



DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE: JULY 19, 2017
TO: Chair Imboden and Members of the Design Review Committee
THRU: Anna Pehoushek, Assistant Community Development Director
FROM: Marissa Moshier, Historic Preservation Planner
SUBJECT: DRC No. 4885-16 – PrimeVestment Residence

SUMMARY

The applicant proposes to reconstruct a demolished service porch and construct a new 15 square foot addition at the rear of a single family residence. The property is a contributor to the Old Towne Historic District. The applicant also proposes to construct a new 303 square foot detached one car garage with access from the existing driveway. The project was continued by the Design Review Committee (DRC) on March 1, 2017.

RECOMMENDED ACTION - FINAL DETERMINATION

Staff recommends that the DRC approve the proposed project subject to conditions of approval contained in the staff report and any conditions that the DRC determines appropriate to support the required findings.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant/Owner: PrimeVestment Properties, LLC
Property Location: 447 S. Shaffer Street (Old Towne Historic District)
General Plan Designation: LDR (Low Density Residential)
Zoning Classification: R-1-6 (Single Family Residential)
Existing Development: 688 SF single family residence (contributor to the Old Towne Historic District, constructed c. 1923)
Property Size: 5,793 SF
Associated Applications: None
Previous DRC Review: Continued on March 1, 2017

PUBLIC NOTICE

No Public Notice was required for this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Categorical Exemption: The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) and 15331 (Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) because the project consists of reconstruction of a demolished service porch at the rear of the historical resource, construction of a small new addition, and construction of a detached one car garage in conformance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Secretary's Standards)*. In conformance with the *Secretary's Standards*, the reconstruction of the service porch is based on photographic evidence of the design and materials of the feature prior to demolition. The small new addition at the rear is appropriately differentiated from the historic building. Both the reconstruction and the new addition fit under the existing roof of the building, and will not destroy historic materials or features that characterize the property. The proposed garage is an accessory structure supporting the primary use of the property as a single family residence. The garage reflects the mass, scale, location, form, and design of typical accessory structures in the Historic District and is compatible with the historic property. There is no environmental public review required for a Categorical Exemption.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes the following major project components:

- Reconstruct a demolished service porch at the rear of the residence. The service porch was located under the existing gable roof of the house and will be reconstructed based on photographs of the building prior to the demolition (See Attachment 3). Based on the photographs, the service porch consisted of a half wall, clad in vertical wood siding, and aluminum sliding windows above the half wall. The applicant proposes to use wood casement windows in place of the aluminum sliders in the reconstruction. The recent history of the property, including the unpermitted demolition of the service porch, is described in the previous DRC Staff Report from March 1, 2017, which is included as Attachment 6.
- Construct a new 15 square foot addition at the southeast corner of the residence. The addition fills in the small area under the existing roof next to the reconstructed service porch. The addition is clad is vertical wood siding.
- Construct a new 303 square foot detached one car garage. The garage uses an existing driveway approach for access. This driveway approach will be extended with new concrete to match the existing to meet the new garage.

The Committee reviewed the project on March 1, 2017 and continued it to allow the applicant to address several issues with the plans. These issues are described in the Analysis/Statement of the Issues section of the Staff Report.

EXISTING SITE

The site is developed with a 688 square foot single family residence, constructed circa 1923. It is a contributor to the National Register of Historic Places and local Old Towne historic districts

(collectively, Old Towne Historic District). The site has an approach and a small section of driveway concrete, but it does not appear to have had a garage or accessory structure associated with the house during the Historic District's period of significance. The area immediately to the south of the property contained orange groves during this period and the driveway approach may have served as part of an access road into the groves or may have been used informally for uncovered parking for the house.

EXISTING AREA CONTEXT

The subject property is located on the east side of S. Shaffer Street between E. Culver Avenue and Chalynn Circle. Surrounding properties are a mix of single and multi-family residences. Properties to the north and east are zoned R-1-6 (Single Family Residential). Properties to the south and west are zoned R-2-6 (Duplex Residential).

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

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

1. **Architectural Features.**
 - a. The architectural features shall reflect a similar design style or period.
 - b. Creative building elements and identifying features should be used to create a high quality project with visual interest and an architectural style.
2. **Landscape.**
 - a. The type, size and location of landscape materials shall support the project's overall design concept.
 - b. Landscaping shall not obstruct visibility of required addressing, nor shall it obstruct the vision of motorists or pedestrians in proximity to the site.
 - c. Landscape areas shall be provided in and around parking lots to break up the appearance of large expanses of hardscape.
3. **Signage.**
 - a. All signage shall be compatible with the building(s) design, scale, colors, materials and lighting.
4. **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).

ANALYSIS/STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

Issue 1: Accuracy and Consistency of Plans

At the DRC meeting on March 1, 2017, the Committee reviewed the project and was generally in favor of the proposed scope of work to reconstruct the demolished service porch, construct a new 15 square foot addition, and a new detached one car garage. However, the Committee identified a number of issues with the accuracy and consistency of the plans that needed to be addressed prior to approval. The following list of requested corrections summarizes the Committee's discussion at the meeting from March 1, 2017 and is taken from the minutes of that meeting.

1. *Add a rim joist at the base of the addition.*

The applicant has added an 8 inch rim joist at the base of the addition, shown on the elevations on Sheet A-2 and on Detail 4 – Section A on Sheet A-1.

2. *Eliminate the transoms and use larger casement windows in the proposed openings for the service porch.*

The applicant has eliminated the transom windows and is proposing single wood casement windows in each bay of the reconstructed service porch.

3. *Detail the trim and window casing to show the intent of the construction; details should be at a larger size on the plans.*

The applicant has revised the elevations on Sheet A-2 to better reflect the proposed trim and window casing. A note on the elevation indicates that all vertical and horizontal trims will be flush with each other as shown in the photographs of the service porch prior to demolition. The applicant did not substantially revise the size of the Window & Trim Detail on Sheet A-2. However, additional section details for the reconstruction are provided on Sheet A-1.

4. *Reduce the size of the trim at the rake of the garage; recommended to be 1 inch.*

The trim at the rake on the garage has been eliminated in Detail 3 on Sheet A-1.

5. *Indicate that the garage has a soffit at the eaves.*

The soffit is noted on the garage elevations on Sheet A-1 and is described in Detail 2 on the same sheet.

6. *Review the accuracy of all drawings to ensure that they comport with each other.*

The applicant has attempted to ensure that the drawings are consistent with each other and accurately reflect the proposed project.

7. *Revise or remove the designer's note on 1st page.*

The designer's note related to the accuracy of the drawings has been removed from the plans.

8. *Verify the height of the eave on the south elevation.*

The applicant has revised the south elevation on Sheet A-2 to accurately reflect the existing height of the eave over the service porch at the rear of the building.

9. *Verify the size of the concrete stoop at the rear.*

The applicant has revised the width of the concrete stoop on the elevation on Sheet A-2 so that it matches the plan on Sheet SP. The stoop is centered on the door.

10. *Provide plan details of the window mullions and at the corners of the service porch.*

Details 5 and 6 on Sheet A-1 are provided to describe the proposed construction of the windows, trim, casing, and corners of the reconstructed service porch.

11. *Revise the man door in the garage to agree with the plan.*

The man door on the north elevation of the garage has been revised to match the location of the man door on the garage plan.

12. *Consider other options for the width of the concrete driveway.*

The applicant reviewed the existing location of the driveway and determined that it was not accurately represented on the first set of plans presented to the DRC. The correct location of the driveway is 5 feet 10 inches from the south property line. This existing location will allow the extension of the existing driveway to line up with the garage door of the proposed garage at the proposed 5 foot setback from the south property line. This responds to the DRC's concern about the driveway not lining up with the new garage.

13. *Review the windows on the north elevation for accuracy.*

There are no changes proposed for any windows on the main portion of the house, including the windows on the north elevation. The windows on the north elevation drawing on Sheet A-2 have been revised to more accurately reflect the existing condition.

With these corrections, staff recommends that the proposed project is in conformance with the Old Towne Design Standards and the *Secretary's Standards*. The reconstruction and new addition use materials and design features that are compatible with the historic building

The proposed new garage reflects the mass, scale, design and materials of historic accessory structures in the Historic District. The detached garage, behind the house and using the existing driveway, matches the typical pattern of development for historic residential properties and is compatible with the character of this block of the Historic District.

ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDATION

None required.

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 with recommended conditions.

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).*

The proposed project is in conformance with the Old Towne Design Standards. The proposed service porch is compatible with the contributing building, as it reconstructs a demolished historic feature of the building that was constructed during the Historic District’s period of significance, based on photographic evidence. The service porch uses new compatible materials to match the removed materials. The mass and scale of the small new addition are also appropriate for the size of the historic building and for the character of the Historic District. The addition is minimally visible from the public right of way, and its design and materials are compatible with the historic building and are appropriately differentiated from the historic building. The addition retains existing historic materials and does not significantly change or obscure the building’s character-defining features. Similarly, the new one car garage reflects the character of historic accessory structures in the Historic District and is compatible with the historic property. Its mass, scale, design and materials are typical of the pattern of development of historic accessory structures and fit within the streetscape of the Historic District.

2. *In any National Register Historic District, the proposed work complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines (OMC 17.10.07.G.2).*

Projects found to be in conformance with the Old Towne Design Standards are generally considered to be in conformance with the *Secretary’s Standards*. In conformance with the *Secretary’s Standards* for reconstruction, the service porch is based on documentary and physical evidence of the demolished structure and preserves the historic spatial relationships of the house and service porch. The reconstruction is based on accurate duplication of historic materials to re-create the design of the demolished service porch. In conformance with Standard 2, the small new addition at the rear of the building will be minimally visible from the street and will not negatively impact the character of the historic

building or the Old Towne Historic District. In conformance with Standards 9 and 10, the proposed addition and the new garage are appropriately differentiated from the historic building, and will not destroy historic materials or features that characterize the property. The project is in conformance with the *Secretary's Standards*.

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 17.10.07.G.3).*

The proposed work conforms with the prescriptive standards and design criteria set forth in the Old Towne Design Standards and *Secretary's Standards*, as described above.

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 17.10.07.G.4).*

The *City of Orange Infill Residential Design Guidelines* do not apply to properties in the Old Towne Historic District. This finding does not apply.

CONDITIONS

Staff recommends the Design Review Committee approve the project subject to the conditions listed below and any conditions that the Design Review Committee deems appropriate:

1. All construction shall conform in substance and be maintained in general conformance with plans labeled as Attachment 6 in the staff report (date stamped July 10, 2017), including modifications required by the conditions of approval, and as approved by the Design Review Committee.
2. 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 plan, the Community Development Director may approve the changed plan without requiring a new public meeting.
3. The final approved conditions of approval shall be reprinted on the first or second page of the construction documents when submitting to the Building Division for the plan check process.
4. 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.
5. Construction permits shall be obtained for all future construction work, as required by the City of Orange, Community Development Department's Building Division. Failure to obtain the required building permits may be cause for revocation of this permit.

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. Vicinity Map
2. Site Photographs
3. Photographs of Service Porch prior to Demolition
4. Garage Door Specifications
5. DPR Form 523 for 447 S. Shaffer Street
6. DRC Staff Report from March 1, 2017
7. DRC Minutes from March 1, 2017
8. Plans (date stamped July 10, 2017)

cc: PrimeVestment Properties, LLC
Attn: Curran O'Connor
31422 Paseo Diosa
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675