CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

November 2, 2011

Committee Members Present: Tim McCormack

Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Bill Cathcart

Staff in Attendance: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager

Dan Ryan, Historical 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 on Item No. 2, Wahoo's, the item would be continued due to lack of a quorum, based on Chair Cathcart's absence and a recusal for Committee Member Wheeler. Wahoo's had been contacted and their item would be heard at the next DRC meeting. She advised Vice Chair Woollett to notify the public present that the item would be held over and anyone wanting to speak would be heard at the next meeting. There were no other changes to the agenda or any additional information to impart.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of October 19, 2011. Corrections and changes were noted.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn the Administrative Session of the Design Review Committee Meeting.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Chair Cathcart was absent and there was 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: October 19, 2011

No motion was made on the meeting minutes of October 19, 2011.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Continued Items:

- (2) DRC No. 4340-08 WAHOO'S FISH TACOS RESTAURANT/BUILDING
 - A proposal for review of the final landscape and lighting plans.
 - 222-228 W. Chapman Avenue, Plaza Historic District
 - Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
 - Previous DRC Meetings July 2, 2008 and August 19, 2009
 - DRC Action: Final Determination

The item was continued to the next DRC meeting due to a lack of quorum.

New Agenda Items:

(3) DRC No. 4574-11 – P.J. MEAD–CRUSTY'S SANDWICH CAFE

- A proposal for parking lot improvements, landscaping, door/window change-out, and sign program for a non-contributing multi-tenant commercial building located within the spoke street area of the Old Towne District.
- 642 W. Chapman Avenue, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Gary Mead Sr., address on file, was available for questions.

Public Comment

None.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was wondering about the trash enclosure and he assumed it was new. According to the City Standard, as he read it, the size should be 8' minimum width and in multiples of 8' x 6'; and the dimensions appeared to be 4' in width. That could affect the parking. He asked if the existing pole sign, which was in a raised planter, would that be destroyed?

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated it would remain.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as the lot was being re-striped he thought the applicant would be required to provide van accessible handicap spaces and he suggested the applicant review that requirement.

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated they had one space and he would review that.

Vice Chair Woollett asked Staff if that was something that had been discussed?

Mr. Ryan stated Public Works had already reviewed the trash enclosure and had not had an issue with that area.

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated he had spoken with Planning and they stated that one space would be sufficient.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the sun shade elements he wanted to verify that they were wood?

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated they were natural wood. The doors would be trimmed with natural wood.

Committee Member Wheeler asked, regarding the awning signs, if the 2/3rd rule applied to awning signage?

Mr. Ryan stated on the valance it was 30% maximum, with the signage set at least 2" from the edges of the valance.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the elevations, in bringing the bottom of the blade sign down to match the cornice, he thought it would need to be there anyway as the two signs were the same size, as he read it. But someone had drawn the two signs differently. He stated the actual sign would fill the space with the bottom of it in line with the cornice. He asked if unit A & B should be included in the sign area?

Mr. Ryan stated they could have that.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if the address could be added vertically to the pole?

Mr. Ryan stated typically the development's name was within the sign area. He would need to check with Public Safety.

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated on the vertical part of the sign, on the channel edge, was where it would be added.

Committee Member McCormack stated he agreed with everything in the Staff Report and the comments should be followed. He had not had a problem with the entire area being one shrub plant, as he liked simplicity, and the low grass was fine but it should be spelled out as to what the plant type would be. He suggested that they might not need to plant at 18" and could get away with planting one-gallon at 24" on center. The Buxus could go 18" and the grasses could go 24" on center. The standard Red bud, 15-gallon, would be very difficult to find. He agreed with Staff's comments on compliance with the 24" box ruling. The landscape square footage was below the threshold for the City's drought-tolerant guidelines, but the landscape should show the intent of the irrigation plan. With the massing of plants, everything suffered in the center, as the plants would grow up. With 4" pop ups, over a two-year period those would only water the edge and everything in the center would die. He suggested a secondary line and a landscape plan would be helpful.

Applicant, Gary Mead, address on file, stated they were trying to keep it drought-tolerant with a good appearance.

Committee Member McCormack stated the most important part of the irrigation plan was the first two years. Irrigation was important, as they would not want to lose their investment. When an irrigation plan would come back to the DRC the head-to-head coverage would be something he would look for, but without a plan he had nothing to refer to. He had read "design/build" and if it was "design/build" there should be a guideline and specs of what it should be. It was not designed and put out to bid. There needed to be some guidelines. It was to ensure the survival of their landscape. He suggested some cut-outs on the west edge for trees for some sun relief.

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated there had been cut-outs, which had been cemented over by the City or someone else. He pointed out where trees existed, and where trees had been, but had been pulled out.

Mr. Ryan stated when they widened Chapman they may have been removed.

Mr. Mead stated he had contacted the City to request a tree and one was being planted next month. He had also asked the City if an additional tree could be planted. The City was not eager to do it.

Committee Member McCormack stated it would relieve the site from some of the heat and reduce air conditioning cost.

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated there were four very large windows. They were covered with shades and if the shades were pulled up the heat would come through. They were going to add some tinting to the windows.

Committee Member McCormack stated it was nice to have open unobstructed windows, so that when cars drove by they would view activity inside.

Mr. Mead, Sr. asked if the trees were something they could plant themselves or was it something the City would need to do?

Mr. Ryan stated the City would review where street trees would be installed and the water costs involved. Putting new trees in would be questionable.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if the building owner could be responsible for irrigation of the trees?

Committee Member McCormack stated if there was water in those zones, they could add lines and the site could be more livable.

Vice Chair Woollett stated it would also provide for a more attractive elevation. It was very bare. He asked if there was a way that the DRC could request from the regulating body, or influence that type of decision to add trees?

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated the City frequently required property owners to install street trees. Truth be told, the staff member who had been in charge of those situations had retired approximately a year ago and some of that planning had been lost with that as there was not someone reviewing all the plans. A street tree was fine, and the City would determine the type of tree that would need to be planted, with size as well. Whether or not the property owner would be responsible for running irrigation to the tree sites was not a question she could currently answer.

Vice Chair Woollett stated every resident in Orange had property that was owned by the City and there was landscaping on the edge of the sidewalk that was City property. The property owner generally irrigated and maintained the plants, and he asked if there were different rules that applied to commercial properties?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated she simply had not known the answer to that. It would be in the public right-of-way and Public Works and Community Services dealt with that area, as opposed to Community Development. If the DRC wanted to encourage the City to allow the property owner to irrigate the trees themselves, that was fine. There would be some type of agreement for those types of situations.

Vice Chair Woollett stated the item before them was a final determination and would not go to anyone else. If it was moving on to the Planning Commission or City Council, they would be in a position to make that determination, whether the City would or would not allow that.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated they would fall back on what the City policies had been and she had not known what those were. A condition could be structured that would allow Staff to gain that information.

Vice Chair Woollett stated it appeared that the applicant was very willing to plant new trees.

Mr. Mead stated it would benefit them and the cost was fairly reasonable.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the DRC could require the street tree, but she was not certain the irrigation requirement vs. hand water could be made.

Mr. Mead stated there were not very many irrigation systems that watered trees, as it was generally a water truck that came along and watered the trees.

Vice Chair Woollett stated a condition could be crafted to require two additional street trees to be provided by the business owner with the irrigation to be negotiated with the City.

Committee Member McCormack suggested that on the white wall to grow a vine on that.

Mr. Mead, Sr. stated they had already spoken of that and wanted to add a vine with irrigation for that. It was a great anti-graffiti tool.

Committee Member McCormack suggested using one-gallon Boston ivy. He would keep the trees a minimum of 8' away from any hard surfaces and he pointed out on the plans where they could plant them. He suggested planting two 24" box trees. He also suggested using Blue Oaked grass.

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to approve DRC No. 4574-11, P.J. Mead-Crusty's Sandwich Café, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. Two 24" box trees to be added of the low branch "Forest Pansy" variety.
- 2. The Blue Oak grass to be spaced at 24" on center.
- 3. Along the east property line wall that a vine shall be planted and to use Boston ivy in one-gallon size to provide coverage of the wall.
- 4. The plans to provide details of where the Buxus would be planted.

- 5. Along Parker Street, to plant two street trees to relieve the west exposure, if acceptable to the City and to plant the appropriate City suggested street tree. The owner to reserve the right to provide irrigation to those trees.
- 6. The irrigation shall provide suitable coverage. The spray to go head-to-head to provide total coverage in the single specie planting areas.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(4) DRC No. 4576-11 – SHAFFER RESIDENCE

- A proposal to construct a 285 sq. ft. addition on the rear of a contributing one-story 1919 Craftsman Bungalow.
- 247 N. Cleveland Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Committee Member Wheeler provided a handout of his comments/concerns to the applicant and Committee Members.

Applicant, Michael Williams, address on file, stated he wanted Committee Member Wheeler to speak first with his list of comments. He felt they were correct and some of the things he had listed had already been addressed. He understood a gable roof coming off of the existing roof should be lower, below the existing gable. There was a question as to the calculation Mr. Ryan had in the 108 square feet for the proposed service porch and he believed it was 96 square feet.

Public Comment

Steve Bennett, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated they agreed with the project and with the comments presented by Staff.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the question of the eaves being too close, he suggested bringing the plate height down on the addition and having that be more of the line of demarcation and to perhaps shorten the overhang for the addition.

Mr. Williams stated that would mean dropping the finished floor.

Committee Member Wheeler stated no, he was just suggesting the plate height to be brought down. It would be an 8' ceiling. He was playing with the idea and to have the addition be clear and not to create a false sense of history; to drop it a bit and to go further and use a different siding exposure for the new additions. It was done a lot in Old Towne.

Mr. Williams stated it was basically 4" beveled lapped siding. Was he suggesting going to a smaller siding?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would suggest going a bit bigger, as that was a more common size. He wanted to put the idea out there for discussion as it was not an uncommon thing to do.

Mr. Ryan stated it was not uncommon. He had seen it done quite a bit and it would not distract.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they would want to have the demarcation be clearer, but on the other hand they were also stating it was something that was often done on additions so that the line of demarcation was less clear.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the line of demarcation would be the line of existing vs. new construction. He asked if going to a 1' overhang would be enough of a reduction?

Mr. Ryan stated any reduction would be enough.

Vice Chair Woollett asked what the owner would be losing by making that reduction?

Mr. Williams asked if lowering the gable to an 8' plate height would be sufficient?

Mr. Ryan stated it would be pulled in and not flush with the other wall.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was going to suggest having it be flush with a trim board and that would be a clear line of demarcation and the addition would not need to be smaller.

Mr. Williams stated he wanted to speak on behalf of the property owners, who were in favor of a flush design with the vertical boards being the line of demarcation. They were okay with the reduction in width of the south side and could that be left at the 8'-8" height?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was suggesting the reduction and bringing the eave in, which would assist with the eave-to-eave separation on the garage side. If that was enough to have that work then he would suggest not having the wall inset on the north side and to leave it on the same plane; with new trim board and siding material.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on Sheet A10 on the egress of the bedroom, often it was suggested that a casement window be installed that would appear as a double hung; he was not certain without knowing the dimensions if that would work. The applicant would need to check with the Building Division on the requirements for egress. The windows might need to be larger.

Mr. Williams stated Committee Member Wheeler had mentioned having vertical bead board in the service porch and he asked if it was okay to use the vertical bead board?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would be delightful; they were doing a really nice job with the service porch.

Applicant, Karen Shaffer, address on file, stated they were really looking forward to.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in reviewing the photos, the window configuration in the backyard had not seemed to match. The photos appeared to be casement or fixed glass, but the drawings showed double hung and there was some sort of slider. The windows had not been drawn to the correct size.

Mr. Williams stated that would be corrected.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the front elephantine columns, they were not drawn the way they would actually appear. According to the photographs there were outlookers in the back and he suggested the same be duplicated on the addition. He had not found where the material type had been listed and stated it should clearly read that the new siding be wood and the same with the windows to be wood to match the existing and the door and window trim to be wood and match the existing.

Mr. Williams asked if he wanted that all written in?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it should all appear on the drawings before it was submitted to the Building Division. The intermediate rafter tails should match the existing intermediate rafter tails. They would allow the new to be nominal, if there was a true 2' x 4' currently. They would allow the new to be a nominal 2" x 4".

Mr. Ryan stated that would change Condition No. 5 to read "nominal."

Committee Member Wheeler suggested they support the barge board in the traditional manner without the 2" x 4" flat outlookers.

Mr. Ryan asked if there were any roofing changes?

Mr. Williams stated it was in their Mills Act Plan.

Ms. Shaffer stated there was a bad section on the side that needed to be replaced.

Mr. Williams asked when they anticipated re-roofing?

Ms. Shaffer stated she thought that was in their plan to repair that section.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they were not speaking to the repair of other areas and that would be up to the homeowner.

Committee Member McCormack stated he was in agreement with the comments presented by Committee Member Wheeler. On the front plan sheet "north" was not displayed correctly and he pointed out the correction that needed to be made. The Committee Members reviewed the plans.

Vice Chair Woollett asked it they wanted to discuss the dimensions as discussed in the Staff Report?

Mr. Ryan stated he was not disputing the dimensions; however, the service porch area had seemed a bit large. The only reason for his comments were if the applicant wanted to reduce the size that would not be a problem as the bedroom could be made larger with the service porch smaller.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they might use the space for something other than a service porch.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4576-11, Shaffer Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. Change Condition No. 4 to read "nominal" and not dimensional.
- 2. The addition shall be lowered to an approximate ceiling height of 8' with eave reduction to ½ of what had been submitted in overhang width.
- 3. The siding to be of a slightly different exposure, either larger or smaller to accentuate the line of demarcation.
- 4. The additional north line of demarcation shall be a vertical board dividing old from new.
- 5. The applicant shall check the new bedroom egress and use a casement window that simulates a double hung window; as close to the size as the windows shown for code required egress.
- 6. Outriggers to match the existing.
- 7. New siding be called out as wood with mitered corners. New windows to be wood to match existing and the new intermediate rafter tails to match the nominal size of the existing rafter tails. The new barge boards to match the nominal size of the existing barge boards. The new barge boards to be supported in the traditional manner without flat 2 x 4 out lookers.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(5) DRC No. 4578-11 – FLORIO RESIDENCE

- A proposal to review and permit an illegal 344 sq. ft. one-story addition constructed on the rear of an existing non-contributing residence.
- 445 N. Harwood Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Recommendation to the Planning Commission

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

Applicant, Cecelia Florio, address on file, stated some of the dimensions as submitted were not correct. The sliding door should be 9', with three-3' sections. The roof on the addition would be lower than the existing roof; the roof line was slightly different and the main reason for the gable was to gain more light. They had shopped around for windows and doors and found that the wood doors had not carried a warranty for more than 1 year and they wanted to use a more durable material, fiberglass. The windows would be white to simulate painted wood and would not require all the up keep. She presented photos and catalogs of the doors and windows that they were considering for use on the proposed project.

Public Comment

None.

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

Vice Chair Woollett stated the additional information from the applicant would be considered a supplement to the documents previously submitted. The drawings called for wood windows and doors and the applicant was proposing the use of fiberglass.

Committee Member Wheeler asked what material were the existing windows?

Ms. Florio stated on the original structure they were wood and the addition contained vinyl.

Committee Member Wheeler provided a list of his comments/concerns. He stated he had been confused with the sliding doors and understanding that they were 9' had made more sense.

Applicant, Michael Williams, address on file, stated they would use a three-door system.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they wanted the windows to have grids?

Ms. Florio stated no.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the window trim appeared a little different; the drawings showed a 6" wide head and jam, but the existing windows looked to be 3". He suggested they match what was existing. The eaves should be square cut and not the plum cut that was being

shown. On the south elevation the bathroom window was missing; it appeared on the floor plans. The soffit on the existing house was stucco and the addition should match. Regarding the hip roof vs. gable roof in the rear, he had done a lot of gables with trap windows and he was not opposed to what was proposed. The bathroom concerned him a bit with the trap window above it and a window with a slightly different size and slightly different location below it; and from the inside of the bathroom it would appear odd. Unless there was a flat pot shelf on top of the bathroom and the window would show above it. He suggested, to cut down on the insulation and heat gain, to get rid of the two outside trap windows and just keep a single fixed glass window; the engineer would be more pleased with that design.

Mr. Williams stated they had looked at that and would consider that change.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he wanted to gain feedback from the other Committee Members to have the gable remain with less glass.

Committee Member McCormack asked if he was stating to get rid of the two windows on the side?

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was what he was suggesting; there would be more symmetry and the bathroom would be odd with those slightly off-set windows.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if that would be a suggestion and not a requirement?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it would affect the exterior elevation and they would need to make a determination on that.

Committee Member McCormack stated he could go either way, but what he was hearing was that the owner wanted to get more light inside.

Ms. Florio asked if the windows could be lined up.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested the use of fixed glass to match the trap window above.

Applicant, Kate Kassuba, address on file, stated there would still be light and the other window could open.

The Committee Members discussed the window placement with the applicants.

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the gable it had been suggested that the eave be dropped slightly.

Mr. Williams stated that would be to define the line of demarcation.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was not concerned with a line of demarcation as it was not a contributing structure. He suggested they keep the height the same.

Committee Member McCormack stated he thought it was a good project.

Vice Chair Woollett asked if there was a question on the window material that they needed to discuss?

Mr. Ryan stated they had the understanding in Old Towne, that a structure over 50 years old that the architectural style was respected when there was an addition being made.

Vice Chair Woollett stated that the only problem he had with that was there had been things that were done in the past that were not really good, in terms of good construction and not everything that was old was good. He was not very familiar with the fiberglass windows and he was not certain if they had rounded edges. Wood windows would have square edges.

Mr. Williams stated the fiberglass was coated over the wood and the detail was similar to wood.

Ms. Florio stated the windows came in two options, pure fiberglass and wood-coated fiber glass. She presented the photos of the windows.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they had been consistent in requiring wood windows on other projects.

Committee Member McCormack stated they had generally called out to match existing materials.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they were speaking to the sliding glass door and one side window.

Vice Chair Woollett stated they were east exposure windows.

Committee Member Wheeler stated one window would be to the south and the other would be set back quite a bit and be protected by the other wall.

Mr. Williams stated he was in favor of using wood.

Vice Chair Woollett stated it was not a contributing home.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he wanted to remain consistent.

Ms. Florio stated they had spent a lot of time and money maintaining the windows on the rest of their home and it was pretty tough. They wanted to use a material that was more durable and nicer than vinyl.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DRC No. 4578-11, Florio Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- 1. The sliding door in the master bedroom be a 3-part door and of a 9' x 6'-8" dimension.
- 2. Window trim of the new addition to match the trim of the existing residence.
- 3. The new addition shall have square cut eaves.

- 4. The drawings to be corrected to show the 2'-0" x 3'-0" bathroom window elevation on the south side.
- 5. Soffits of the new addition shall be stucco to match existing.
- 6. The gable form of the addition to remain as shown on the drawings, with the eave height to match the existing residence.
- 7. Revision to the east-facing bathroom window shall be fixed glass of a width and location to be lined up with the width and location of the trapezoidal window above.
- 8. Sliding door shall not have a divided light pattern.

SECOND: Tim McCormack

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

(6) DRC No. 4588-11 – WATERS IN-FILL GARAGE & ART STUDIO

- A proposal to construct a new 464 sq. ft. detached two-car garage and 112 sq. ft. art studio, at the rear of a 1921 Craftsman Bungalow.
- 140 N. Cleveland Street, Old Towne Historic District
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, dryan@cityoforange.org
- DRC Action: Preliminary Review

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

Vice Chair Woollett clarified that the item was being presented for preliminary review and no action would be taken on the proposed project.

Mr. Ryan stated that was correct.

Applicant, Ryan Wald, address on file, stated other than the existing brick in the front, that would be the only thing they would want to further discuss. The project was being presented for preliminary review and he wanted to hear what the DRC had to offer.

Mr. Ryan stated the lattice would work and it was not in view from the street and would offer some shade. There were parts that would work.

Public Comment

Steve Bennett, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he had reviewed the plans and he liked the basic design and where it was placed. The OTPA agreed with Staff's comments that it was a bit overwhelming than the home itself. He felt they could take the plan and smooth it out a bit. It would be a good plan and the OTPA was in support of the project.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated what they had drawn was a lot of fun; it had a bit of whimsy to it. There were things such as the beam that stuck out with the columns at the end of the beam and in another area there was a cantilevered beam going past the columns and there were interesting elements to the design but he was very much in agreement with Staff that the proposed project was overdone for the site, as the home was much more simple and had a different feel and style to it. He knew the applicant liked the elephantine columns, however, the house had not had that detail and he could not support that choice.

Vice Chair Woollett stated what he was hearing was that Committee Member Wheeler was referring to the Old Towne Design Standards or were they his personal views?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed that an accessory structure in Old Towne typically would not overwhelm or outdo the home itself. The home was simple and required compatibility.

Mr. Wald asked what were the thoughts on the trellis?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the trellis was fine. The columns concerned him. One thing he had done in a similar situation was to make up a little story and treat the site as if there had been a garage and someone came along and added an addition to it. They could have some fun with it. He had done one where there was a gabled roof garage and the addition had a shed that came off of it, which presented a composition that it had been completed at different times.

Committee Member McCormack stated he liked the proposed project. He heard what Mr. Ryan had stated, that the secondary unit looked better than the original. He liked what he was reviewing and he liked the beam coming across. If the project came in alone, it would be good.

Committee Member Wheeler stated in another situation, of course it would work.

Committee Member McCormack stated how far they would need to go in taking stuff off was the big question. As soon as the columns were removed the beam would go, then the lattice, and then it went into a boxy 1950 style.

Mr. Ryan stated with the art studio being at the interior of the lot they could use some characteristics from the original structures on one elevation and then the side that was not visible from the street could have more detail. It could be a nice space.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could add more fenestration, more windows, and there could certainly be columns and trellises. The columns could be in a more simple form, to have just posts, as that was what already existed.

Committee Member McCormack asked how would they get the depth if they had to pull so much off?

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was not suggesting that they had to pull it all off, but to simplify; for the columns to use 6" x 6" posts, or 4" x 4" posts. They could use 4" x 4" with some lattice work between them.

Committee Member McCormack stated they could put a vine on that.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could use several posts; he gave the applicant some suggestions. Sometimes there were three or they could use a pair.

Mr. Ryan stated the simple bungalow would be visible from the front and in looking down the driveway the side that faced the street could be simplified; and the patio and other areas on the side could be more detailed. It would be a balance that they could achieve.

Vice Chair Woollett stated what was at stake was the integrity of Old Towne and precedent setting. They were charged with that at the DRC level. He would not disagree with the discussion. The garages were very utilitarian and many times the siding went vertical.

Applicant, Jessica Waters, address on file, stated what she was understanding was that the columns in the front would need to be changed and she asked what other things would need to change?

Mr. Wald stated he was hearing that the details needed to be taken care of.

Mr. Ryan stated the DRC was sharing the Standards and the relationship to what was being proposed and to find some wiggle room with the details. His sense was that in looking at the proposal as a garage of the period and then to look at it as someone coming along and putting in an additional garage. There was some flexibility. It was not visible from the street and it was a different space with a different function. When looking at the street scape they would not want to distract from what was there and it would need to be more subtle from a street view and to have it be more simple in the front, which could be obtained with a simple door. There was a house on Cambridge which had a garage with a flat roof and in front of the garage they placed a couple of posts and beam and the roof became less visible. It was simple enough, but worked.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they wanted the trellis in the front they could use that with a beam across and that type of arbor was seen a lot. He suggested they use a different garage door, as the one proposed read as a roll-up door and they could find one that gave the appearance of a sliding door and to get away from the roll-up door look.

Committee Member McCormack stated with the garages they would see a "man door" that would have direct access; it would take from the space inside but provide for more convenience.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they should not dictate where door and window placements needed to be when they were not visible from the street.

Vice Chair Woollett stated the home reminded him of his parent's home and they had a garage in the back with a building added onto the garage, and very similar to what the applicant wanted to do.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they could have a simple garage with something added to it that had a little whimsy and fun; to suggest that someone came along later and added to the garage for a different function. He had completed one that suggested the use was a tool shed for the add-on; for this one, the applicant's would be an artist studio.

Committee Member McCormack asked if the height was 10' and the same as the original structure?

Mr. Wald stated he thought so; he would need to check that.

Mr. Ryan stated with a structure that was over 10' it would start to change the setbacks. He believed it was 10' or under.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the windows and door material would need to be called out on the plans and there were notations of lapped siding, mitered corners, and one area had corner boards. All the details would need to be cleaned up.

Committee Member McCormack stated on the ribbon driveway they needed to discuss how far it would need to come back.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would often go with a 20' pad in front of the garage that was solid concrete with the ribbon coming off of that.

Mr. Ryan stated generally 3' to 5' back from the sidewalk would be where the grass strip would start.

Committee Member McCormack stated he had a ribbon driveway at his home and it was 3', 2', and 3'. He would not make it any wider than 2'.

Committee Member Wheeler stated they had brick going up to the house and there had been problems with brick in Old Towne and he suggested that the driveway should be concrete.

Committee Member McCormack stated he believed the driveway was already concrete.

Mr. Wald stated there was brick along the edges and they could bring photos of that with the actual submittal. He asked if a ribbon driveway was being required? The driveway was concrete with brick outlining.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if they already had a driveway the DRC would not ask that to be changed.

Mr. Wald asked how often the DRC met?

Mr. Ryan stated every two weeks and the next agenda was quite full and they were looking at about two meetings out.

There was no action needed on the preliminary review of the item.

ADJOURNMENT:

Committee Member McCormack made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, November 16, 2011.

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Tim McCormack, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Bill Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.