CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

July 20, 2011

Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack

Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Bill Cathcart

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Robert Garcia, Associate Planner Doris Nguyen, Associate Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Vice Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:12 p.m.

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there were no changes to the Agenda. The minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 15, 2011 would need to be held over to the next meeting as there were not enough Committee Members present to vote on that set of minutes.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they would not be able to hear Item No. 5.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated Committee Member Wheeler had just informed her that he would not have a conflict with Item No. 5 and he would be able to participate in the item's discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler stated apparently the conflict with the Jensen building was on a separate parcel.

Committee Member McCormack stated that he recused himself in the past on Doug Ely's projects and asked if the time frame of the conflict that created the need for his recusal occurred in the past year?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it would be during the past 12 months, if Committee Member McCormack's wife had worked with Mr. Ely during that time then it would be a conflict; if it was outside of 12 months it would not create a conflict.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was probably right there at 12 months or more.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated it would be his call.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the minutes from the June 15, 2011 meeting would be placed back in his binder, as he had already marked the corrections on his copy?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they would be kept for the next meeting.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of July 6, 2011. Corrections and changes were noted.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if there was anything further to discuss?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there had been a call received from a member of the public inquiring whether or not the DRC Member's terms had expired last month. The website, which had been incorrectly noted, showed that the terms of all the current Design Review Committee Members ended on 6/30/2011. The City Attorney's office had received the call and they had done some quick research. All current Committee Members had been appointed or re-appointed in February of 2008 and with a 4-year term which would end June 30, 2012, or longer, if a successor or a re-appointment was made. It might come up during their meeting and she had a copy of the Code available.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if all the current Committee Member's terms were due to expire in 2012?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated all the terms were 4 years; and they were all in the same cycle.

Vice Chair Woollett stated theoretically in 2012 there could be an entirely new Design Review Committee.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated that was correct.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the member of the public that was making the inquiry was wanting to overthrow the Committee?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the person who called thought that the DRC should not meet if the terms had expired. The person who called had not identified himself and he might be a person involved in one of the Agenda items.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee meeting.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Bill Cathcart absent, and one open seat on the Design Review Committee.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

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

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 ITEMS:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

(a) June 15, 2011

The meeting minutes from the June 15, 2011 Design Review Committee meeting would be held over to the next scheduled meeting due to a lack of quorum to vote on that set of minutes.

(b) July 6, 2011

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting of July 6, 2011 with changes and corrections as noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items: None

New Agenda Items:

(2) DRC No. 4543-11 – DOLLAR TREE STORE

- A proposal for exterior improvements to an existing commercial building, including an awning.
- 1421 W. Chapman Avenue
- Staff Contact: Robert Garcia, 714-744-7231, rgarcia@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, stated his applicant was not present.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they would proceed to the next item on the Agenda.

The applicant for Agenda Item No. 2, Dollar Tree, arrived late. Agenda Item No. 2 was heard after Agenda Item No. 3.

Associate Planner, Robert Garcia, presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Applicant, Tony Rector, address on file, stated he was the sign expeditor for Superior Electrical Advertising. He was available for any questions.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was an improvement to the building. The project was a submittal for the sign, there were sign details included. One of the requirements in the sign ordinance was when the sign was submitted that the horizontal bands that would contain the sign be shown on the drawings, and that was not shown. The sign could not be more than $2/3^{rd}$ of the height of the horizontal band. It appeared it was fine and to meet the $2/3^{rd}$ rule they should not have a problem. He would include a request that the spacing be shown to Staff to verify that the height was appropriate. On the fascia that would be painted green, his first thought was that the fascia of the mechanical space should be painted as well. He pointed out the area to the applicant.

Mr. Rector stated he agreed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in painting the fascia it was easy to stop at the re-entrant corners, but where would they stop on the other two sides? They could go back to the fin wall on one side where the fascia turned the corner. On the upper mass he was not certain where the

green could be stopped and his best guess would be if they stopped somewhere over the building where it was not too visible.

Mr. Rector stated those suggestions were very helpful and very creative.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the color could end somewhere midway over that mass.

The Committee Members reviewed the drawings.

Vice Chair Woollett suggested that the awning be pulled back 6" on each end. In looking at it from the side it would be flush with the corner and it would be an awkward joint.

Mr. Rector stated he could make that change.

Vice Chair Woollett stated there was a blank space between the two awnings, and on the other set of drawing there was more glazing in the middle.

Mr. Rector stated the existing awnings had been removed.

Mr. Garcia stated that was a new entry that already existed. The glazing area was approved administratively over the counter before the rest of the changes were proposed.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4543-11, The Dollar Tree, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the additional conditions:

- 1. The canopy to be shortened by 6" at each end to provide a slight change of plane at the ends where it met the wall.
- 2. The painted fascia on the far west side of the building to continue all the way to the north corner to the loading dock.
- 3. The painted fascia on the upper most portion of the building to extend back to a point midway over the one-story space below.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig, Wheeler Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Rector stated he had done sign permits for a living and the City of Orange's Staff were magnificent, even when they said "no." He thanked Committee Member Wheeler for his input and thorough discussions. He had attended various City review meetings and there were very few Committee Members that were as hands on as the DRC of Orange. He thanked them.

(3) DRC No. 4552-11 – VERIZON WIRELESS STORE

- A proposal to remodel the exterior walls and signage of the existing Verizon Wireless store.
- 1500 E. Village Way, #2205
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Jim Van Dalfsen, address on file, stated he had worked with Committee Member Wheeler years ago. He was with Verizon and managed the design and construction of their retail stores for Southern California and he worked out of the headquarters in Irvine. Verizon had been going through a process of re-branding the exteriors of the stores and had done that in the Western United States to 10 or 15 stores. The architect, Joel Shulman, was available and would be making a presentation.

Applicant, Joel Shulman, address on file, stated he was with the corporate architect group for Verizon Wireless dealing with the national design standards for a look and feel of the store process. They also represented the architects for any store remodels and design. Verizon had approached them to review the existing stores in the current space they were in and to brand the space in keeping with Verizon's current design philosophy of a lighter and brighter airy space. The interior design remodels had occurred in over 300 stores in the country over the last several years and they had wanted to have the interior colors come out to the exterior of the stores. He stated on the rendering design the existing space had a dark interior, the light had not come through and there were posts that had dark spaces and the site was not very inviting and had not warmed up the street scape. They wanted to brand the exterior and provide the space with a more modern look to tie the exterior in with the interior. They proposed to add the beige and natural colors, which were still represented in the shopping center as there was beige split face block and other wood textures. The color scheme worked well without having to modify their standards. The white L-wrap would also be introduced, which was the white piece that wrapped over the top and it was a very important element. That element represented the soffit lines around the stores and the desks had the entire L piece on them. They wanted to have the inside and outsides very identifiable. Over the years Verizon Wireless was confused with resellers and other agents that were out there. They were a corporate owned entity; they were company stores and they wanted to brand the stores differently than anyone else. The sign package, which was not included in the proposal before them, was company standard signs without any alterations or neon or any other changes. The proposal would be to remove the heavy timber columns, the metal roof, and lighten the space up with an L-bracket. The piece that wrapped around was 4' deep and that would provide some protection from weather, but it would not cut off the light coming into the store. The bottom piece, to create a contrast, was a darker gray base which brought the base out of the ground and capped off the building. They would also raise the parapet not only for signage, but to provide a natural break. The proposal would keep all the existing doors and frames and add the stucco material to the outside. The other parts of the building had the same E.I.F.S. material. There was some split face block that they would be covering and wrapping; they would not leave a thin edge, but return it in 2'.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated he had photos of other stores that had been completed. He presented the photos and gave information on the store locations to the Committee Members for review.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated since they were wrapping around the north corner, he asked if they would be able to work around the existing fence post?

Mr. Shulman stated there was enough space around the fence post and they could work around it.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was the only issue he had with the project-the wrap-around corner. It was the kind of thing that had been done in the 1960's on residences when they wrapped material around it; it had not appeared to be as strong. It was a very thin surface. He had a suggestion and it would not cover so much of the split face block. He suggested thickening the parapet portion so it could return back to the split face block and the rest could be left and not covered.

Mr. Shulman stated they had wanted to cover the split face block, as it had not tied in with the building and by extending their color they would widen their presence. They had initially completed a rendering with the block left uncovered, but their bosses were not pleased with that result. There would also be some landscaping elements and it would present a very clean finish. If the return was objectionable they could pull the edge back and leave 2' of the block there and pull the stucco back.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they used that approach, could they take a plane further out (which he pointed to on the drawings) and to have a thickness there?

Mr. Shulman stated they wanted a change between the planes where the L-wrap came up and to the next plane back, which they were creating and they had not wanted to have a deep box there. The design intent was to have a space that was relatively smooth. They wanted simple clean boxes. They could have pushed things up and down and all over the place, however, they wanted to keep things simple and the building would stand out.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested a pilaster-affect to terminate it; to get away from a thin sheet wrapping the corner and stopping arbitrarily.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated the 2' return had been stopped where they felt it would be adequate, but if they needed to go back another 6' he would opt to do that and his client would support that.

Committee Member Wheeler asked how would that work for the sign?

Mr. Shulman stated they would need a panel when the sign was done.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated maybe they could do a block (he noted his idea on the drawings). It would not be visible below the line anyway as the fence wall was high and it would be difficult to differentiate the colors.

Mr. Shulman stated he was not certain how the gate worked.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared there were two posts there and he believed they were both fixed posts.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it would make sense to go all the way back to the first pipe?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it might make sense to bring it back to the beginning of the sign and it could be a flag for the sign and would add more reason to it.

Committee Member McCormack asked if that would be the sign?

Mr. Shulman stated the sign would be submitted later.

Ms. Nguyen stated it was the question whether the entire area would be the sign.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could be painting themselves into a corner and that was why he brought it up.

Mr. Shulman stated it was just a wall.

Committee Member McCormack stated if it was a frame for a sign he wanted to caution the applicant from going in that direction.

Mr. Shulman stated doing the flag-type piece would make sense and it would appear as just another texture of the wall plane and it would not stand out.

Ms. Nguyen presented a photo of the angle they were discussing and she stated what she thought what was being suggested was for the wrap to come up 1/3 of the height and the natural brick would still be visible beneath it. She asked if they would want the E.I.F.S. to come all the way around and to have the natural brick visible or should they run the whole height to the top of the fence so there was the perception that it went all the way down?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt it would be better if it had not come all the way down to the fence because it would appear as if they were hiding the block. It was a feature that was being applied to the block and used as a disguise.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated the gas pipes next to the wall came up and he was not certain how those would work with the sign.

Ms. Nguyen stated with channel letters they could go around it.

Vice Chair Woollett stated if the flag would not go across they would have a problem with the pipes in their sign and the suggestion by Committee Member Wheeler solved that problem.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated they were not currently seeking approval for the sign but had placed it in the proposal to show what would be there. If a raceway was used they could just box the raceway and the pipes would not be visible.

Committee Member McCormack suggested moving the sign area to the north. With a big enough mass it became the same thing as the L-shape with the pipes behind it.

Mr. Shulman stated it depended on the return to the ground and how far that needed to be.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would not vote to approve a raceway.

Mr. Shulman stated okay; they would need to come out in front of the pipes to clear those.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated they would need to determine the exact dimension of the fence posts.

Committee Member McCormack stated they needed to look at the sign and how the return would work all together. He asked if there were any guidelines for The Village shopping center architectural elements and pointed out an element that he had not seen anywhere else.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the element appeared in one other area.

Committee Member McCormack asked if it acted as a frame for the main entry?

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated the columns were different sizes and they had not had matching stone bases, the metal roof was different and it was set back on a different plane.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the element (he pointed to on the plans) repeated anywhere else in The Village shopping center?

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated it occurred in one other area with similar materials, but used slightly differently.

Ms. Nguyen stated what they would need to follow was the sign program; but other than that they would follow the Tustin Street standards and they specifically addressed the mall. The color issue was the only thing that she had addressed in covering the natural existing materials; and if it was not an issue with the DRC they would pass on that.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested having the material to be as thick as it could be and meet with the post. The flag portion could be thicker and would read as a thicker form and it would be all the same material.

Mr. Shulman stated for consistency he would want the plane to wrap down to avoid having an extra shadow.

Mr. Van Dalfsen stated there was 12-inches of pipe; it was a double steel pipe with a gate hinge that happened past that. There was room to cover; they would wrap around it and caulk it.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve DRC No. 4552-11, Verizon Wireless Store, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

1. Where the E.I.F.S. (Exterior Insulation Finish System) wrapped around the north side of the building that it continue 2' or more beyond the point as shown and the upper portion to go further to create a flag-like shape to form a backing for the proposed sign. The sign was not a part of the project submittal. The width of the flag to cause the sign to be balanced within that portion, the flag and wrap around the corner to be thick enough to cover the existing gas pipes.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(4) DRC No. 4557-11 – HARVEL & ASSOCIATES

- A proposal to renovate the exterior façade of an office building.
- 747 W. Katella Avenue
- Staff Contact: Doris Nguyen, 714-744-7223, dnguyen@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Ron Jenkins, address on file, stated the site was a 1960's building that needed some updating and it was tenant occupied.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated, unfortunately, he had much admiration for mid-century modern architecture. His big problem with the proposal was that it appeared that they wanted to hide the building rather than fix the building. Forms and materials were being proposed that were not a part of the original building and were probably not appropriate to the period. He was hoping that they could come up with an alternate solution; something that showed a little more love for the building and an appreciation of the existing form and style.

Committee Member McCormack agreed with Committee Member Wheeler and when he first looked at the proposal it was kind of cool; but what bothered him was the arch and he was not opposed to what the applicant was attempting to do. He was trying to deal with the arch form.

Mr. Jenkins stated he was not married to it, but the reason the arch was there was for the soffit they were attempting to tie in the columns.

Vice Chair Woollett stated some of the most contemporary buildings that he was seeing currently were similar to the existing building on the proposed project. Screens were being used to shadow the sun and he had noticed in the proposal a note that the design made the building more efficient, but in reality it would not be as efficient as it was. The screens shadowed the glazing.

Mr. Jenkins stated the new UV resistant glass would help with that.

Vice Chair Woollett stated it was not as good as the shadowing. He agreed with Committee Member Wheeler; the forms were arbitrary and they were fighting against the building. There was a better way to respect the building. The form and arches and some of the materials appeared very arbitrary and it was as if they were attempting to be some other commercial building somewhere else.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the arches were not appropriate, but even if they were, there were two and possibly a third one with different profiles. The return on the west elevation

needed a way for the soffit to return. It would be really jumpy and fighting the building. The building needed help, it needed paint, and the screens were dented and damaged. The other big objection was the proposed use of artificial stone and if they wanted to do something with stone they could use the concrete masonry and not introduce a new foreign material that had not existed at the site.

Mr. Jenkins stated they wanted to get some mass.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could do some great things with new colors, but to introduce new forms and materials was not the best way to go.

Mr. Jenkins stated that was why they were present. If it had not worked they could leave the building alone and there were some leakage problems with the windows in the back and they could replace those. He liked the proposed changes that he had presented.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested trying something that agreed more with the existing building. The screens were a nice feature for energy conservation and they could possibly come up with a new screen to replace the dented and damaged screens. Something that was more compatible with the building.

Committee Member McCormack stated some contemporary architects would add fins and show the type of design that was already there and follow up with a very stark landscape, a more desert landscape. More of an industrial-type feel with a landscape design that responded to it. He thought the building was an airline fabrication plant. Was there a theme? There were places in Cypress that had the old 1950's and 1960's architecture with the painted block and it looked great.

Committee Member Wheeler stated everything cycled. There was a technical issue regarding the columns and he had not felt that wood columns would work. One approach might be to use steel tube columns to replace the wood columns.

Vice Chair Woollett stated there were a lot of choices for screens.

Committee Member McCormack stated the landscape concept should have the same feel. The only problem he had was with the Indian Laurel Fig; it seemed to want to be a tree and he would caution having that type of tree planted so close to the building. Other than that the plants on the list were okay and how they were arranged was appropriate. He would suggest a mid-century plant theme.

Mr. Jenkins stated it was an office building.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was not suggesting something residential.

Ms. Nguyen asked if the DRC would be agreeable to the applicant changing the windows if they needed repair?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was fine and suggested that the applicant take another pass at it.

City of Orange – Design Review Committee Meeting Minutes for July 20, 2011 Page 13 of 18

Vice Chair Woollett asked the applicant if the DRC Members had provided him with a rich enough response and with something to work with?

Mr. Jenkins stated yes; he would need to do something with the windows and he would leave the rest of it as a mid-century look.

Ms. Nguyen stated that the applicant had the opportunity to return to the DRC.

Mr. Jenkins stated no thank you. He wanted to replace the windows as they were leaking.

Ms. Nguyen stated the applicant would need to go to the Planning counter and pull a permit.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4557-11 Harvel & Associates.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(5) DRC No. 4566-11 – CARRIER JOHNSON

- A proposal for new wall signs for a second-story office building within the multi-tenant Jensen Building.
- 190 S. Glassell Street, Unit 201, Plaza 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.

Applicant, Philip Pipal, address on file, stated they had just moved into the City of Orange and he was available for questions.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the signage was appropriate and the font size and the materials; and there was no plastic involved.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated his only comment was an editorial comment that in the mid-Nineteenth Century Emperor Napoleon III had a dinner party one night and many people came to the party. The "A-list" or elite guests were given utensils made of aluminum, while the rest of the dinner guests were given gold utensils. During that time period aluminum was more valuable than gold. In 1885 a cap for the Washington Monument was made of aluminum, which at that time was as valuable as silver. His point was that aluminum had not become useful as an inexpensive commercially used material until after the turn of the century. It was at the same time that a Belgian chemist invented Bakelite, the first commercial plastic, and it had struck him as odd that aluminum was viewed as being historic in Old Towne but plastic was not.

Committee Member McCormack stated the project was great. He asked if there was lighting to be used over it. He liked aluminum.

Mr. Ryan stated there were no lights.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they generally had not approved channels, but the channels proposed were very discreet channels that would be painted out.

Committee Member McCormack asked about the "plus?"

Mr. Pipal stated it would be painted and part of the logo, it was on the edge of their business card and a concept as part of their brand.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4566-11, Carrier Johnson, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND:

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

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

(6) DRC No. 4571-11 – WIENS RESIDENCE

- A proposal for a new 70 sq. ft. bathroom addition to a one-story 1921 Bungalow residence.
- 283 N. Harwood 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.

Applicant, Becky Wien, address on file, stated Mr. Ryan told her it would make the site look better and she was assured it was not a big deal to remove the carport.

Public Comment

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated the proposed project was a very sympathetic addition and it was not visible from the street. It was out of public view. Appropriate materials were being used and it was not necessary to replicate all the details of the house on the addition, but if it was what they wanted to do it was okay. The removal of the non-permitted carport that had obscured the garage was a plus. The garage was a nice and unique contributing garage. OTPA would always support developments such as the one proposed. He had noticed that there were two windows being removed from the rear to accommodate the addition and he suggested utilizing the other window on the north elevation above the toilet area.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was a very well done project and he found no problems with it. He asked if the applicants were content with removing the carport?

Ms. Wien stated initially she had been taken aback by the suggestion as she had not known what was involved. After Mr. Ryan explained it, the site would appear better as the carport had been slapped up against the roof line. They were okay with it. They could possibly reuse some of the material from the carport.

Mr. Ryan stated they could use it for a small shed protection over the porch.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was a little nervous as the shed projection was not something that was found anywhere else on the house, but it was not a big deal one way or the other. There was a 2' roof extension above it. It would not need to be done. He wanted the applicant to give Doug Ely a hard time, as there was reference to a broken pediment; a broken pediment was generally where the top was broken and many times that was where a finial or an angel or pineapple was affixed, but when the bottom of a pediment was open it was called an open pediment.

Ms. Wien asked if rain gutters were permitted?

Mr. Ryan stated they were permitted and he would suggest that they be installed in appropriate areas and to match the site and materials architecturally.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was a good project.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4571-11, Wiens Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, August 3, 2011.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 6:47 p.m.