CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

December 2, 2009

Committee Members Present: Adrienne Gladson

Bill Cathcart Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Ed Knight, Assistant Community Development Director

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair McCormack opened the Administrative Session with a review of the Agenda.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda or any policy or procedural information. There were no minutes to review and there would be minutes on the next Agenda along with one item that was scheduled for the December 16, 2009 meeting. She had heard back from most of the DRC Members that there would be a quorum present for that meeting. Projects were anticipated to be agendized for the January 6, 2010 meeting.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, stated there were three items currently set for the January 6, 2010 Agenda.

Chair McCormack stated there was a possibility that he would be recused from the 2nd Agenda Item. He had recused himself previously on projects with Doug Ely, as his wife had worked with Mr. Ely.

Assistant Community Development Director, Ed Knight, stated if Chair McCormack's wife had worked for Mr. Ely he would be recused from the presentation of the item.

Chair McCormack asked if there was a time limit on when work had been done with an applicant?

Mr. Knight stated there was a time limit, which he would check on, and he believed it was six months to one year. If Chair McCormack's wife had worked with Mr. Ely within the last year then Chair McCormack would be recused.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated he would be recused and she would follow up on the time limitations.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be recused from Agenda Item No. 2, as he was the architect on the project.

There was no further discussion.

Committee Member Gladson made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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 DRC members were present

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

There was none.

CONSENT ITEMS:

All matters that are announced 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

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(2) DRC No. 4433-09 - SCHARER REHABILITATION

- A proposal to rehabilitate a contributing residence and accessory structure, including porch modifications.
- 525 W. La Veta Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC ACTION: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler recused himself from this item as he is the architect on the project.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report. Mr. Ryan handed out additional information for the Committee Members to review.

Committee Member Gladson asked if the information had just been received?

Mr. Ryan stated it had just been handed to him.

Applicant, Linda Day, address on file, stated she would go through the recommendations that had been given to her from Mr. Ryan. On the siding, new siding would match the existing and they had saw blades that would match the cuts. The house had two types of siding and they would do the back house in the original type siding and the front house in its original siding. She was requesting that Condition No. 2 be eliminated for a final landscape plan as there was existing irrigation on the property. An additional parking space would be added, but as the project was a remodel they would maintain the irrigation in its present state with some new citrus plantings and an addition of a planter box. She pointed to the areas on the drawings. The Avocado tree would be maintained. On the demarcation line, with the potential of moving the house 10 feet forward, she believed in lifting the house the basement would be able to be filled in and the engineer would install additional supports and there would be no need to move the house forward. Condition No. 4 pertained to the infill of the basement and they had spoken with numerous individuals who had stated there would not be a problem filling in the basement. Condition No. 5 was okay.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated nothing appeared to have changed much on the project. He wanted to reiterate the OTPA's satisfaction that the project was moving in the direction of rehabilitation instead of demolition and the OTPA fully supported the project.

Chair McCormack opened the item for discussion by the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett stated as he had gotten through the letter and Mr. Ryan had gotten through the letter, he asked if Mr. Ryan had any objections to the requests being made?

Mr. Ryan stated he recalled that the option for moving the building was that there had been a problem with compacting and filling the old abandoned basement. If the applicant was able to build a foundation to comply with Building and Engineering it was okay. On the landscape requirements, on an accessory unit, there would be a landscape plan required. The property was very unique with the long setback and had some very unique cultural plantings. The character should be maintained and it might be as simple as requiring an irrigation system. The intent of the applicant was to maintain the character of the historic setting. He stated that the only change on the building was that previously there was siding wrapped around the stairs going to the accessory unit and the security ordinance required the open railing.

Committee Member Woollett stated there had been a roof (over the stairs).

Ms. Day stated there had been a roof that had been added much later and it would be removed as it had cut off one of the windows. The upper level of the stairs at the landing would be protected, and the remainder would be an open stairway.

Chair McCormack stated he was satisfied with the building. Since the prior review of the project he had driven by the home five days a week, twice a day, and he had seen at the most six or seven cars parked all through the driveway and there were always two cars in a zone he pointed to on the drawings. Once a car was parked in a landscape area, it took away the uniqueness of the front yard. If he had cars parked in a front yard in his neighborhood it would not last.

Ms. Day stated the property was vacant. They had problems with people breaking into the home consistently, with windows being broken and someone living in the home. They had a renter around the corner and she had asked that person to park her cars on the property so it would have the appearance of being occupied. In the evening the gate was closed and locked. They also had a problem with other people parking on the property. She and her husband would go to the property and it was disconcerting to have someone crawling out of the window, unknown of they were carrying a weapon or not. Having the neighbor park cars on the property gave her extra security. Once the building process began the parking would not be allowed at the site. She pointed out areas where parking would be allowed.

Chair McCormack stated he had taken the liberty to draw out a simple plan that would allow parking; they could take or leave the suggestions. Some of the issues he had were the cars parked in the front lawn, he pointed to the drawings and noted the places he felt parking would be okay on. He felt the key issue was to ensure cars stayed on the concrete and not in the orchard and what he had drawn out was an Orange grove that would not be in turf; it was in decomposed granite and the rest of it was turf. On the Avocado tree it would be important not to have turf and to let the leaf litter just sit. Once someone drove on a lawn it would compact the area and grass would not grow there. He had drawn out a concept to get the parking and have landscape; as Staff would be reviewing the proposal and there was not a landscape architect on Staff. He asked Committee Member Cathcart if he had anything to add?

Committee Member Cathcart stated he felt it was fine and he was going to ask that they might condition the project to have an "as built" to understand the conditions that existed on the site, in terms of irrigation. A new plan would not be necessary, but to just identify where the existing landscape occurred.

Ms. Day pointed out where the existing irrigation was on the plans and stated they were currently hand watering the lawn. She stated the plan from Chair McCormack was nice and they would be having a family live in the home and she would not want a situation where there would be dirt coming up to the front door for the trees. She had no problem with the trees being on dirt in one area, but there would be a tree that would be surrounded by grass and provide a play area for children. Once it became a home there would not be parking on the grass.

Committee Member Cathcart stated it was not presented as a Condition but as a suggestion.

Chair McCormack stated it was just a simple solution and they had spoken about reducing turf and water efficient landscape in the Committee's Administrative Session. There were water costs, fertilizer maintenance, and mowing to consider. The suggestion was not for dirt but for decomposed granite which was recommended for orchards and it limited the amount of water that would go into the drip zone of the trees and saved water. It could be used as a walkable surface and would make harvesting fruit easy. He had looked at all the issues and the long term viability of having a sustainable landscape was his suggestion. He had noticed 5 gallon trees on the proposal and they would be very small and suggested the use of 15 gallons for the citrus trees. Since there was not a landscape plan being conditioned, he felt due to the size of the lot that some consideration should be given rather than just placing a 5 gallon tree on the property and calling it a day.

Ms. Day stated she was attempting to maintain the historic character, but she would not be able to. Originally there was a fish pond on the property and she had reduced the trees to three and would be doing away with the fish pond.

Committee Member Gladson stated she felt there would still be value in having an "as built" plan or some sort of landscape plan as part of the proposal. Because of the rental aspect of the second unit it was typical to have something that showed how the planting materials would be handled. She felt they had not needed a full blown landscape plan, but something that showed how the property's landscaping would be treated. She would be in support of retaining the landscape requirement condition.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he agreed; it was important that there should be something that showed where the plants were in relationship to each other and where the irrigation would be located, in reference to the sprinkler heads and the valves. The applicant spoke about having no intention of moving the house and the word intention bothered him as they might find sometime that an applicant intended to do something but then changed their mind. If the applicant was adamant about not moving the house it should be clear that it was stated in the proposal that the house would not be moved.

Committee Member Woollett stated the plans that were being submitted showed the house in its current location.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he was speaking to the Conditions of Approval and the information received in the letter; it was stated that there was not an intention to move the house and that should be clearly stated.

Committee Member Gladson stated if the home was to be moved the project would need to be returned to the DRC.

Committee Member Woollett stated the recommendation of moving the house should be removed so the issue of moving the house would go away.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he felt that it needed to be clearly stated that they would not be moving the house and to have the recommendation removed. He was fine with everything else.

Mr. Ryan stated if they would decide to move the house it would change things.

Chair McCormack stated since he had seen so many cars parked on the front yard, he suggested possibly containing the area so that would not occur again, because once it happened the grass would not grow there.

Ms. Day stated the cars had not belonged to the family that would live there; those cars were merely there to help them maintain security.

Chair McCormack stated what the applicant was stating was that no one would be parking on the front yard.

Ms. Day stated that was correct, she would not let them.

Committee Member Gladson stated she was okay with that as it was an interim situation. If in the future cars were parked there it would be dealt with. She was comfortable with the project.

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant had explained the situation and he was fine with that.

Chair McCormack stated his suggestions were a simple drawing that had taken him 20 minutes that addressed the issue of not allowing cars to be on the front lawn and to have the Orange trees and a leaf drop area for the Avocado tree.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4433-09, Scharer Rehabilitation, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with Conditions No. 3 and 4 to be eliminated.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Craig Wheeler

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4451-09 - ESSENMACHER ADDITION

- A proposal for a 333 sq. ft. addition to a contributing single-family residence
- 704 E. Maple Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Dan Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC ACTION: Final Determination

Chair McCormack recused himself from this item due to his wife working for the architect on the proposed project.

Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report. He passed out photos for the Committee Members to review. He apologized for the Committee Member's receipt of last minute information; however, when he had reviewed the project the addition was larger than the 20% floor area and that would have automatically taken it to the Planning Commission and required additional environmental reviews. Through discussions with the applicant, he was able to accommodate a quick turn around in modifying the project for presentation and final determination by the DRC.

Applicant, Doug Ely, address on file, stated he wanted to add a few things. When he had designed the proposed project they had come up with a few different approaches and had worked with Mr. Ryan. Mr. Ryan had asked that they take a look at preserving the existing eave line. He tried a flat roof and a lower pitched roof, but it just looked tacked on and had not looked right. It seemed that the appropriate approach was to match the style and character of the original residence and to provide a line of demarcation. He had not known if the Committee Members had a chance to review the photographs; the photos that had been originally submitted had a gable roof on the back, as the initial thought was to convert the attic into a livable area, and the owner would still want to do that. The owner had applied for a separate addition that would go to the Planning Commission. He had wanted to keep the project moving with the proposed addition as they had wanted to start the project as soon as possible. He presented 3D views of the property and the area where the addition would be most visible on Harwood Street. There was a large tree in the way and through Photoshop the tree had been removed to allow the view from the street. He pointed out where the tree existed and reviewed the photos with the Committee Members. The Staff Report listed the porch as 180 square feet and it was actually 132 square feet; it was 8' x 10' x 15' and Staff might have gone off a previous plan with their measurement. As far as the porch treatment, he had not wanted to compete with the wrap around porch that existed at the front of the residence and was the gem of the property; he had wanted it to be of a more contemporary nature with simple elements and to match the rhythm and proportions of the existing structure. He presented black and white 3D views of the proposed porch. The owner had wanted a covered porch; they had looked at it with a trellis and also as covered. The columns would be 6" squared with wood trim over a 4 x 4 post, and it would be all trimmed out with the eave detail similar to the eave detail that existed at the front of the residence. He had not wanted to match the glorious columns that were out in front and wanted the new porch to be discernable as a new addition. He proposed to place a line of demarcation using some vertical trim and pointed out where those would occur on the drawings. Mr. Ely stated the existing covered porch at the front of the residence had a plastered ceiling with dropped wood beams; the new area would have a flat roof with a little bit of detail, not as ornate as the existing residence. There would be some simple trim and he preferred to not use a capital on it, as it placed it more in the line of something he had not wanted to replicate.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he wanted to thank Mr. Ely for meeting with the OTPA on the previous plans; the plans had changed quite a bit since then. He wanted to compliment the applicant on the great job on the rehabilitation of the structure and it was too bad that it had to be ripped up again. It was always a challenge to add a sympathetic addition onto a modest structure and to keep it out of public view and especially on a corner lot. The OTPA would want the addition completely out of view and the fence would hide the west elevation, but the north elevation would be visible. The OTPA would want to ensure that as much as possible of the historic fabric would be retained and it was a shame that the rafter tails and the roof line would change. Not being an architect he felt the roof line appeared to be a little awkward and it would be visible from the street. He agreed with Staff on recycling windows and other features as much as possible, and on the window designs to match the double-hung windows. The OTPA was pleased to see that the upstairs attic area was not included in the plan, and hopefully they could work with the applicant on getting a design that would not impact the historic roof. To create a gable on the back of the home would not meet the Design Standards or the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Vice-Chair Gladson opened the item for discussion by the Committee.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was a bit confused with the comments about wanting to take the project through the review with what was being presented and the adjustments made on the plans. He asked for clarification on increasing scope of the project and going to the Planning Commission?

Mr. Ely stated the square footage of the floor area would not be expanded, but they had wanted to present at a future date a proposal to have the attic be a habitable living area. It would require returning to the DRC and to the Planning Commission for approvals. He had discussed that addition with Mr. Frankel. That proposal would be a totally separate project.

Committee Member Woollett asked Mr. Ryan if the proposed project would not exceed the area of limitations?

Mr. Ryan stated based on the calculations the proposed project would not exceed 20% of the floor area.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they would move forward with additional space in the attic?

Mr. Ryan stated based on the attic habitable space it would move the project for approval by the Planning Commission and also any addition or expansion of the 2nd story would require specific code requirements.

Mr. Ely stated it would return to the DRC prior to Planning Commission approval.

Committee Member Woollett stated the DRC had not needed to know that in order for the consideration of the proposed project before them.

Mr. Ely stated that was correct and he had spoken with other Committee Members and they had reviewed it with a gable roof and he wanted to inform them of why it had no longer existed.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had contact with Mr. Ely prior to the meeting. Regarding the trellis area, had there been any consideration to have a trellis that was covered with fabric?

Mr. Ely stated no, the property owner had wanted the cover to be rain proof. He asked if Committee Member Woollett was speaking of using some type of retractable cover?

Committee Member Woollett stated that could be. It would look like a trellis but it would be covered.

Mr. Ely stated that was not considered, but he had designed a trellis, which he proposed and presented drawings for their review.

Vice Chair Gladson stated one of her immediate thoughts as she listened to the presentation was that she had concerns that the project had been bifurcated into two elements and that was troubling to her. A larger plan was proposed for the house and she felt that it should be treated as a whole, and it was bothersome to her; she was troubled, puzzled, and concerned with what she might or might not do in the decision making process.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated the Committee Members needed to deal with the project before them. The secondary portion of the project was a separate project and irrelevant. What Vice-Chair Gladson might have been thinking of were the impacts there might be based on any future plans and that they should also take those into account. If approved, the proposed project would be built and act as a baseline to build on. Ideally it would have been nice to have the project all packaged together, but sometimes that had not happened. It was not ideal, but she was okay with the project being presented as it was.

Vice-Chair Gladson stated they could creep into doing something that had not been intended by splitting the project in two, and in the world of Planning, if you were to build 14 homes and only showed one at a time, there could be less impact with 1 house vs. 14.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the projects were fairly different and whatever impacts there might or might not be would be reviewed.

Committee Member Wheeler asked that if both projects went forward, would the cumulative impact of the projects trigger additional parking requirements?

Mr. Ely stated that could occur.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there was a component in the Code that dealt with a certain amount of additions within a certain time frame would be considered together.

Mr. Ely stated it was not the initial desire to split the project, but it became necessary based on the time it took to process the project to get it to the particular stage they were at. The owner had construction personnel available to begin construction very soon. If they had been able to get the other approach approved with the porch, it would be a stand alone project and would not have been built for a while.

Vice-Chair Gladson stated she appreciated the clarification by Staff that supported the DRC's review. None of what Mr. Ely had discussed was in the Report and it got her questioning the intent. She stated she had a problem with the flat roof on the project and they could review that element and the potential of shielding it on Harwood Street with trees or additional landscaping. Staff had suggested a more open-style porch.

Mr. Ryan stated Staff and the applicant had discussed using open lattice vs. a solid roof and there were probably other options.

Vice-Chair Gladson stated she understood that the area would be used as an extension of space for the master bedroom and she had no problem with that, it was the aesthetics.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was a bit troubled by the roof as he had not seen a precedent for it on a similar style of home. He asked if there had been any other flat roof additions on that same style of roof.

Mr. Ryan stated most homes had a bit of a roof pitch.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the 100 block of Grand there was a home with a flat roof and it had not looked appropriate and it was troubling to him and the use of a trellis would be more suitable.

Mr. Ely stated he had the original submittal with the trellis and they could review that approach.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the use of a gable that moved in over the roof.

Mr. Ely stated they had tried that but it just competed with the roof and he had wanted that element to really stand alone. He had wanted to have only a minimal slope of 1%, as it would only stick out just under 9 feet. He discussed the design and measurements with Committee Member Wheeler and stated the trellis had basically the same design; it would be a framed perimeter with joists that would come out with every other one notched and have 2" x 2". He had not wanted everything going horizontally across because the edge would not have the same appearance. There would be enough of a platform that could hold some type of covering over it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be in favor of that design. He had some minor questions; he asked why there had been no note number 13 on the drawings?

Mr. Ely stated that was just an error.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt there should be more clarification, through conditions, about items that should match existing features and those were fascia, soffits, and to incorporate drain scuppers on the back porch deck. On the roof form it was shown as basically a fold on the bell cast, but in actuality it was curved and he wanted to verify there would be a curve to match the old construction.

Mr. Ely stated that was an interesting detail. The ceiling joists had been framed all the way across and the roof frame, rafters, were actually framed on top. The curved element was then built.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he had used that detail in the past, using a curved shim that went between the two pieces and it met current structural requirements. The frieze board was not shown and he assumed that would be carried throughout. It was a frieze board and a belly band that carried around. He noticed there was a callout for a vertical trim board at the line of demarcation and he felt that the Committee had previously allowed just an interior corner to be a line of demarcation and they had not asked for a trim board. He reviewed the plans with the applicant and thanked him for providing roof plans. The cap detail on the window trim was different than what was presented in the drawings and he assumed that detail would be matched.

Mr. Ely stated he would be matching the existing trim.

Committee Member Cathcart stated he was glad to see the trellis.

Vice-Chair Gladson asked if there were permits for the other additions?

Mr. Ryan stated yes, there were permits, and the space might have been used as a home office.

Committee Member Woollett asked if they could speak about the trellis for a bit. It was a difficult issue for him; there were inconsistencies that they dealt with all the time, dealing with the demarcation between added and existing construction and mitigating the historic work when new work was created. Theoretically they would encourage an addition to be very different from the original historic structure and the Standards allowed them to and somewhat encouraged them to do that. What had occurred was that the DRC had created a precedent in asking applicants to come close to replicating the historic style on new additions and although it was an addition the applicant was asked to use like materials, and that created a false sense of history. That was not the intent of the Federal Standards.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was what they had been doing and his feelings were that it was appropriate for the community, rather than using some of the requirements of the Federal Standards to use something very stark and very modern for the addition.

Committee Member Woollett stated although they were creating a false sense of history the integrity of the neighborhood has been kept.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the problem with the Federal Standards approach, as one would go through time, each addition would be a different form and create clutter. He felt that asking for compatibility was acceptable so they would not get different forms from different eras and attempt to decide what was appropriate.

Committee Member Woollett stated the precedent the DRC set was to ignore that part of the Standards.

Committee Member Wheeler stated "or to soften it."

Vice-Chair Gladson stated she viewed the issue of false sense of history as being more internal to the structure. The average individual who would look at an addition might not realize the subtleties of what was done for compatibility, in terms of similar styles and design, but if it was studied and looked at intently, and looked at what was old and what was new, one could tell what was new because of the newer materials. It was wood but it would not be 100 year old wood or not 100 year old windows. That was how she separated the two; it was not a false sense of history, as it would be a compatible addition that paid homage to what existed. It was complicated and that was how she wrestled with it.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was typical of what they had all discussed.

Vice-Chair Gladson stated to place a ranch style addition on the existing structure would be out of context and character, and she supposed the applicant could find wood from the 1950's.

Committee Member Woollett stated he had not wanted to drag it out, but from time to time the Committee needed to discuss the issue to remind themselves of what they were doing. In some cases creating a false historical content was a very big issue.

Vice-Chair Gladson stated it was also a balance between the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the City of Orange's Guidelines to find the best way to complete a project for the community.

Committee Member Woollett stated in the proposed project they were speaking about the trellis and he heard from all the Members that the trellis should be more in style with the original structure and for the sake of the community it would be preferred. He had also heard that using a fabric cover could provide protection and possibly rain protection.

Committee Member Cathcart stated there were materials that would allow shade, shadow, and air to go through but not moisture due to the small screen size.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to approve DRC No. 4451-09, Essenmacher Addition, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and in accordance with the revised plans submitted at the start of the meeting; and to eliminate Condition No. 2 and with the following additional Conditions:

- 1. The rear porch covering be designed as a trellis in accordance with the submitted sketches and that a water proof shade fabric may be added as desired by the property owner.
- 2. The following items to match existing conditions as closely as possible:
 - a. Eave brackets, fascia, soffits, the rear deck drainage scuppers, frieze board, window trim, belly band, and the roof bell cast form to feature a curve.
- 3. The line of demarcation may be executed with a re-entrant corner rather than the use of trim board.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was important to recognize that although it was not a part of the proposed project, if the applicant was to return with a modification the issue of a false sense of history could be discussed again.

Mr. Ely asked if that meant an alternate approach?

Committee Member Woollett stated the applicant could return with anything he wanted.

SECOND: Bill Cathcart

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: None

RECUSED: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled meeting on December 16, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.