

# DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE: AUGUST 19, 2015

To: Chair McCormack and Members of the Design Review Committee

THRU: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager FROM: Kelly Christensen Ribuffo, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: MNSP No. 0824-15/DRC No. 4801-15 – Chapman University Roosevelt Hall

**Rehabilitation** 

## **SUMMARY**

A proposal to undertake an exterior rehabilitation of Roosevelt Hall on Chapman University campus. This project includes a rehabilitation of the existing historic façade, with modifications designed to restore missing or altered building features.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION – RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Design Review Committee recommend approval of the project to the Community Development Director subject to the conditions in the staff report and any additional conditions the DRC deems necessary to make the required findings.

# BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant: Kris Olsen, Chapman University

Owner: Chapman University
Property Location: 332 N. Orange Street
General Plan Designation: Public Institutional

Zoning Classification: P-I (SP); Chapman University Specific Plan

Existing Development: 12,240 SF academic office building

Property Size: 9 acres (part of Chapman University's main campus)

Associated Applications: None

Previous DRC Review: None for this application

## PUBLIC NOTICE

No Public Notice was required for this project.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Categorical Exemption: The proposed project will be categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines 15331 (Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation.) The project is limited to rehabilitation of an historic property and will be in conformance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Secretary's Standards)* and the Old Towne Design Standards. There is no environmental public review required for a Categorical Exemption.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Roosevelt Hall was constructed in 1928 as the Cafeteria and Domestic Arts Building for the Orange Union High School. The building was designed in the Neo-classical style, characterized by its rusticated simulated stone base, pedimented entrance with engaged pilasters and Ionic capitals, and overall symmetry of all elevations.

The proposed project involves a rehabilitation of the exterior of Roosevelt Hall, which will restore some altered or missing architectural features to the building as well as adapt the building for its continued use as an academic office building. Some of the major modifications to the subject building include:

- Replace opaque window panels over all exterior windows to restore the original glass transoms:
- Remove the existing central doorway and stairs on the east elevation, replace the door with a new window to match existing windows, and relocate the door and stairs to the south end of the elevation;
- Remove the existing vent above the entrance on the north elevation and replace it with a new transom window with the signature Chapman 'starburst' design;
- Remove an existing small window on the north side of the west elevation and replace with a new window to match the proportions of the original filled-in window opening;
- All new materials, including wood windows and stucco walls, will match existing historic materials and finishes.
- Existing landscaping will be maintained, with plants being replaced like-for-like as needed.

A detailed description of the proposed changes, including background information, site photographs, and historic information are provided as Attachments 1 through 6 of this report.

This project also includes a substantial tenant improvement that would completely remodel the interior of the building to upgrade the administrative offices, provide for a new elevator and a complete seismic upgrade of the building, as described in the applicant's Letter of Explanation

(Attachment 2.) These items are not within the purview of DRC review, but included by the applicant in the project description so as to provide a complete picture of the scope of the project.

## **EXISTING SITE**

The subject building is located within the core area of Chapman University, on the north side of the historic Orange Union High School quad. The building is used for academic and administrative offices, including the dean's office.

## EXISTING AREA CONTEXT

The building is located at 332 N. Orange Street, within the core campus area of Chapman University. The property is located within the boundaries of one planning area and two historic districts, as follows:

- Old Towne Historic District Located three blocks north of the Plaza, the property is a contributing resource within the historic district.
- Orange Union High School National Historic District Listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1975.
- <u>Chapman University Specific Plan Area</u> The property is located within Academic Planning Area 1 (A-1) of the Chapman University Specific Plan. Administrative offices are permitted by right in this planning area.

The building is a contributing historic resource to both historic districts and to the Specific Plan area, being one of five original buildings within the historic Union High School campus quad.

# **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Orange Municipal Code (OMC) Section 17.10.070 establishes the general criteria the DRC should use when reviewing the project. This OMC Section states the following:

The project shall have an internally consistent, integrated design theme, which is reflected in the following elements:

#### **Architectural Features**

- The architectural features shall reflect a similar design style or period.
- Creative building elements and identifying features should be used to create a high quality project with visual interest and an architectural style.

#### Landscape

• The type, size and location of landscape materials shall support the project's overall design concept.

- Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of required addressing, nor shall it obstruct the vision of motorists or pedestrians in proximity to the site.
- Landscape areas shall be provided in and around parking lots to break up the appearance of large expanses of hardscape.

#### **Secondary Functional and Accessory Features**

• Trash receptacles, storage and loading areas, transformers and mechanical equipment shall be screened in a manner, which is architecturally compatible with the principal building(s).

## **Applicable Design Standards**

• In addition to the above general criteria, the Old Town Historic District and Chapman University Specific Plan Design Standards apply to the project.

## ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

Overall, the proposed rehabilitation project is in keeping with the historic appearance of the building and meets the requirements of the Old Town Design Standards, the Specific Plan Design Standards and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. However, staff has one issue item to present for consideration, as follows.

#### Issue 1: North Elevation Windows

The applicant has proposed to replace an existing louvered metal vent above the north elevation entrance with a new window, to match the dimensions of the window shown in the historic blueprints of the building. However, instead of doing a simple divided light window pattern as shown in the blueprints, the applicant is proposing to use the 'starburst' window pattern shown on other windows of the building.

Because the 'starburst' pattern is a historic design element of the building, and the change is being made to a non-primary elevation on the building, staff has no issue with the modification to the design of the window, and believes that the change will have no adverse impact on the historic integrity of the building.

# ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The proposed scope of work does not contain any changes to the site, landscaping, circulation or public utilities. As such, No SMART Team review was required for this project.

Section 7.3 and Appendix L of the Chapman University Specific Plan state that when work is proposed to be undertaken to a contributing historic resource within a historic district, the Community Development Director must make a preliminary determination as to whether the scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as well as the Specific Plan's Historic Preservation and Enhancement Guidelines. On July 2, 2015 Anna Pehoushek, Acting Assistant Community Development Director, made the determination that the proposed

project is deemed to be consist with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the applicable Specific Plan guidelines, and may proceed to the Design Review Committee for review.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REQUIRED FINDINGS

The courts define a "Finding" as a conclusion which describes the method of analysis decision makers utilize to make the final decision. A decision making body "makes a Finding," or draws a conclusion, through identifying evidence in the record (i.e., testimony, reports, environmental documents, etc.) and should not contain unsupported statements. The statements which support the Findings bridge the gap between the raw data and the ultimate decision, thereby showing the rational decision making process that took place. The "Findings" are, in essence, the ultimate conclusions which must be reached in order to approve (or recommend approval of) a project. The same holds true if denying a project; the decision making body must detail why it cannot make the Findings.

The Findings are applied as appropriate to each project. Based on the following Findings and statements in support of such Findings, staff recommends the DRC approve the project.

- 1. In the Old Towne Historic District, the proposed work conforms to the prescriptive standards and design criteria referenced and/or recommended by the DRC or other reviewing body for the project (OMC 17.10.070.G.1).
  - Section 5.2 of the Chapman University Specific Plan incorporates design guidelines specifically targeted at ensuring compatibility of on-campus development with the surrounding Old Towne Historic District. The project as proposed is consistent with the development standards and design guidelines set forth in the Chapman University Specific Plan, which require that changes to historic properties respect the history of the property itself, preserve the integrity of the Old Towne Historic District and comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, as discussed below.
- 2. In any National Register Historic District, the proposed work complies with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines (OMC 17.10.070.G.2).
  - The project site is within the boundaries of the Old Towne and Orange Union High School National Historic Districts. The proposed project complies with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, specifically Standards #4 and 6. None of the changes to the exterior of the building will involve removal of historic fabric of later additions that have gained any historic significance. Furthermore, missing architectural features are being restored using evidence from historical blueprints of the building, and are not conjectural changes. Overall, the scope of work is consistent with the Neo-classical style of the building, and will have no adverse impact on the historic integrity of the building or the rest of the Orange Union High School Historic District.
- 3. The project design upholds community aesthetics through the use of an internally consistent, integrated design theme and is consistent with all adopted specific plans, applicable design standards, and their required findings (OMC 17.10.070.G.3).

The proposed exterior modifications to the building are minor in scale and specifically intended to restore or be consistent with the historic appearance of the building, as shown in the blueprints provided as Attachment 5. The scope of work is consistent with the Neoclassical style of the building, and by complying with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is consistent with the design standards for the Old Town Historic District and within the Chapman University Specific Plan.

4. For infill residential development, as specified in the City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines, the new structure(s) or addition are compatible with the scale, massing, orientation, and articulation of the surrounding development and will preserve or enhance existing neighborhood character (OMC 17.10.070.G.4).

This project is not an infill residential development, therefore this standard does not apply.

## **CONDITIONS**

The recommendation of approval of this project is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All construction shall conform in substance and be maintained in general conformance with plans and exhibits labeled Attachment 4 of this staff report (dated August 15, 2014), with any approved amendments resulting from said meeting including any modifications required by the conditions of approval, and as recommended for approval by the Design Review Committee.
- 2. The applicant agrees to indemnify, hold harmless, and defend the City, its officers, agents and employees from any and all liability or claims that may be brought against the City arising out of its approval of this permit, save and except that caused by the City's active negligence.
- 3. The applicant shall comply with all Federal, State and local laws, including all City regulations. Violation of any of those laws in connection with the use will be cause for revocation of this permit.
- 4. Except as otherwise provided herein, this project is approved as a precise plan. After any application has been approved, if changes are proposed regarding the location or alteration of any use or structure, a changed plan may be submitted to the Community Development Director for approval. If the Community Development Director determines that the proposed change complies with the provisions and the spirit and intent of the approval action, and that the action would have been the same for the changed plan as for the approved plot plan, the Community Development Director may approve the changed plan without requiring a new public hearing.
- 5. These conditions shall be reprinted and added onto the first or second page of any refined plan documents.

6. If not utilized, project approval expires twenty-four months from the approval date. Extensions of time may be granted in accordance with OMC Section 17.08.060. The Planning entitlements expire unless building permits are pulled within 2 years of the original approval.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- 1. Letter of Explanation
- 2. Site Photographs dated 6/28/2015
- 3. Architectural Plans dated 8/15/2014
- 4. Existing and Proposed Comparison Diagrams
- 5. Historic Elevations dated 3/8/1928
- 6. Historic Resources Group Report dated 5/16/2015

cc: Kris Olsen Chapman University One University Drive Orange, CA 92866 kolsen@chapman.edu

> Mark Hickner KTGY Group, Inc. 17922 Fitch Irvine, CA 92614 mhickner@ktgy.com

Troy Aday Aday Architects 208 N. Pennsylvania Glendora, CA 91714 troy@adayarchitects.com