HVAC rooftop equipment should not be allowed
- More detail should be given to what does not go with the aesthetics of the home
- More photos should be provided that illustrate the do's and don'ts, and the photos and illustrations should be labeled with checkmarks to show the do's and don'ts.
- The language related to AC/heat on page 92 should be softened to reflect that people do live without air conditioning.
- In the section about noncontributing structures, a number of the sections say the standards from other chapters apply, but there are other points where the standards do not reference other chapters. The Committee would like to see more clarification on what standards apply for specific features on non-contributing buildings.
- Some Committee members expressed that landscaping should have a more formal review and approval process and they need a way to explain the design principles of Modern landscape design. The concept of sustainability should also be injected in order to support the design principles.

- One of the Eichler neighborhoods’ biggest defining features is the streetscape; it is a very clear open space and too many things can interrupt it. The Design Standards do not have to specify particular plants, but they should address landscape design principles.
- Paint colors are not a required element in the Design Standards; they are provided for inspiration to homeowners. Some Committee members expressed that the standards should include requirements for paint colors.
- Where and when the design standards apply should be more clearly defined and emphasized; the standards only apply when changes are made.
- On page 23 in the treatment hierarchy flowchart, a Committee member recommended that it should read " *if changes are proposed, they **shall** be compatible with Eichler aesthetics and neighborhood*"; “shall” replaces “should.”
- Committee Members will provide their documents to staff with their copy edits.
- The Committee has not had the time to go through the comments that have been submitted this evening and it is important that they collectively do that.

In response to a Committee member’s question about the terminology used in the standards, Ms. Moshier stated “shall” is a requirement and is intended to be specific and limited to those things that are so important that if they change, it would really change the character of the house/neighborhood as a whole. "Should" are encouragements, the practices that they would like to see for the preservation of the neighborhood but they’re not a requirement because there may be a different creative design principle that could be used to come to a compatible solution.

She stated design principles for landscape and best practices for how to paint a house to fit in with the character of the neighborhood fall into the realm of "should". It is strongly recommended language, but they are elements that have a lot of personal taste and character to them and they want people to be able to express their personal tastes in their houses.

Chair McCormack stated he would like to see a revised document and comments with a longer review period.

Bill Crouch, Community Development Director stated the staff will reach out to the Design Review Committee to coordinate another session.

Chair McCormack reopened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Wade suggested bifurcating the document with respect to the building and landscape. There is no historic reference with respect to the landscaping and the Committee is creating the design standards for landscaping from the ground up and establishing a different set of standards. There has been no consensus among the homeowners as to whether or not they want the landscaping to be that highly regulated; similarly with the color of the houses. The houses, as built, were stained not painted and they are now all painted.

Chair McCormack stated there are known landscape principles and design standards for midcentury landscape that would provide a framework, not a requirement. This Committee has always had a great focus on landscape treatment. He feels the color palette should have a range.

Mr. Lesak stated they can get some of the landscape principles in the document without having to do a major shift.

Harriet Toplansky stated she has attended all of the other community meetings and now feels there is getting to be too much regulation; too many “shalls” on the landscaping and the colors. She asked what would happen if some residents did not want to participate. There were no restrictions when the homeowners originally purchased the home and now they’re being added; she doesn't want to be told what color to paint her home or what kind of rock to use

Ms. Moshier stated the historic district applies to all of the properties in the boundaries of the original tract; everyone is in or out together, it is collective. The City Council would have to approve or remove the designation. The Committee is there to make recommendations on the Design Standards. However, staff has heard from the residents that they are not interested in regulations on landscaping or paint color and, based on that, do not intend to make it a requirement.

Bill Salamandrakis cautioned that the landscaping and colors are controversial amongst the residents.

Carol Fox stated it is much easier to monitor a “should” statement, because it allows residents to come up with a solution to different situations. She also feels that the Committee should deliberate some of the specifics that are in the document to make sure that they are on the right side of appropriate or inappropriate. There has been no discussion on the architecture and there is a lack of clarity for panels on front doors, for example.

Mr. Salamandrakis stated it would be helpful to publish the updated documents on the website.

Ms. Moshier stated if anybody thinks of any suggestions or comments after the meeting is over, they can call her or send her email.

Hearing no other comments from the Committee or public, Chair McCormack asked for a motion to adjourn.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**A motion was made to adjourn at 8:33 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, August 15, 2018, at 7:00 p.m.**

**MOTION:** Skorpanich  
**SECOND:** McDermott  
**AYES:** McCormack, Skorpanich, and McDermott  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** Imboden, Fox

**MOTION CARRIED.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.