CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

October 20, 2010

Committee Members Present: Adrienne Gladson

Tim McCormack Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Bill Cathcart

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner

Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the Administrative Session at 5:07 p.m.

Planning Manger, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda.

Vice Chair Gladson stated Historic Preservation Planner, Dan Ryan, would provide a presentation and discussion on the Table of Contents of the Historic Preservation Design Standards. Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, was also present.

Ms. Pehoushek stated that about a year ago Staff had come to the DRC and other City Committees to gain input on issues that could be identified that were problematic or areas that needed refining in the efforts to update the Historic Standards. They were now beginning the framework for the document.

Mr. Ryan stated they had a Table of Contents for the Standards organized in a manner that reflected the way the document might be used. It was broken down into several parts. There was also information regarding the administrative procedures, review and approval process. He read through the Table of Contents and explained the various headings. They wanted to also include photographic and technical notes and, going along with that, they wanted to have Standards for design elements on commercial and industrial properties. Some of the things they wanted to include were good examples and sample project submissions. In looking at the Application of Design and Development Standards, Item No. 4, the first thing was Standards of Excellence and one of the issues was that there were projects that came to Staff that met just the minimum standards in every category and it was important to set a tone for the document for excellence as anyone could build to the minimum standards. There was information for streetscape patterns and the relationship of the building code to the zoning ordinances and relationships to other policy documents. They hoped that the process would allow an opportunity to bring all the elements together into a document that was workable, understandable, and would provide an applicant with some specifics of what was required and to make the job of the DRC easier in reviewing projects. It was the first draft.

Committee Member Woollett stated his reaction to the document was very favorable and he had not studied it as thoroughly as he would have liked to. On the issue of sustainability and energy conservation and solar panels, he asked how would they approach that?

Committee Member McCormack stated he had lighting as being one of his issues in reviewing some of the sustainable issues for using lighting that was not necessarily historic and it would be a tough one to deal with in terms of appearances and understanding that historic lighting was not very efficient; and how would they grapple with having lighting fixtures that were part of a lighting scheme to ensure that a historic structure was lit correctly?

Committee Member Woollett stated the building that Committee Member Wheeler was in now had had gas lighting.

Committee Member McCormack stated what had occurred several times as an issue was what period should they choose as being historic, and it would be nice to have a choice for the applicant and what direction would the City have in offering a choice. There was also the signage element, was it wood or fake wood? Those were the issues that were important: lighting, signage, and materials.

Vice Chair Gladson stated there was solar in the residential areas and it probably should be picked up in industrial and commercial as well. She felt it was a good framework. There were two things that she had not understood what they meant, but she knew the clarification would follow later. It would be a nice document for guidance and good for the applicants to have a framework of what the City and the DRC needed to see. Sometimes she felt projects came to the DRC a bit too soon and they needed to be sensitive to applicants and their time lines, but many times the information provided was incomplete.

Mr. Ryan stated that was a reason for including examples of really good projects. It would give applicants a level of detail needed in their documentation. The DRC had commented on that more than once and having examples would encourage applicants to get professional assistance on their projects.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the standards of excellence and setting the bar high was good; it would benefit everyone to have the DRC throw in their two-cents so the bodies above, the Planning Commission and City Council, could benefit from their expertise. She felt sometimes things got watered down and there was a tendency to just allow applicants to complete their projects and they needed to protect the gem of the City, Old Towne.

Mr. Ryan stated there was some public feedback on how the DRC was viewed and it was important to have some information about the process for members of the public to understand what the DRC was charged with. He had seen all types of professionals on the Committee over the years and all types of personalities; but when it came down to it the DRC was there to assist applicants through the process and to have a design that the applicant was proud of. Part of the intent of quality of excellence went hand-in-hand with what they wanted to accomplish. There were some situations where applicants were hesitant to go before the DRC, and it was important to elaborate about the process in order to have applicants feel comfortable with that process.

Vice Chair Gladson asked what were the "four R's"?

Mr. Ryan stated Rehab, Reconstruction, Restoration, and Preserving.

Committee Member Woollett asked, "Preserving" starts with an R?

Ms. Pehoushek stated one of the things that was a bit of a departure with the document was they had the current standards organized around the Plaza, residence quadrants, and spoke streets. Within those areas there might be residential buildings that had been converted on the spoke streets or a commercial building that fell in residential quadrants and the standards might have focused on commercial development, and residential would be focused on building types. What they wanted to do was to go further and get into dealing with just a residential building type and what would those expectations be and if it was commercial to deal with the commercial building and not necessarily the area. In the past it was difficult to fulfill all the standards; there was no clear guidance for industrial buildings and they would be adding that in.

Committee Member McCormack stated on commercial buildings it was an issue with utilities and how they would get melded into the project. With Francoli it was an issue with the historical setting and how would the utilities fit in. They could touch on that and create some guidelines for those situations. It was also an issue with Haven and with items that came outside of the building and how to deal with those issues. He had some thoughts on landscaping and Committee Member Woollett had brought up sustainability and he had brought up that issue with a landscape theme, image or scenic value vs. something that was not sustainable; in a historic neighborhood how would they deal with landscape and something needed to be addressed in terms of the context and how to treat landscape in a historic area. No where had he seen a restriction if an applicant wanted to put a tall hedge around his historic structure; and those were the types of things that were tough.

Vice Chair Gladson stated there would be a difference in how to deal with that in a commercial area vs. a residential area in the Historic District.

Mr. Ryan stated there needed to be some type of guideline and what was appropriate, it would take some time to research, but was an area that needed addressing.

Committee Member Woollett stated there were many issues, and when landscape was considered applicants thought of plants, but it was also hardscape, the fences, walls, and maybe those should be distinguished from one another and perhaps some of them were more related to historic issues than others. Plant types would be less of a historic issue than hardscape, fences, and walls.

Ms. Pehoushek stated it would be an interactive process and they would have further discussions.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they could add information on what the minimum was for a submission of a project to the DRC; and what items were required or encouraged.

Vice Chair Gladson made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee Meeting.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Committee Member Cathcart was absent.

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 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

CONSENT CALENDAR:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 6, 2010

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular Design Review Committee Meeting on October 6, 2010, with the changes and corrections noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

CONSENT CALENDAR (contn'd):

(2) DRC No. 4501-10 - SPRINT WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to replace 6 existing panel antennas with 3 panel antennas and 3 parabolic antennas to an existing co-located monopole. The new equipment cabinet would be located within the existing CMU equipment enclosure. One new GPS antenna attached to the outside of the proposed equipment cabinet.
- 1963 N. Main Street
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org

• DRC Action: Final Determination

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4501-10, Sprint Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

(3) DRC No. 4449-09 – AT&T WIRELESS FACILITY

- A proposal to convert a co-located, non-stealth monopole to a stealth monopine, add 9 new panel antennas, 4 equipment cabinets, increase the height of the structure, and a Variance for the equipment enclosure wall height.
- 595 The City Drive
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- Item Continued from DRC Meeting of July 21, 2010
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Beth Broussard, address on file, stated when they had left the DRC the previous time it was not a good feeling. They had spoken about the tree and a lot of design issues and they had taken all of the comments under advisement; they stayed with the equipment enclosure and tree idea as there were already carriers there. It was a tight space. She worked with Staff and they were proposing a wall so the site would be completely screened from view and the wall was higher.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member McCormack stated in reviewing the minutes there had been a note about a negotiation for more space and asked if that had been done?

Ms. Broussard stated when they had discussed the wall they realized it would require a footer and the space had to do with encroachment into the parking lot, just a few inches, and that had been worked out.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a note for the landscaping on the east to be removed.

Ms. Nguyen stated it was the landscaping on Sheet No. 4.

Committee Member McCormack stated he would want the split face block to match what existed at the site.

Ms. Nguyen stated the wall was 42" currently and only 3' was retaining; and due to such a short wall the entire wall would be replaced. The chain link area would be removed.

Ms. Broussard stated they wanted the entire area to look uniform.

Committee Member McCormack stated there was a grade change.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was a 3' grade change in total. The retaining wall would be the same as existed now and it retained from 6" to 3' and the wall would graduate in height and as it moved to the southwest corner the wall would grow to 12' 2" high to make up for the grade difference and to screen the equipment. She reviewed the plans with the Committee Members.

Ms. Broussard stated there would still be a retaining wall.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they would be re-using the gates?

Ms. Broussard stated she had not given that any thought and stated they would not be tall enough and the gates would need to be new.

Committee Member McCormack stated the plans note existing wrought iron fence.

Ms. Nguyen stated they would need to change that notation.

The Committee Members reviewed the gates and the chain link fence extension. Ms. Nguyen explained where that was located in the photos.

Committee Member McCormack asked about the existing Bougainvilleas and the vines?

Ms. Broussard stated that would be removed due to the new wall; they could not have the wall that close to the fence due to zoning regulations.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was only a 9" gap where the Bougainvillea was growing on the west elevation and with the thickness of the wall and the footing there would not be any area for plants. On the west the wall would take up the space. There was landscape on the north elevation which would remain.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt it was a much better solution and he agreed that they use a split-face block. On the elevations on the bottom it showed existing to remain and proposed fence and he thought those were old notes that should be taken out, on page no. 5. He also stated there was a notation about the CMU wall that should be cleaned up. He asked what the diameter of the faux Pine tree would be and that had been asked for at the last meeting; he wanted to know what the diameter at its widest point would be?

Ms. Nguyen stated in the analysis they had discussed that and AT&T needed to have an open bid; the DRC could suggest a diameter or radius, but if AT&T would need to provide that they would be limiting themselves in the open bid. If there was a diameter requirement it could eliminate some vendors from bidding.

Ms. Broussard stated a City would many times provide a density requirement, how far branches needed to go beyond the antennas and they could work with them on that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they wanted some guarantee that the tree would taper and be similar to the illustrations provided.

Vice Chair Gladson stated they would want to clarify that.

Ms. Broussard stated the trees had come a long way. At the last meeting they had chosen the Santa Barbara-style Pine tree. They had gone to that tree manufacturer and obtained all the specs from them and they had wanted to use that tree. She could not promise that due to the open bid process.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if those specs were available?

Ms. Broussard stated she could get that to him.

Committee Member Woollett stated open bid had not meant that there were no specifications.

Ms. Broussard stated during zoning they were working with a conceptual idea. They were attempting to figure out what the City wanted and to provide that; they would not come in with a tree in mind from a specific manufacturer.

Committee Member Woollett stated in the past they had provided a minimum. They had already provided a guideline and how would that work in regard to the diameter and the density.

Ms. Nguyen stated she had not seen the guidelines, but they conditioned that the monopine look within visual conformance of the visual simulation.

Ms. Broussard stated the City of Santa Barbara published their guidelines and they were pretty strict. She could obtain that and they could pattern their project after that.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she would want to look at it prior to permits being pulled.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could state they wanted it to look like the illustration, or like the Santa Barbara tree, but it was difficult to know what the numbers were. On page no. 8 the structural called out for a central beam and there was a bearing post in the middle, and he thought it would be a good idea to ensure that it was coordinated to the equipment plans below and someone should check that, as they wouldn't want the post going down where it shouldn't be going. There were cross members that were shown as 2" galvanized pipe, but there were other members going the other way and those had no detail or information as to whether they sat on top of the galvanized pipe or how they were connected. The plans needed to agree with the excellently-worded condition in the Staff Report; that it all needed to be below the top of the wall.

Ms. Broussard stated that was the reason they had increased the wall height to conceal everything.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4449-09, AT&T Wireless Facility, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. On recommendation no. 6, to be re-written to read the applicant shall replace any existing landscape in like size and kind if damaged.
- 2. Landscape plans to show the plants on the west elevation to be removed.
- 3. Wrought iron gates to be replaced with new gates.
- 4. Split-face block to match size, color, and pattern of existing.
- 5. DRC to review plans prior to issuance of building permit.
- 6. The faux tree specifications to come back to the DRC prior to issuance of building permit.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

New Agenda Items:

(4) DRC No. 4274-07 – AYRES HOTEL

- A proposal to construct a new 93,452 sq. ft. hotel building with 143 rooms on 2.64 acres of land. An additional two-story, 211-stall parking structure and 63 at-grade parking stalls would also be constructed along with a swimming pool, trash enclosure, and landscaping.
- 3737 W. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Don Ayres, address on file, stated he was the developer and owner, and they had some design elevations to present. He presented presentation boards to the Committee of the proposed Ayres Hotel. There were simulations of the buildings that were adjacent to the hotel. He presented a color board and the textured and decorative stone they would be using. It would be used on the first two stories up to the fourth story and it broke up the stucco pieces. It was a treatment they used on many of his hotels. There was scoring and a cornice. He pointed out the various elements of the hotel and where the parking structure would be.

Applicant, Cyril Chok, address on file, stated he was the architect of the project. The Ayres Hotel had a certain style with the two tone and they would blend in the colors. The stone would carry from the boiler room which was at the base of the building and they would be carrying the same stone up. From a streetscape the building would blend in. The landscape would also soften the building. The stone feature was arrived at by scoring and the manner in which it was finished; it was hand-troweled and there were various tones to give it dimension. It was a great look and gave the building a stone look, not just plaster. The parking structure was to the back and it was very low key. When coming off of the freeway the structure was visible from the offramp; but in driving along the street there was a very limited view. There would also be landscape to act as a screen.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Woollett stated he was familiar with the building and he had gone through it. The thing that concerned him was the relationship with the other building; the buildings had the same name, they were the same height, along the same street, and they had a relationship. They were going through a preliminary review and if there would be significant changes to the other building he asked if they would need to review that project as well?

Ms. Nguyen stated the DRC had reviewed that building, twice.

Committee Member Woollett stated he would want to see it in relationship to the current proposed project.

Vice Chair Gladson stated they would want to review them together.

Committee Member Woollett stated the other building had a stronger visual connection to the Doubletree Hotel than the new UCI Medical building. The Doubletree was a simple rectangular building. This project was following the Ayres mark, so to speak, and making the architecture was a bit of a challenge.

Mr. Ayres stated as a developer they looked at the existing property and if they wanted to match it or have it be something nicer, as it was on the corner; and as a property owner they would want distinction between the two properties. It was a marketing thing. It would be a bit of an upgrade from the other property. The difference within the two buildings they would be okay with.

Committee Member Woollett asked if Chapman would remain the primary entrance?

Mr. Ayres stated there was another entrance.

Ms. Nguyen stated the new proposed hotel would have a driveway off of City Drive and there was an overhang entrance to simulate the lobby of the new hotel.

Committee Member Woollett stated the primary visual entrance to him was on Chapman and he wondered if there was a way to make the new primary entrance more notable. The older building, and he realized where they had started, was kind of a hodgepodge with used brick and many other arbitrary visual things going on.

Mr. Ayres stated the brick would be going away and replaced with the decorative stone.

Committee Member Woollett stated when the project came back he would want to see both buildings.

Committee Member McCormack stated the one thing in reviewing the landscape and how it was articulated on the south elevation, the set back was only 12" punched back on the different planes and he asked if 12" was okay?

Mr. Ayres stated some pop-outs would be a little more.

Mr. Chok stated they could experiment with that. There would be a lot going on with the color, the stone, and the molding, and they felt because there was so much going on that they had not wanted to have much more. If it was a single color, no stone, no molding, and just a flat plaster building he would agree with Committee Member McCormack. He felt they had enough going on that the eye would not look for delineations and the building would not have a flat feel to it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the rustication would help with that.

Mr. Ayres stated they could get a feel for where the stone was on the front elevations and he pointed it out on the drawings.

Mr. Chok stated the roof element would pull your eyes up and not focus on the ins and outs aspect of the building. The roof element set up the rhythm as well.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the roof plan there was a roof area coming out over the mechanical elements, but on the elevation it had not been shown that way. On elevation number 3.2 he thought the roof element should be shown there. On 3.1 there was a gable element that was not shown on the roof plan and they would want to see what that was. There were issues with the returns and as it was a preliminary review they could just clean that up. He would want to see how the sign would be displayed on the building and if they would use cross braces and how thick it would be, unless they were considering a neon sign, the type that was used on top of buildings in downtown Los Angeles.

Ms. Nguyen asked for clarification on the returns.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were returns on the cornice that he thought were shown in the wrong place and they needed to be coordinated with the roof plan. His biggest questions were on the garage and he could not fathom why the garage needed to be separated by 2' from the Best Buy building. High rise buildings very commonly were right next to each other and it should not be a design issue for an engineer to have the garage be right up against the building. It would be a great advantage to them and there would not be that little area to maintain. It would also add 2' to the patio.

Mr. Chok stated offset footings were a lot more expensive.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be worth it and he suggested that they research it. The stairs that were visible from the pool area were just one step better than from a fire escape and they should study that a bit more. They might want to do something that had a wall with a railing and had more thought to it, and not just a packaged stair. On the question of the security grill he suggested picking up the motif of the wrought iron fencing as something that would tie that all in. On the parking structure he would want to see an end view of the stairs. On the parking structure if that was the only CMU visible on site he suggested that it be a stucco finish for compatibility. He thought the hotel design worked well and he felt it would be reasonably compatible to the existing building.

Committee Member McCormack asked if they could enter one hotel from the other hotel?

Mr. Ayres stated no, they were separate.

Committee Member McCormack stated when the project returned he would want to see how the shade arbors and gates worked together. He had commented last time that if there were pathways between them to have the handicapped curb access and to have some sort of speed bump and they could connect those areas. He assumed that the arbor was over the fence and gate in the pool area.

Mr. Ayres stated it was over them and designed as more of an entry. It was on the site plan.

Committee Member McCormack stated the Palm trees needed to be a minimum 12' brown trunk height; they would not be 24" box. They could catch those details when they returned.

Ms. Nguyen stated was he asking if they had card access and if they had a room at the existing Ayres Inn could they get into the new hotel?

Mr. Ayres stated probably not, they would be keyed separately.

Committee Member McCormack stated if there would be connection they would probably want to connect the ramp area that he pointed out on the plans. On the two Oak trees he suggested to leave it in mulch and on a separate water zone. He was confused with the comment that there would not be landscaping on the north side.

Ms. Nguyen stated on the north and west elevations they had proposed to have a 2' gap due to the footing and they were asking if the DRC agreed with that. Generally there would be landscaping when a building was not right on the property line and the issue that Committee Member Wheeler had brought up to regain the two feet both north and west.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she mirrored Committee Member Wheeler's comment on the 2' area on the parking structure and she suggested some additional study on that situation. She was always a bit picky on parking structures. The parking structure had not appeared to do the hotel justice and she suggested the details on the parking structure were just as important as the details on the hotel. On the proposed storm tech chambers on the grading plan, she assumed that was a water retention system and asked if any of that would be visible?

Mr. Chok stated those would be completely underground.

Vice Chair Gladson stated the environmental document would assist them in gaining information regarding the compatibility of the existing hotel.

Committee Member McCormack suggested the use of green screen on the parking structure.

There was no further discussion and no motion was needed since the item was presented for preliminary review only.

(5) DRC No. 4483-10 – SANTA INES SENIOR VILLAS

- A proposal to demolish the existing preschool and construct 44 affordable Senior apartments.
- 184 N. Prospect Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Associate Planner, Doris Nguyen, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Scott Choppin, address on file, stated he was one of the developers on the project. They had a bit of a history in Orange and it was their third project in Orange. The project was a 44 unit affordable senior housing project and they were working with the City's Redevelopment Agency. They were going through the process.

Architect, Jeff Schneidereit, address on file, stated this was an interesting project; they had made a horseshoe design and with the parking and layout it allowed a courtyard with landscaping. It would increase the usability for the occupants. The design was Santa Barbara in style and fairly simple. There were entry elements with a trellis and a pedestrian-friendly access. The outside area negated landscape due to the space limitations and the need for fire access around the building.

Public Comment

None.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he disagreed with the Staff Report comments on page 4 about the minimal architectural treatments on the east elevation. It was suggested that a more decorative treatment of windows be provided. He felt the design worked well and the style should be simple but with variations in wall planes and roof forms and the proposed project had been presented in that manner. He would hate to have it embellished with frou-frou that was not necessary. On an arched form, that he pointed to on the drawings, there was no reason to have a masonry form with finished slabs on each side. He suggested bringing the soffit down or moving the arch up slightly; or to use the bracket form a bit more too. Another thing that concerned him was that the arch at the garage entrance had such a small thin area at the top and it would be very difficult to do with masonry, historically it appeared a bit fragile and there was a cornice that appeared to be much heavier than the other cornices used. He suggested the use of a smaller cornice and something much simpler. The big foam cornices were so "last week" and he suggested the use of a simple rectangular cornice, a New Mexico style. Another thought to emphasize the arch would be to paint the plane behind it a bit darker, something that would match the gate.

The applicant, architect, and Committee Member Wheeler reviewed the drawings and Ms. Nguyen noted the suggestions.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the roof texture appeared to wash out any of the lines of the roof edges and with the next presentation to allow those lines to be more visible. He could not tell if there was window trim or just a function of the CAD. If they wanted trim he suggested keeping it very simple.

Mr. Schneidereit stated the intent was to not have any window trim.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was something also on the pedestrian gate that might have been left over from a previous drawing. If they wanted to add a bit of frou-frou they might use some decorative Mediterranean tile, possibly on the balcony. He thought the courtyard would be gorgeous.

Committee Member Woollett stated he liked the project. He had not studied the proximity of the windows looking in at each other and they appeared fairly close. He appreciated the simplicity.

Mr. Choppin stated with affordable housing their comment would be that the windows would come with shades and that was probably not the best answer, but it was the reality of the situation.

Mr. Schneidereit stated the windows were not all on the same plane.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the project. On the fire access and how it related to the trees, he asked if the fire access requirements would not allow trees around the building?

Ms. Nguyen stated her understanding was that they needed ladder access to the building windows and those were noted on the plans.

Committee Member McCormack stated with that being said and the site being 51 trees short of the tree requirement, he would not want to locate 51 additional trees on the site. He felt the front of the property looked good and the plant choices were good and they had chosen a non-traditional landscape palette. The issue was that with a west and south elevation those areas needed some relief from the sun. He would have proposed trees at the non-ladder access areas; he added 17 more trees in looking at those areas. There were two properties to the south that showed good examples of trees between the buildings. He would attempt to locate more trees there and the tree choice would be important. They could use the Cercis and to just leave them in gravel.

Vice Chair Gladson asked if there was an opportunity to have a garden area in the rear yard setback for the residents to grow vegetables and herbs?

Mr. Choppin stated he was not certain there was enough sun there. He would be more inclined to do something more at the top level and not in the back. From a mobility standpoint the residents might not be able to take advantage of that opportunity. The space was very limited.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it was just a thought and she could see maybe out of the 44 residents who would reside there that maybe 15 would take on a gardening project.

Mr. Choppin stated he was open to suggestions and his thought was to add greenery that would grow up; with the tree canopy of the additional trees that they would be adding he was concerned with how much sunlight would get to that area. Maybe as an acknowledgement of the Committee's suggestion they could add a condition that if residents were inclined they could create their own green space and planters could be built for the residents along the back.

Ms. Nguyen stated there was an area along the back that was 18' wide and the property to the west had a carport that was fairly low and there would be sun to the west side.

Committee Member McCormack stated if they would be conditioning that trees be there, it would have come from a "sustainability" standpoint. He suggested using Tristania conferta, Catalina Ironwood, Sweetbay, or a more vertical tree. Those types would not require too much maintenance and they would provide some relief with sun shading. He suggested using one of those suggested trees and to plant seven on the west side, one on the north, and one on the south. They would not be able to get to 51 trees and he would provide those suggested tree names to Staff. There were some plant species that would get larger for the space that they would be planted in and he suggested they take another look at those. The area that was in the shade and through the courtyard would not do as well as they might want them to do and a full shade study might need to be done and to pick plants that might take more shade.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they had any thought about skateboarders using the ramps out front. He was not certain there was anything that could be done as they were needed for wheelchair access.

Mr. Choppin stated it was always an issue.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it would be up to on-site management to deal with those issues.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4483-10, Santa Ines Senior Villas, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. To add trees as noted on the plans provided to Staff and to choose one of the four trees suggested and to continue with the Cercis Tree on the north and south property lines.

And a recommendation to:

- 1. Research the plant palette in the entry and courtyard for shade tolerance.
- 2. Recommendations made by Committee Member Wheeler.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(6) DRC No. 4508-10 - WESTENHOFER RESIDENCE

- A proposal for a new 464 sq. ft. single-story addition to a contributing Bungalow.
- 626 W. Culver Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

Committee Member McCormack recused himself from the project due to a conflict.

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

Peter Westenhofer, property owner, address on file, stated he had recently married in July and he and his wife both worked at Chapman University and they liked to ride their bikes to work everyday.

Heather Westenhofer, property owner, address on file, stated she purchased the home three years ago at the top of the market. It was now very upside down and there was no way she could sell it. They just recently married and they planned on starting a family; they loved their block, they worked in Orange, and they wanted to stay here. They wanted to grow their family and it was the reason behind the project. She felt it would add value to the street.

Applicant, Doug Ely, address on file, stated the residence was 617 square feet with an existing one-car garage and a storage unit at the back of the garage. He presented an aerial graphic and visually they had the smallest house on the block as most of the lots on the block were much larger. The Staff Report stated the average was .25, and he found that surprising, as visually it appeared that the FAR was much higher on the block. The existing home was a one bedroom, one bath with a living room and kitchen. Adding to a small residence was a challenge and in increasing the size more than 20% required that it go before the Planning Commission. In order to allow for the property owners to utilize the home as they expanded their family they needed three bedrooms, two baths, and he was proposing a 464 square foot addition. The total square footage of the home upon completion would be 1,081 square feet and it would not be a huge house. The manner in which it sat on the property was that they would expand to the rear of the home, to the west and out to the south. Part of the complexity was that they had to have provisions for a two-car garage to be able to be added to the property in the future. They had looked at that in a couple of different locations. They also needed to comply with open space requirements. Heather and Peter had not planned on tearing down their garage and the likelihood that it would occur was very slim, however, they needed to have provisions for that due to code requirements. It limited the area where they could expand. The other issue was the low profile roof; there was not much of a roof height and they could not typically add anything higher. He presented some three dimensional views of the proposed project and explained how the addition would work and what would be seen from the street.

Mr. Ely stated from nowhere could it be discerned that there was a flat roof, and it was a struggle. He had researched the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and they provided recommendations; the statement that the project had not been supported was questionable and he

would present some of his findings. There were recommendations and the DRC had to come to a conclusion based on those recommendations and what was and was not applicable. They took photos of the site and they could place their proposal into a photograph, which he presented for the DRC to review. He explained the differences in the "before" and "after" photos. There was a brick chimney; it was there to resolve some of the design issues. There was another photo taken from the west side and the only place the rear could be seen was from a very small angle and nowhere could a flat roof be seen. He had not wanted to cite verse, but they were issues they all needed to review, and there were a number of Committee Members that were very familiar with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and he had highlighted some excerpts that he wanted to go through. The Standards continued to state that they were guidelines. In reviewing the initial definitions, rehabilitation was defined as the act or process of making possible compatible use of a property, to make alterations or repairs while preserving the proportions or features that conveyed historical, cultural, or architectural values. The key decision was what were they doing; were they destroying historical, cultural, architectural values?

On page 3 he had highlighted recommendations under rehabilitation. He read from the handout: designing additions to roofs such as residential, office or storage spaces, elevators, housing, decks, terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by the new use so that they were inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character defining features. His contention was that they were obscuring the new features from the public right-of-way, but were they damaging character-defining features? Not recommended; radically changing a character defining roof shape – and had they determined that his proposed design was a radical change?

On the next page there were additional things he wanted to point out. He read from the handout; some interior and exterior alterations to a historic building were generally needed to assure its continued use, but it was most important that such alterations would not radically change or obscure or destroy character defining spaces, material, features, or finishes. Again it made that distinction, radical changes. Under building exterior and roofs, not recommended: radical changes.

On the last excerpt were some guidelines that the National Park Service put out; they had probably seen those before and there was a Preservation Brief regarding exterior additions. He had highlighted some areas which he read from; all but minor changes to primary elevations and historic features that distinguished one building or row of buildings that could be seen from streets or sidewalks were more likely to be the significant ones. The next page had a topic about roofs and stated that to some extent there was a predictable relationship between the size of a historic resource and the degree of change that a new addition would impose. For example, in the case of relatively low buildings or small-scale or residential structures it was difficult and all but impossible to minimize the impact of adding an entire new floor even if the addition was set back from the plane or façade; alterations in historic profile would likely change the building's character, however, a roof top addition to an eight-story building in an area of other tall buildings might not affect the historic character as the new work would not be visible.

Mr. Ely stated there were other excerpts about the visibility of additions from the public right-ofway and if the changes were considered a radical change. Lastly, under preserving historic character, he read: "to place the new addition on an inconspicuous side or rear elevation so that new work would not result in a radical change of the building." Those were issues for discussion and Mr. Ryan had suggested some alternatives. They had looked at some alternatives that essentially extended the back and he presented some drawings to the Committee Members. In looking at alternate designs, the bedroom sizes would not be what Heather and Peter wanted. He presented a floor plan that they would want to proceed with and understanding that the addition was not visible form the street and they would be preserving the character of the residence from all sides.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the Secretary of Interior's Standards They had sections that had recommendations and they had the "Ten were pretty clear. Commandments" so to speak; the terminology of that was shall be avoided, not be undertaken, shall be retained and preserved and those were definitely not recommendations. Basically, character-defining features shall be preserved. He appreciated the need for more room. His first bungalow was small; it was about a 900 square foot home and they had a family. They ended up having three children and they moved to a bigger house; that was their decision. The proposed addition was so large for a small bungalow and the OTPA would oppose changes to the roof form. The alteration had not met the Secretary of Interior's Standards or the Old Towne Design Standards. The roof form was a character-defining feature that the Secretary of Interior's Standards stated must be preserved and the document used the word "must." Considering the project was a Mills project and all properties had to conform to the Standards, but the fact that a property owner was receiving a tax credit for preservation of their property made a difference. They were receiving tax credits but wanting to remove or alter a character-defining feature which was the roof form. Even though it could not be seen from the street, he thought it could be seen from the street and he had not understood the faux fireplace that was a skylight and he had not understood what the function of that was. Since skylights should not be seen from the street it should be flush if it was just for additional light. The OTPA agreed with Staff that alternatives should be explored. Maybe the project should be scaled back. The fact that the project had not complied with the Secretary of Interior's Standards also meant it would not comply with CEQA. The project as proposed would diminish the character of the small bungalow and he encouraged an exploration of alternate designs.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the 5' setback was a requirement.

Mr. Ryan stated it was something that he had spoken to the applicant about. There was the possibility of getting an Administrative Adjustment for the side yard setback and a 10% reduction in the spacing reserved for the possibility of a future garage. It could provide for an additional foot or so.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as it would be an accessory structure at the rear of the property, could the garage move closer to the property line?

Mr. Ryan stated no, they were at the maximum of 3' from face of building and one foot overhang.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the existing home would they be able to modify windows, they had shown new windows. Within 3' of a property line he thought it was a requirement based on fire rating.

Mr. Ely stated along that wall the only change would be to add a window; it would be a dining room that would be added and the only change to that façade would be the window. Committee Member Wheeler suggested the applicant would need to check the code for that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would want to explore other possibilities; he thought the real problem was forcing the need for the flat roof and the faux chimney. He was wondering if moving the section over, which he pointed to on the plans, the widths could be the same and there could be a new added extension.

Mr. Ely stated he had spoken with Mr. Ryan yesterday and he presented a graphic which explained the areas, and Mr. Ryan suggested the use of an Administrative Adjustment to go from 5' to 4', which would allow the width to be the identical width and the roof pitch to remain the same. The challenge was to develop a floor plan that would work in that configuration. There was another design with the garage at the rear of the property. They took a look at how that would work and one of the ideas chewed up more of the backyard and had not provided anything in the spatial configuration that would work. An alternate design was basically the same in size, but because of the configuration it would not be adaptable to the room size. They had looked at a lot of alternatives and the property owners were on a fixed budget. There were no funds to relocate the existing bathroom. The alternate configuration took into consideration the extra square footage in one manner but not in another and he was not certain how close they could get.

Mr. Ely stated they had studied alternatives and what that would do was not provide the amenities that the property owners wanted, the bedroom sizes were not what they would want. They would lose efficiency in utilizing the proposed space. The master bedroom would have a master bath and walk-in closet in the original proposal. It was not what the property owners had in mind.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the relocation of the bathroom on a raised floor was that big of an issue?

Mr. Ely stated when the budget was limited it was.

Vice Chair Gladson asked if there was a way to phase the project, to time the changes as the budget would permit? They could do two bedrooms and then the third one later.

Mr. Ely stated was she suggesting building the shell and doing the in-fill later?

Vice Chair Gladson stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with the alternate design, they would gain a bit of patio area, keep the roof form, and be in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Committee Member Woollett stated he thought the proposal was a brilliant solution and very creative. The idea of the flat roof would not work, but the reality was it was done in such a way

that he felt no one would be aware of it. He felt they needed to review the rules a bit more closely and he heard the comments presented, but he also understood what the applicant had brought forth and the documents that he was reading and quite frankly in order to come to the notion that the proposed project would not satisfy the requirements he would need to review them paragraph by paragraph. The impression he got was that there were good reasons to allow what was being proposed; it was a small house. An increase would always result in a higher percentage when starting with something so small and one of the things the DRC needed to keep in mind was to preserve the Old Towne District and if they imposed some of the requirements so rigidly it could be self-defeating; as they had found if the standards were interpreted too rigidly that it became so difficult that no improvements could be made. They needed to review the proposed project and determine if the ordinances allowed the flexibility that the design represented. He thought the project was extremely well done; as for the skylight, he had not cared if it was a skylight or not if it maintained the appearance, since the Standards referred to what was visible from the street. The proposed project had done it far better than some of the other projects that they had approved in terms of meeting requirements. For the moment that was where he stood on the proposed project.

Mr. Ryan stated he appreciated Mr. Ely's research, but in looking at the Secretary of Interior's Standards they needed to look at the right modality, in looking at preservation for the original bungalow they would look at what the Mills Act intended, and in looking at preservation as far as roofs were concerned the section stated not recommended not altering the roof and roof materials which were important defining overall character features.

Committee Member Woollett asked what had that meant; there was still the same roof pitch.

Mr. Ryan stated most certainly the DRC had made the argument before to put wood siding on the front and to leave the three sides with stucco, in looking at changing a roof form that was changing a character defining feature and he wanted to find a solution to get what they needed without needing that change. He considered that part of the proposed project preservation of the existing bungalow. They could look at the other attributes and the expansion as necessary to accommodate current needs and those were things they had done all the time.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was not George Washington's house; they were not preserving something that was so historically significant that it needed to be preserved as precisely as it had existed. The intent of the rules was to preserve the building's appearance and they had interpreted that to mean the integrity of the structure and it also included material. The manner that the design had been done in the proposed project provided the building's appearance to be maintained and since defining appearance of the roof had not been changed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in a small way it had changed, but how would the transition be treated as far as the flashing?

Mr. Ely stated he thought it would be a well to collect water with a roof drain system that would come down through the house to the attic and out at the base. If it was drained elsewhere there would be roof flashing issues that would be challenging and it might be something that worked well for the first 5 to 10 years. They could treat it like any flat roof and have an interior drain. He reviewed the drawings with Committee Member Wheeler. There would not be a bump that would be visible and it would look like a ridge. In the first design they had a much larger

chimney and it was there to handle the roof transitions. The ridge was at a different point and it came to the area to allow for a transition and it was treated with real brick on the outside. They would place a solar tube in the inside for lighting.

Vice Chair Gladson stated she found it as a character-defining feature of the house to change the look of the roof, and if even a bit of the flat roof was visible it would not be appropriate in her interpretation of the Secretary of Interior's Standards. She was wrestling with that a lot and flat roofs would not be an element that would be seen there. She was also sensitive that they would be changing other elements such as the rear façade; there was a Mills Act contract in place and they were able to support additions to resources when they had been very sensitively and mindfully placed and took into consideration original materials. She commended the addition, but she would have an issue with the unresolved issues of the appropriateness of it. The home was very modest and to attempt to add a lot onto it was a lot to ask of that very small parcel. There were probably ways to get there, for her to find it compatible and find it appropriate with all the requirements it needed to be spot-on for her to make that determination. She respected her fellow Committee Member's opinions, and she found the Standards to be nothing but black and white; there should not be a lot of flexibility in those Standards.

Mr. Ely stated he had gone through the same issues and dialogue in his own evaluation of the proposed project. The roof was a character-defining feature but from what perspective, because it could not be seen.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it was the fabric of the home and if the flat roof element had not existed in the proposed project she would not feel as strongly.

Ms. Westenhofer asked if it was possible to have a roof that was not flat that was visible from the street?

Vice Chair Gladson stated she was not certain of that. She felt more comfortable with one of the alternative designs that had been presented. She asked Staff if the Mills Act covered the proposed project?

Mr. Ryan stated the Mills Act allowed for additions that met the Standards and they assumed there would be no impact on the original house.

Committee Member Woollett asked who decided whether something was in compliance with the Mills Act?

Mr. Ryan stated there were 35 conditions in the Mills Act contract and there was reference to the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Old Towne Design Standards. There were some cases that went to the State office, and those were typically something that an applicant had not done or something that had been done inappropriately. When the contract was developed, the homeowner would provide a wish list of what they intended to do and if all the things they wanted to do complied or in some cases those changes required approvals. Staff always assumed that people who entered into a Mills Act contract agreed to the conditions and understood they would be protecting and preserving the original structure. There were always questions about additions in the future and he told property owners about where the additions needed to be, the 2 car parking requirement, setback requirements, and the need to follow the rules and it would not

be a problem. His concern, and he understood it was a small building, was with a gable roof when it was changed it was changing the character-defining features of the bungalow. The main problem he saw was the impact on a defining feature.

Committee Member Woollett stated Staff felt it had not complied because the defining feature was being changed.

Mr. Ryan stated the Old Towne Design Standards dealt with visibility from public view and the Secretary of Interior's Standards dealt with the architectural features. They followed both. If he felt that some changes to an individual building were okay because of the large district that they existed in, it was just the opposite as all the buildings that were contributing made up the district as a whole and the protection of those individual buildings was important as it was the collection that was being protected. That collection included all the features that could be emulated on a Bungalow, Craftsman, or Prairie.

Committee Member Wheeler stated what kept gnawing at him was that it was an extremely creative solution, but it was artifice, artificial and they were doing something that was pretending to be something that really wasn't. That to him was starting down a slippery slope and if they started allowing that in Old Towne it would be going in the wrong direction. They all saw that the flat roof would not be visible from the street, but there was a flat roof and it was an artificial solution to try to make a large house look like something it wasn't. He would hope that the applicant could work on it a bit more and come up with something that would work for them. The idea of phasing was a good idea, to add a second bathroom at a later date. The further back the rear side gable form was moved, the more they could preserve the exterior of the existing form and the more comfortable he felt about it.

Mr. Ely assumed that was the direction they would be heading in and he had not received the documents addressing alternatives until Friday, October 15, when they had received the Staff Report. He encouraged that everyone read the Standards because what he had found to be Standards were guidelines for interpreting the Standards. It was not as black and white as he had heard commented and it was found in the guidelines and how the Standards should be applied. He was not certain what the correct approach was and he wanted to support his clients for their home and what would meet their needs and the proposed project was that. When the property was sold it had to be a working space that would work for someone else. Maybe there was an alternative.

Committee Member Wheeler stated everyone had to come to a compromise to some degree. It might not be the ideal but if it came close to the Standards and closer to what they wanted in Old Towne it would be a better direction.

Committee Member Woollett stated they had considered projects where someone had added a half-story; they had accepted that and it changed the roof in some cases. There were allowances for dormers and things like that. What if the mid-portion of the roof simply went higher to a higher ridge so that there was a vent that followed the style and it was not a flat roof.

Mr. Ryan stated it would still be a change to the roof style.

Committee Member Woollett stated it was not another style.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be another gable form.

Vice Chair Gladson stated it would be okay on the addition, but to add it to the original footprint it was back to the point of a roof line change. If the applicant was agreeable it was probably time to stop the discussion and allow the applicant to review alternatives and come back to the DRC.

Mr. Ely stated he wanted to ensure that they were leaving with the correct marching orders. One of the comments he had just heard was if they proposed something towards the rear that was higher, and if they looked at the residence straight on it would not be visible; would that be a possible alternative to consider?

Mr. Ryan stated he would be more comfortable if some of the other options were explored. With a second addition they were pushing against another Standard.

Vice Chair Gladson stated all the alternatives could be explored and she wanted the property owners to have a nice addition; it was getting the project in compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and the Old Towne Design Standards.

Committee Member Woollett made a motion to continue DRC No. 4508-10, Westenhofer Residence.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

AYES: Adrienne Gladson, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart RECUSED: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

(7) DRC No. 4512-10 – SKORPANICH & LEPORE RESIDENCE

- A proposal to change a rear porch roof on a contributing Bungalow and remove a non-conforming addition on an existing garage.
- 292 N. Cambridge 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 and indicted the plans submitted to the DRC were not the intended set of plans.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, asked if they were reviewing the correct plans?

Mr. Ryan stated yes.

Applicant, Maryanne Skorpanich, address on file, stated there was a pop-out in back and there was a cellar door and they could see where the foundation wall was. The extension room had a powder room and a washer/dryer in it. Inside the other addition it added onto a service porch and the door between the kitchen and the service porch had two holes in the door frame, one for a dead bolt and right next to that was the original fuse box for the house which indicated that the back corner of the house would have been a porch original to the house due to the foundation wall, maybe it was screened in. When it was enclosed and added on, there was a header beam that was lower. She believed that the part with the original shed roof was not part of the original home and had been added later. There was no part of the original home that had a shed roof. Part of what they were seeking to do was to place a gable over it to make it more consistent with the remainder of the house style. Where the shed roof met the original gable it had gotten worse with leaking problems and they had stopped fixing it as they had patched it so many times. They wanted to also extend the new gable over the porch as well. The north elevation was what would be visible from the side street.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he had prepared a number of comments, but in light of the change in the plans and after discussions with the applicant, and understanding the changes were on the wish list in their Mills contract, the OTPA would support the project. The proposed project used appropriate materials and in-kind materials for the garage restoration and the fact that the shed roof structure was an addition.

Vice Chair Gladson opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked the applicant if their engineer had reviewed the project?

Ms. Skorpanich stated yes.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was not much to tie back to the existing structure and there might be some lateral problems with that, and how to restrain it from movement. An

engineer might want to add something such as a column. The simplest way would be for the engineer to add a larger post or even a small wall section.

Applicant, Mr. Lepore, address on file, stated when they were discussing changes to the lattice the engineer had suggested a change and the use of a larger post size.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if that design would not work and there were major changes he would want that to return to the DRC for review. He asked what they envisioned the underside of the ceiling to be?

Mr. Lepore stated under the eaves it was cider board and to match the eaves.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the drawings showed roof extensions that they had normally not approved with flat out-lookers, such as 2' x 4' that held up the barge boards and he normally asked that they not do that. He reviewed the plans with the applicants.

Mr. Lepore stated he was reviewing the siding on the back of the house.

Committee Member Wheeler presented a photo of a home with the out-lookers that supported the barge board and it acted as a beam that supported the members that came out and it was what they asked that they do and not add the flat out-lookers. It was not appropriate.

Ms. Skorpanich stated the type they used was much simpler.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the plans needed some clean up on the details. It was in details 5 and 6. The exposed rafter tails were shown smaller and shaved down as they should be smaller and match what existed.

Mr. Lepore stated they had initially had a larger plan that they would now subset and there was some confusion in the gable.

Committee Member Wheeler pointed out some errors on the drawings. He stated they would want to ensure that the drawings included the exposed rafter tails. There were also all types of exposed modern structural hardware and those would need to more traditional or hidden.

Committee Member Woollett asked what would be done with the fences, since there was wood and block both used in an arbitrary relationship.

Mr. Lepore stated they would be open to suggestions and they would also want a suggestion for the garage door.

Ms. Skorpanich stated the wooden area was not a fence, it was actually a gate.

Mr. Lepore stated it was a gate that opened for an R.V. which they had not used. It was attached to an extension of the garage and it would need to come off when the garage extension was removed and replaced. They had considered a roll-up door with a historic look.

Ms. Skorpanich stated they liked the look of the sliders. There was an issue, one being they wanted an automated garage door and it would be nice to have the open space without a post in the middle. They knew others in the neighborhood that had two roll-ups that were side by side.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would be difficult with a roll-up to get that detail.

Mr. Ryan stated there were many now that had good detail.

Mr. Lepore stated they would want to keep a gate there.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested to open up the area to remove the block wall and replace it with a 42" high fence to improve the streetscape.

Ms. Skorpanich stated at a later date they would want to remove some of the concrete as there was a lot of concrete on the site.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4512-10, Skorpanich & Lepore Residence, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- 1. The addition to the rear of the house to feature exposed rafter tails of a size and spacing that matched the existing house.
- 2. The addition to the rear to use traditional barge construction without the use of flat outlookers.
- 3. The garage door be wood, either one piece or roll-up in a Carriage style.
- 4. The use of structural hardware on post to beam, post to slab, and so forth be concealed and not of modern materials that would be visible.
- 5. If the design of the addition to the rear of the house would be substantially different due to structural issues, that the applicant return to the DRC for review of that proposal.

SECOND: Joe Woollett

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Meeting on Wednesday, November 3, 2010.

SECOND: Adrienne Gladson

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.