# CITY OF ORANGE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES – FINAL

July 5, 2012

Committee Members Present: Carol Fox

Robert Imboden Craig Wheeler Joe Woollett

Committee Members Absent: Tim McCormack

Staff in Attendance: Anna Pehoushek, Principal Planner

Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

## Administrative Session – 5:00 P.M.

Chair Woollett opened the Administrative Session at 5:05 p.m. with a review of the Agenda.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated there were no changes to the Agenda. She stated that she would be the new administrator for the next six months for the DRC Meetings.

The Committee Members reviewed the meeting minutes from the Design Review Committee meetings of June 6 and June 20, 2012; changes and corrections were noted.

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

SECOND: Robert Imboden

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

Administrative Session adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

#### Regular Session - 5:30 P.M.

# **ROLL CALL:**

Committee Member McCormack was absent.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

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

There were no speakers.

# **CONSENT ITEMS:**

## (1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

(a) June 6, 2012

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 6, 2012, with corrections and changes noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Carol Fox, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Robert Imboden
ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

(b) June 20, 2012

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve the minutes from the Design Review Committee meeting of June 20, 2012, with corrections and changes noted during the Administrative Session.

SECOND: Robert Imboden

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Joe Woollett
ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

# **AGENDA ITEMS:**

**Continued Items:** None

# New Agenda Items:

## (2) DRC No. 4628-12 – MOLINA & PORTER RESIDENCE

- A proposal to remodel a front and rear porch on an 1889 Victorian residence.
- 435 E. Palmyra Avenue (*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, Kurt Porter, address on file, stated he was available for questions.

#### **Public Comment**

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated he agreed with Staff in retaining the bead board siding as that was historically correct and marked the differentiation between the house and service porch. It was important to retain the service porch. Re-siding and removing the historic fabric was inappropriate and the historic fabric should be maintained as much as possible. The use of the room was being changed internally and some of the windows needed to be changed; there were some fixed windows. The porch should remain intact; the Staff Report referred to the porch as being "rebuilt", but the room should not be rebuilt but retained with the bead board siding.

Applicant, Hope Molina, address on file, stated the porch was not original to the house, it was not built in the 1800's. It was built on in the 1960's as far as they were aware. The windows were fixed, they would not open and they were all different. They assumed, and the architect assumed, that the windows had been taken from other sites and put into the porch when it was built. The plans that were proposed would make the room appear more original to the house in a Victorian style.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if Ms. Molina had any documentation of when the addition was built?

Ms. Molina stated no, but that their architect was able to ascertain that by researching the changes that had been done to the house, renovations that had been done up to that point were between 1940 and 1960. The architect believed that the porch addition was completed when the kitchen was done in the 1960's.

Mr. Porter stated louvered windows were added at that time.

Committee Member Fox stated it was possible that the kitchen was remodeled in the 1960's with changes to the façade, but part of the porch may have been built earlier than that.

Ms. Molina stated that they were under the impression that the porch was not built in the 1800's.

Committee Member Wheeler stated service porches were very common up until 1935 when electric refrigerators came about and people had to find space in their kitchens for a refrigerator.

Committee Member Fox stated it could have been added on when plumbing was introduced in the late 1920's or early 1930's; which was still in the historic era. There were so many houses with a service porch added on and that part of the home was part of the historic fabric which the National Historic District was trying to maintain. Given no documentation to the contrary, she would err on the side of caution that the service porch was added on before 1930's when plumbing was introduced.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was visually in the mode of a service porch. With the horizontal band of windows and keeping the trim below and above the windows it screamed "early service porch." It would have been odd to have been built in that form at a later date.

Committee Member Fox stated there was a roof change between the hallway and the bathroom. She found the area she spoke to on the plans and explained what she was referring to. She asked if the proposal called for removal of that roof portion, as the proposal had all one pitch?

Ms. Molina stated the only pitch that would be changed would be the pitch of the service porch as they had wanted to have the ceiling all at the same height.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that was how he had interpreted that change, but what it meant was that all the walls in the existing service porch would need to be rebuilt.

Mr. Porter stated unfortunately the walls were not real solid; there was nothing but bead board. It was single wall construction.

Committee Member Wheeler stated typically a new wall could be built inside the existing wall. The insulation could go between the new studs. There was a home on Pixley, it was a very dilapidated board and batten house with single wall construction; they had built a home inside of it and left the outside the same. It was unfortunate that the applicant's architect was not present. In one of the photographs it appeared that one wall was inset from the other and he would be opposed to reframing the wall out. There was a very definite break between the original home and the service porch and to change that would be adding a false sense of history.

Committee Member Fox stated that much of what they were discussing may sound strange, as the applicant certainly wanted to take what they had and blend it, to match what existed. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards discouraged that. There needed to be a recognizable difference in what was original and what was new, or if there were historical additions made, that

there would still be distinction between those types of things. It seemed counter-intuitive, but to create a break was preferred along with the change in siding.

Mr. Porter stated the exterior walls had a mish-mash of windows and were not well built.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he would be in favor of removing the louvered windows and replacing them.

Ms. Molina stated the proposal was to replace the existing windows with double hung windows.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he agreed with Staff. Double hung windows would not have been found in service porch rooms; they could be double paned and casement, but just a single glazed window would be appropriate.

Chair Woollett stated the room would no longer be used for a service porch and the City allowed additions to historic buildings and a change of use for some of the spaces. The room was at the rear of the house, it was not at the front of the home and he thought it was a misapplication of the rules to require strict conformance. The room was on the back of the home, if the homeowner wanted to get rid of their service porch and turn it into something else that would be consistent with the rest of the structure; the building could have been built as proposed originally and have been consistent with the design. The rules had stated that there needed to be a line of demarcation, but the rules had not required the house to forever have a service porch, particularly, since the service porch was not part of the home's original construction. Maybe the DRC was pushing it further than it needed to go.

Committee Member Imboden stated he agreed with what had been stated and he had not understood the comments that Chair Woollett presented that the applicant's were not being allowed to use the space as they wanted. It was a matter of allowing the adaptation of another use inside the home; and he had not heard anyone stating that the applicant was not allowed to do that. The proposed change to the exterior was not in keeping with the Standards; additions were allowed at the rear of a home, but they had to meet the Standards.

Chair Woollett stated windows were allowed to be moved.

Committee Member Imboden stated the DRC may have allowed that in the past, but he had opposed that since he had been on the Design Review Committee; it was not supported by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was a demolition, and they had to consider, without having any proof, if the service porch was a contributing portion of the structure. It was a part of the structure that was very much a part of the fabric of Old Towne Orange. Service porches were a prominent feature.

Committee Member Fox stated that portion of the home was visible from the side street.

Ms. Molina stated they would be building a fence and she was not certain how visible that side would be once the fence was installed. She would love double hung windows, it would be the

kitchen that they would be in for the rest of their lives, it was the home they would live in forever and where they raised their family. It was comfort and they wanted to adhere to the rules and have it look fantastic, original, and keep the integrity of the home. It was their life.

Mr. Porter stated part of that was making the home safe for their children, and it was not currently safe. He was not certain if they kept the actual make up of the walls with bead board if it would be safe. It might be safer in the long run to have more modern construction, whether it was ship lap or bead board along the side if it was important to pretend it was a service porch.

Committee Member Imboden stated that for him, safety was not an issue as plywood could be placed over it and framed from the inside; there would not be any safety issues. The issue was pretending it was a single story part of the Victorian home that matches and blends in with the rest of the home; it was not constructed as such and not what it was. The question he had; and he understood the intent of what was proposed, what part of that proposal necessitated changes to the exterior?

Mr. Porter stated they wanted to rehab the whole thing and raise the angle of the roof so there would be the same ceiling height in the interior.

Ms. Molina stated the kitchen would be extended, it was very small currently.

Mr. Porter stated raising the ceiling would necessitate going up a foot or two on three sides.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that would mean demolishing the present service porch and building a new one.

Mr. Porter stated that it could be in the style of the old one, with either the ship lap or the bead board.

Chair Woollett asked what the floor level situation was?

Mr. Porter stated throughout most of the home they had gone back to the original sub floor. The floor of the service porch was another material it was not a  $2\frac{1}{2}$ " sub floor. There were holes in the floor boards and they would be replacing those.

Chair Woollett stated the exterior wall of the service porch had wood framing and bead board on the outside and asked if there was any paper in there? Was it single board construction?

Ms. Molina stated there was no paper. When it got very windy there was a lot of dust and there were cracks in the walls.

Mr. Porter stated it was just bead board.

Chair Woollett stated the Building Department would require a weather seal and insulation with interior surfacing in it. All the old material needed to be removed to get all that in there, there needed to be a moisture barrier and insulation would be needed. It would seem that the exterior

wall needed to be rebuilt no matter what they decided. He asked if there were studs at 16" and 24" on center; he would think with bead board there would not be.

Mr. Porter stated there were no studs at that spacing.

Chair Woollett stated there were no studs with horizontal framing and in order to place dry wall on the interior there would need to be framing at 16". The structure of the exterior would need to be changed.

Committee Member Wheeler stated a good example would be the Mennonite Church on Sycamore and Olive that Chapman University was redoing; it had single wall construction. Each board had been carefully removed, numbered, cleaned up, then they had put in new framing and studs for the interior finish. Insulation was put in with the original boards being placed back on the structure.

Chair Woollett stated he just wanted everyone to understand what needed to be done.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the difference between that method and tearing it down was that in order to add height to the roof, new bead board could be added up above to fill in the gap; that was a step beyond what the DRC had approved in the past.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain that all the original material needed to be removed, as it was all exposed inside. The vapor barrier could be applied inside.

Chair Woollett stated the vapor barrier could not go against the interior wall; it had to be next to the exterior wall.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was all exposed inside. The framing that would go in would not be structural framing; it would just be holding the interior finish.

Chair Woollett asked where would the vapor barrier go?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the vapor barrier would go on the warm side of the wall, not the cold side, but against the interior.

Chair Woollett stated there was a barrier required on the outside wall as well. There needed to be a weather barrier next to the exterior siding.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain that would be the case as it was already constructed. He was not certain that Code could not be met.

Chair Woollett stated without the barrier, the insulation would get wet.

Committee Member Imboden stated he believed they were discussing building a different type of structure, he was discussing a finishing issue. The house already existed, the space already existed.

Chair Woollett stated he knew that, but in order to have the service porch on the back and change the interior space the outside wall needed to be built according to the standards, and it currently was not. There would not be a way to leave the bead board in place; it would need to be taken off.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he thought that was not the only issue; it was whether the completed structure would be reinforced and enhanced or would be a whole new structure?

Chair Woollett stated the existing structure could be enhanced.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there was a horizontal trim on the existing windows, but the drawings had not shown that.

Chair Woollett stated the window framing would be the same as it existed. He asked if there was anything that would prevent the owner from putting double pane glass in there?

Committee Member Wheeler stated no.

Chair Woollett stated the applicant could use double pane glass with the existing frames.

Mr. Porter stated each sash was different and did not face the street. He asked if it would be acceptable for the windows to have a uniform appearance as opposed to the differences that currently existed; some stuck out, some went in.

Committee Member Imboden stated whether the windows matched or not was what was historically significant about the elevation. Personally, he would not have a problem with the windows being changed out; there needed to be diligence in terms of what existed and finding a style that was appropriate for the porch and carrying that through. Some would need to be operable casement windows. Having new windows that matched would not significantly alter the structure.

Committee Member Wheeler and Committee Member Fox stated they agreed.

Committee Member Imboden stated one thing the DRC members should remain cognizant of was that part of the structure currently had the original lap siding with a different roof pitch from the service porch, and a different finish material, and to deviate from that they were getting into troubled territory.

Committee Member Fox asked what the plate height was on the outside of the service porch wall?

Mr. Porter stated he did not have the number.

Committee Member Fox stated she felt a portion of the roof (which she pointed to on the plans) was a significant part of the house that would be obliterated by the proposed project. She had not minded that the height and shed roof of the service porch would be changed, but it needed to be different from the rest of the house. It had been an addition and would not need to match.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was best to go by the photographs as the drawings of the pitch were not accurate.

Committee Member Imboden stated the roof pitch could not match what currently existed. The roof pitch in the proposal needed to change because if it was carried down it would not work.

Chair Woollett stated the kitchen ceiling would have two levels.

Committee Member Fox stated yes, she had done that before.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it could be done and there could be some fun things done with the interior ceiling treatment.

Committee Member Fox stated she was fine with the project being built with Mr. Ryan's suggestions regarding window trim and vertical siding. The height had to be a useable space and it would be acceptable with a pitch break.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there would need to be new bead board installed on the exterior where the additional height was added.

Committee Member Fox stated she was fine with that, which was her personal take.

Committee Member Imboden stated if they went that route it might be new construction and not historically accurate, but that might be okay as it was a new addition.

Committee Member Fox stated it was important to keep the separation. She was fine with having the project completed per Staff's recommendations with the additional condition that the pitch break would occur in order for the structure to maintain its integrity.

The Committee Members reviewed the plans with the applicant to explain where the pitch break was being suggested to occur.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was pleased with the columns that were being replaced on the front porch. The drawings for the front porch appeared a bit sketchy and incomplete and it was noted that the posts in the front would match what remained of the historic posts; the DRC would want to hold them to that. He would propose that the drawings for the porch posts be submitted to Staff to ensure the post were in close resemblance to the existing post in the back.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had a concern about the railing height and how it would join at the column. It was sounding as if they were moving toward approval with conditions, and for him he was not there yet. The design needed to change substantially before he could put his stamp on it. He would rather not move toward conditioning the project, but to have it come back.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he was moving in that direction as well.

Committee Member Fox stated the Committee Members were just clarifying the points.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was just concerned that an action might be taken as there were statements regarding conditions.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared that the railing pickets were based on the current code height requirement of 42"; it appeared that the porch was less than 30" above grade and with that a 42" guard rail would not be needed. He suggested that the railing height be revisited, as it might be more appropriate, visually, to have a lower railing. He would not want to condition that, but it was something to consider. On the proposed north elevation, it might be a drafting error, but on the porch there was an arch trim and below that there was horizontal siding. If they looked at the existing porch area there was a panel there and it would not be justifiable to remove that original fabric of the house.

Committee Member Fox asked if (an area she pointed to on the photos) was single wall construction?

Mr. Porter stated it was being held on by its teeth.

Committee Member Imboden stated assuming that the applicants wanted to continue exploring their project and returning to the DRC, they had not spoken much about the little porch and the windows, and what would come back and what would be proposed. There was a window on the door side that was a little lower.

Mr. Porter stated that was correct and the windows were a mess.

Committee Member Imboden stated the DRC members might want to provide some direction on the window placement as he would hate for the applicant to return and then have a problem with the porch and windows.

Committee Member Fox stated she would want to provide input on everything in order to allow the applicants to get everything tuned up.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would venture to ponder if the service porch was originally open and later enclosed. Certainly opening it up was not what they needed to do. He asked if the applicants should return with windows that were all the same, and whether they should carry the same windows all around?

Committee Member Fox asked if Committee Member Imboden wanted the windows to match the kitchen windows?

Committee Member Imboden stated he was fishing for ideas and he certainly had not wanted to necessarily provide a solution. He had not wanted the applicant to return with the window issue not being addressed.

Committee Member Fox stated she was not concerned if the windows did not match; the other windows were responding to the column and kitchen counter height and it was okay to have the windows a different height in the service porch area.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the different heights reflected the reality that there were changes made at different times.

Ms. Molina asked if the suggestion was for the lattice to remain the same as in the gable above the porch? They assumed it might have been open at one point.

Committee Member Fox pointed out the area she had been concerned with.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the architect had listed that area as being replaced with siding, and he preferred it remain with the materials that existed. He understood that the little porch roof was being taken out and that was a happy thing.

Ms. Molina stated it was a happy, happy thing.

Mr. Porter asked if it needed to be removed?

Ms. Molina stated what they had hoped was for the back door and a little porch to remain with a little awning added at that location.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not opposed to having a small roof over the door as long as it was well thought out.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that could be a simple shed roof with a couple of beams coming out.

Committee Member Fox suggested that small brackets could be used to hold a little roof.

Committee Member Fox asked if there were any comments on the front porch?

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was wonderful.

Committee Member Fox stated it was gorgeous and she agreed with having the height of the railing be lower. She asked the applicants if they wanted a wrap-up of their suggestions?

Ms. Molina stated yes.

Mr. Porter asked for clarification of the roof height. Were the DRC members wanting some type of delineation between the existing and the new?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes.

Committee Member Imboden stated when the project was complete the intent was to understand that the service porch was a piece on its own and should be offset; if the roof pitch changed the DRC would be open to that.

Mr. Porter stated offsetting the roof would not be an issue.

Committee Member Imboden stated he did not know what the applicants would run into, and he was not certain how high the roof could be raised.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there could be a different pitch.

Committee Member Imboden stated a slight change in pitch on the service porch would not present a significant impact on the structure.

Committee Member Wheeler requested that the applicants please tell their architect that the DRC members would want to see a little more accuracy on the drawings. The window trims were in error in many cases, as was the area around the service porch entrance; the existing trims were very different from what was shown on the drawings. The roof pitch on one portion was different.

Committee Member Imboden stated the double hung windows on the small existing porch were drawn as being smashed up against one another without any structure at all between them and that would not work; it was those types of things that needed to be cleaned up. He was speaking about the north elevation of the recessed porch area.

Committee Member Fox stated the biggest question would be if the DRC would be okay with the applicant taking down the back structure and rebuilding it with the new height.

Committee Member Imboden stated his intent was to keep as much of the existing structure as possible, and change as little as possible to maintain the size and style, and to be conservative with any changes.

Committee Member Fox stated the applicant would want to keep the siding and put it back on. She would think the window sills would need to be a bit higher in order to have the kitchen counter fit.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would suggest not adding fancy detailing to the porch; details on the plans were necessary, but the architect should not feel that the DRC was wanting to see more fancy detailing added.

Ms. Molina asked if the detail was overly ornate?

Committee Member Imboden stated no, but the architect logically was attempting to clean the whole thing up, bring it in to be a part of the house and to match the detailing. He suggested that the detailing of the service porch be more humble, to keep it utilitarian.

Mr. Porter stated they had some re-evaluating to do if they were not able to raise the roof height as that had been the reason for the whole thing.

Committee Member Fox stated the kitchen would be more useable and they were growing the kitchen out onto that service porch area and reinforcing the idea that Victorian kitchens were small. The space was more useable and having the change in the ceiling with the line of demarcation would be a very charming feature of the kitchen. She had done those types of designs for a lot of people.

Committee Member Wheeler suggested that the applicants ask their architect to cut a section through that space and explore ideas for the ceiling that could be fun; have some fun with the problem and turn it into something neat. There were many things that could be done that stated "whoopee."

Committee Member Imboden noted that the lowest portion of the ceiling would be over counter space.

Committee Member Fox stated the applicants were doing an amazing service for the house, it was a glorious house.

Committee Member Imboden and Committee Member Wheeler agreed.

Chair Woollett asked if they could have a motion?

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4628-12, Molina & Porter Residence, with the guidance and suggestions provided during the review of the item.

SECOND: Robert Imboden

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

#### (3) DRC No. 4630-12 – BROWN RESIDENCE

- A proposal to replace existing roof rafters, and modify the roof form (install 21 feet of new canted roof) on the west side of the contributing garage/apartment.
- 609 S. Orange Street/212 E. River Avenue (*Old Towne Historic District*)
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicants, Mark Brown and Pat Thomas, addresses on file, stated they were available for questions.

## **Public Comment**

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated obviously the roof was in severe disrepair and needed attention. He was confused with the status of the structure as it seemed that it was built during the period of significance, but that was questionable. If they were altering the roof form that would be inappropriate, but since there was no evidence that it was contributing it would be okay. It needed attention.

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

Committee Member Wheeler stated on the drawings there was a reference to 3-16, and he asked what that meant?

Ms. Thomas stated that was the pitch that was given to them by the person evaluating it. It was a hip roof with a very simple slope.

Committee Member Wheeler stated generally that measurement would be listed as 3:12 and seemed like a lot. The overhangs were shown at 3', but he was not certain if that was something they were wanting to change as it appeared the existing overhang was at 18".

Ms. Thomas stated what had occurred over time on the roof was that it had fallen apart and in walking around the property it had been cut off at different times. There was some fascia that had fallen down and going back to the house and looking at the height and the protection of the overhang, they were at the 30" to 36" discussion. They went with a 36" overhang including the fascia to protect the siding of the home. The goal would be to go within the 30" to 36" overhang and whatever was determined appropriate by the City.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it appeared to him that the original home was built with an 18" overhang as there were three strips of starter board or sheathing and it appeared from the ground that those were 6". If the applicant wanted to stay with the original size he would suggest 18"; the structure was non-contributing so they could change that.

Ms. Thomas stated she had no proof of the size, but she had watched the home over the years and she had seen the starter boards come down.

Mr. Brown asked what her guess was as to the overhang size?

Ms. Thomas stated the least would have been 28".

The Committee Members reviewed the photos and discussed the size.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the home had exposed rafters?

Ms. Thomas stated no. There were similar models in the neighborhood that had fascia.

Committee Member Imboden stated the fascia was generally a later add on.

Committee Member Fox stated the existing roof seemed to cut back, except for the porch area and what the proposal showed was a raised lip that transferred that around the entire house. She asked if the existing pitch on the rafters would be followed?

Mr. Ryan pointed out where the pitch break would occur.

Committee Member Wheeler presented a drawing of how the pitch break could occur.

Committee Member Fox stated it should appear as in the drawing presented by Committee Member Wheeler.

Ms. Thomas stated it was not being raised a lot of inches and the hip would work even though it had not seemed logical to her. The manner in which it cut into the roof currently and sat, the small area that would be raised would fit and go straight across.

Committee Member Fox stated maybe there was a lot of warping in the overhang, as geometry would not allow it to occur as presented in the applicant's drawings. She was not opposed to what was being proposed, she was just pointing out that the drawings were not accurate. She reviewed the drawings that Committee Member Wheeler had provided and reviewed with the applicants how that area of the roof would work. She would not add a fascia as shown, as it would drop down and darken those areas.

Ms. Thomas stated it would go the entire length of the porch.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if they would not want to stop it at the porch?

Ms. Thomas stated no, it was never stopped there; those portions of the fascia had all fallen off.

Committee Member Fox stated she was fine with it, but she had thought the pitch was being changed all the way around and the rafter tails would all be equal and it would work. It was such a tall structure and the roof was not very visible.

Chair Woollett stated it would appear that the logical approach would be to stay with 18" to 24" overhangs all the way around and have the break point at the west side where the porch was and not to run the whole width, but hold it back a foot and there would be a separate little shed roof off of the hip. The exterior porch area would work geometrically.

Committee Member Wheeler asked if it would be raised to the height of the fascia?

Chair Woollett stated no, the rafter tails would be lower, but the pitch could be set anywhere they wanted to gain the clearance that was needed. It would be much cleaner and it would work.

The Committee Members reviewed the idea presented by Chair Woollett.

Ms. Thomas stated the joinings would be visible in order to establish them properly and it was her understanding that in Old Towne, things needed to be more seamless and less exposed. The line would be broken and wrapped with some other type of wood to cover the supports.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with the rafters being exposed there would be some hardware up there that might not be very appropriate for the period of the home.

Chair Woollett stated the flatter roof could be run through the wall and the other one could come down on top of it, which was pretty simple.

Committee Member Imboden stated the break would only occur at the eave.

Chair Woollett asked about the starter board issue; there were rafters with starter boards resting on top of that?

Committee Member Wheeler stated the applicant proposed adding a fascia, but either way it would work.

Ms. Thomas stated the interior of the space was all wood clad and it followed the roof line of the rafter tails. There was not the convenience of adding a flat roof and going into the attic, there was not an attic.

Chair Woollett stated nothing would change inside.

Committee Member Fox reviewed how the roof would work.

Ms. Thomas stated she would need to measure it to ensure it was wide enough. To drop it down the way the Committee Members were proposing, there were still going to be issues with coming out and going across without getting the clearance.

Committee Member Wheeler stated that nothing would be dropped down. Another situation that was occurring was that there was a beam connected to a post at the edge of the porch and it was shown that there would be a metal connector covered with wood trim, and it struck him as a lot of work and not in keeping with the style of the home. He suggested setting the beam on the

post with a rod that would be drilled in and set with epoxy; the rafters could then be attached to the beam with a lag and there would not be any exposed hardware. He would provide his drawings with that information to the applicant, as a suggestion for their builder. Another suggestion on the hardware was that while the LPC4Z connector that was shown was a neat idea, unfortunately the gap between the flanges was about 3 9/16" and the wood might be a full 4" so it might not work. He presented a drawing and suggested it might work better that way.

Committee Member Imboden stated the disclaimer that Committee Member Wheeler was not a structural engineer. He would not want that to come back to the DRC.

Chair Woollett stated it appeared they may be leading up to a continuance to allow the applicant to clarify what they wanted to do and he suggested the use of an 18" overhang instead of 3' and that would help with the roof. In trying to extend the overhangs past where they currently existed would be awkward and difficult.

Committee Member Wheeler stated with the C cut on the rafters hanging out there at 3' that would put more stress on the saw.

Chair Woollett stated if those were more than 18" now it might be cleaner to cut the longer ones off that currently existed on the house.

Ms. Thomas stated they were going to put boards all the way up and sister them. Mr. Ryan had suggested that they be trimmed to a 4" height as opposed to leaving them 5 ½"; the visual difference was minuscule. By using a higher board it would allow some ventilation which had not existed in the roof. The roof needed to be vented.

Committee Member Wheeler stated there were all types of vents that could be incorporated into the roofing; some were hidden into the roofing.

Ms. Thomas stated there would need to be so many of them it would have a visual impact.

Committee Member Imboden stated what Committee Member Wheeler spoke of were vents that would not have a profile and were built into the roofing.

Chair Woollett stated the idea was to put in new rafters all the way around and build a new roof on top of the existing roof.

Committee Member Fox stated all the sheathing would be removed and putting new material that would result in the roof being 2" higher than how it currently existed.

Ms. Thomas stated they were attempting to reduce as much roof heat as possible. She wanted to review what the DRC Members were wanting on the project; they were wanting to do a very simple replace and repair and stay within the confines of the existing roof. She asked if the Committee was against using a longer overhang, beyond 18"?

Chair Woollett stated no, but if it was limited to 18" the porch side would be easier to handle.

Committee Member Imboden stated before he spoke for all the Members, he had not known if he would support doubling the eave to what currently existed. It was not necessarily supported by the style and they had no evidence that there had been longer overhangs.

Committee Member Wheeler stated 3' was awfully big.

Chair Woollett stated what he was hearing was that aesthetically it should remain at 18".

Ms. Thomas stated the overhangs were not at 3 rudder boards, she would see if she could find it in a photo.

Committee Member Fox stated that the longer rafter tails was what might have caused them to rot.

Mr. Brown stated actually 20 years ago they were all covered.

Committee Member Fox stated 24" would be a pretty normal overhang length for that style of home.

Chair Woollett stated they may have been 24".

Committee Member Fox stated with extending the roof overhang to 36" the windows would be darkened; it would go as low as the current porch.

Ms. Thomas described the natural light in the unit, indicating it was a foresty place anyway. They had not wanted to get too dark and there had been very little protection to that upper unit. The object would be to find a design that made sense and provide the most protection and natural cooling, and at the same time not create half closed "eyelids" with too much extension. It seemed that the DRC Members were asking her for professional plans. It was a simple roof and they wanted to contain expenses.

Chair Woollett stated he would guess that the Building Department would want better details.

Committee Member Wheeler stated especially if the roof overhang would be extended the Building Department would want calculations on how that would work.

Ms. Thomas stated there needed to be clarification on the porch.

Committee Member Fox stated there needed to be a line where there would be a pitch break and it would need to end some how and that was where Committee Member Wheeler's drawing would be helpful. The only question was the overhang length and the framing for the covered porch area and how the fascia would work; if fascia was used and how that would appear.

Ms. Thomas stated she understood that the DRC Members would want porch clarification and to identify separate pitch and fascia vs. overhang length.

Mr. Brown asked if there was any problem with extending the porch to where it had originally been?

The Committee Members agreed that was not an issue.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if the porch was carried out to the end, another post may need to be added.

Committee Member Imboden stated that might create a roof issue.

Committee Member Fox stated there would be fascia running along, with a pitch break and they would need to bring it in about a foot at each end to make it work.

The Committee Members reviewed the drawings and how the area would need to work.

Committee Member Fox stated she would not want them to provide elaborate plans and the applicant would want to check with the Building Department to find out what was needed. She stated she was not personally opposed to a 36" overhang.

Committee Member Imboden stated if the applicant wanted to find other homes in the neighborhood that had larger overhangs and having 36" overhangs was consistent, he would be open to that suggestion, but he was not certain they would find that treatment.

Chair Woollett asked what the size of the rafters in the home were?

Ms. Thomas stated true 2" x 4".

Chair Woollett asked for a motion.

Ms. Brown asked what had they decided on the fascia?

Ms. Thomas stated it would depend on the roof pitch. She asked if she could keep the drawing that was provided by Committee Member Wheeler, with a disclaimer on it?

Committee Member Wheeler stated his name was not on it so he thought no one would know where it came from.

Chair Woollett stated it appeared they were heading to a continuance.

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to continue DRC No. 4630-12, Brown Residence, with the comments and guidance provided during their review of the item.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

**MOTION CARRIED** 

#### (4) DRC No. 4632-12 – JOYCE BRIGHT INTERIORS

- A proposal to install a new tenant blade sign on the front of the Royer Mansion.
- 307 E. Chapman Avenue (Old Towne Historic District)
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Cory Keith, address on file, stated her only concern was why the business address needed to be on the sign? There were many signs in Old Towne without an address on them. For the size of her proposed sign it would alter how she could get everything on there. If a sign was being hung in front of her building she would be there; she did not need a number on the sign. Aesthetically it would appear better and she would not want to pay for that change.

# **Public Comment**

None.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion

Committee Member Wheeler stated he could not find anything that stated an address was required on a blade sign and the address was behind the sign on the wall and it was also on the building. The address also appeared on the monument sign.

Committee Member Fox asked where the request was coming from?

Committee Member Imboden stated they needed to find where the requirement was coming from.

Principal Planner, Anna Pehoushek, stated she would review the Code.

Mr. Ryan stated if the address was on the building that should suffice.

Committee Member Fox stated the address was on the building.

Ms. Pehoushek read from the Code: In order to aid the building or development the identification of each building address was required in Title 15.52 of the Code; the numbers may not be displayed upon a sign to avoid confusion and minimize clutter. The question was if the big number on the building sufficed.

Chair Woollett stated he was not certain how that information related to the blade sign.

Committee Member Imboden stated he wondered if the Code requirements had already been met with the address on the building.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was a tenant sign. One of Mr. Ryan's concerns was that the sign attachments were drawn inaccurately and appeared to come from the bottom of the railing and the other drawing was shown differently. With corrected drawings there would not be any damage to the railing. It would come over the floor board and either method of attachment presented would work. On the one application, if long screws were used with a beam behind the fascia it would work.

Committee Member Fox asked why the alternate application was presented?

Ms. Keith stated the gentleman that created the sign had provided both methods of application for the sign.

Committee Member Fox stated the load would go down vertically instead of torquing the beam.

Committee Member Imboden stated his initial reaction was that he would prefer to see less hardware; at some point it would take over the sign. The facade of the building was quite elegant and adding more hardware would not necessarily improve it.

Committee Member Fox stated they might need the hardware to manage the load.

Committee Member Wheeler stated one drawing called out the sign at 24" x 48" and another that called it out at 32" x 44" and the third one 32" x 38". Visually he thought the 24" x 48" would work.

Mr. Ryan stated the 24" x 48" would meet Code.

Committee Member Wheeler stated the specification of where the sign would hang was needed and he suggested that it be at least 80" above the floor. The Staff Report stated that the sign would be sand-blasted wood, but the drawings had not called out the material.

Ms. Keith stated it would be wood.

Chair Woollett asked Staff if they had any further clarification on the Code issue?

Ms. Pehoushek stated she found that the requirement was to have a clear illuminated address, and there was no requirement that the sign itself needed an address. The address on the building needed to be of a 6" height in a contrasting color and visible.

Committee Member Fox stated she could not tell if the existing building address was 6", it was on a contrasting color and visible. They could craft a condition that the address on the building be checked to ensure compliance with the Code reference. She wanted to verify which layout they were approving.

Committee Member Wheeler stated it was the 24" x 48".

Chair Woollett asked for a motion.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4632-12, Joyce Bright Interiors, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff Report and with the following additional conditions:

- Eliminate Condition No. 1, and the applicant shall prove that the existing address on the building meets the current Code and therefore the address shall not need to be placed on the blade sign.
- The 24" x 48" sign version was being approved.
- The bottom of the sign shall not be lower than 80" above the finished surface underneath it.
- The sign material shall be sand-blasted wood.
- The sign shall be centered in the western bay of the southern facade.

# And with the recommendation:

• The shorter attachment brackets be used if possible, understanding that the alternate bracket installation may need to be used.

Ms. Keith asked as far as the building number, the 307, was she needing to be responsible for that meeting Code?

Committee Member Fox stated if the applicant had not wanted to place the address on her sign, she would need to prove the numbers that existed met the current Code.

Mr. Ryan stated 10" in a contrasting color.

Committee Member Fox stated 6"; they could not confirm the height of the numbers. The applicant would need to pursue having the numbers upgraded if they had not met current Code.

Committee Member Imboden stated he would not want to pursue placing numbers on the individual tenant signs and the address requirement was about emergency vehicles locating a building.

Chair Woollett asked if there was a second to the motion?

SECOND: Craig Wheeler

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

#### (5) DRC No. 4637-12 – WIELGOS RESIDENCE

- A proposal requesting the approval of a contemporary-styled replacement entry door for a non-contributing 1943 Art Moderne Styled residence.
- 206 S. Center Street (Old Towne Historic District)
- Staff Contact: Daniel Ryan, 714-744-7224, <a href="mailto:dryan@cityoforange.org">dryan@cityoforange.org</a>
- DRC Action: Final Determination

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

Applicant, Lucyn Wielgos, address on file, stated Art Moderne was not even on the City's website and not part of the City pamphlet. She was told when she purchased the home from the City that it did not fall under the historic preservation guidelines. When she had Mr. Ryan visit the site, she thought she was being polite and being a good new member of the community in getting his opinion. There apparently was some miscommunication because Mr. Ryan's words were that he liked the porthole door, he thought it would be cool to redo it, and it was in bad shape. It was hung the wrong way and it was an out swinging door. The communication on that day that she took away from the conversation between Mr. Ryan and herself was that the door needed to be wood, for Old Towne, to replace like with like and she had not understand that she had to keep the existing door and repair it. Her take away from that conversation was that she needed to install a wood door. She also asked if it would be okay to put in a sliding glass door in another area of the house; there was a patio that was not useable and she wanted access to that area from inside of the house. During that conversation was when Mr. Ryan stated that it was necessary to come to the DRC and get approval.

Mr. Ryan stated the applicant had done a great job of rehabilitating the interior of the house.

#### **Public Comment**

Jeff Frankel, address on file, representing the OTPA, stated there was not another similar house in the district and the fact that it was within the District; it was bound by the Old Towne Design Standards. Also, in addition to that, the home was probably eligible for listing. The OTPA had been trying to push for the 50 year criteria but the City was not going for that. The door was very unique and a character-defining feature of the home. Unless the door was deteriorated beyond repair, he would want the original door to be reinstalled or recreated. He agreed with Staff, and the Staff Report had stated that the door was not beyond repair and it would be nice if the door was reinstalled. The other features of the home reflected the Moderne style.

Chair Woollett asked, when Mr. Frankel had stated "eligible for listing," what had he meant by that?

Mr. Frankel stated it was eligible due to the home's uniqueness, and it was not eligible as a contributor due to the 50 year criteria.

Chair Woollett asked "eligible for listing" with whom?

Mr. Frankel stated for local listing, because it had a unique architectural design, and maybe it was eligible for listing as an independent resource. He was not sure. Maybe one of the Members could enlighten him.

Chair Woollett opened the item to the Committee for discussion.

Committee Member Imboden asked if the home would be considered a local historic resource? If it had been inventoried and identified as significant and able to contribute to a historic district, would it be considered as a local contributor?

Mr. Ryan stated for example the Eichler homes that were built much later, had significance as being listed as tract homes. Things that had merit with rare construction style, such as the home they were speaking of, could be individually listed on the California Register and the National also. The building had all the qualities for listing.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was talking about the City's local listing. They had discussed that at the last DRC meeting, and would the structure fall under that local listing? It had been inventoried and identified.

Mr. Ryan stated the criteria that they were operating under structures built after 1940's received a 6L or 6Z rating.

Committee Member Fox asked what the difference between those two ratings were?

Mr. Ryan stated the 6L was for planning purposes, concerned with and for changes to the building and for back up, for non-historic structures within the district to have them match the architectural style of the period when making changes; it was a combination of things.

Committee Member Fox stated on that merit alone it would require having a porthole in the door. It was similar to the landscape project that had come before them a few weeks ago, where the landscape had to fit in with the 1957 home, and that was a non-contributing structure. Improvements needed to be kept within the era that the house was built. The home was built in 1943 and the door should be a 1943 style door that matched the house.

Ms. Wielgos stated the first permit pulled on the home was in 1947.

Committee Member Fox stated the home had a Moderne style door from 1947.

Ms. Wielgos stated when Mr. Ryan had come to her home he had looked through his records and told her that the home had not been listed as anything in particular. She was not given any guidelines, there was nothing in writing served to them, and they had just found out about the requirements as they had gone along; she certainly had not wanted to come across as defiant. It was amazing to her. After all of this, would she be able to install a screen door?

Committee Member Fox stated she would be in favor of a door that had a porthole that swung in. The photographs showed some deterioration. A new door with a porthole, for her personally, would be approvable.

Committee Member Wheeler stated he felt a little uncomfortable stating that the door needed to be replaced; the home was a non-contributing structure. But if the door was his, the new door would bug him every time he went in, it was so inappropriate for the house.

Ms. Wielgos stated the glass block that was next to the door set forth a geometric design that was picked up in the new door.

Committee Member Imboden stated he understood why the choice was made for the new door, and it was a beautiful door and she probably spent a good amount of money for that door; but he was in the same place as Committee Member Wheeler.

Committee Member Wheeler stated as a compromise a straight smooth finished door would look so much better and appropriate to the building. The new door that was chosen did not fit with the rest of the home. The door was in the shadow of the home and hard to see, but it did not belong.

Committee Member Imboden stated the situation was unfortunate. The City would be well served in adopting policies such as providing certificates of appropriateness that could be dealt with over the counter where a resident could bring in an example of what they proposed, and for a small fee the documents could be processed and they would avoid situations such as the project before them. Where there was difficulty with the door, it was that the original door matched the home, it was the one that absolutely belonged there and the new door was a later door. The thing that had kept Old Towne and its historic resources so valuable was that all the little pieces were still there. If windows were changed out and siding was changed out, eventually the whole district would not rise to the occasion.

Committee Member Fox asked about the out-swinging door?

Committee Member Imboden asked if the door was painted on both sides?

Ms. Wielgos stated yes.

Committee Member Imboden stated he felt the door could be re-worked and re-hung; and it could be made to work.

Committee Member Wheeler stated if that was the original door it was in-swinging and asked if it had been modified?

Committee Member Fox stated that was probably done by the City when it was a different use. The door appeared fairly damaged and she would not oppose a new door that appeared similar to the original door.

Committee Member Imboden stated he had suggested using the existing door for economic reasons.

Chair Woollett stated it was an awkward situation; and they faced such situations before and they were never happy with them. It was also precedent setting.

Committee Member Fox asked why the item would be an approval of the project subject to the conditions, as actually it would be a denial. It was the only thing being requested on the proposal before them.

Ms. Wielgos stated she had no guidelines, nothing in writing.

Committee Member Fox stated the City had guidelines.

Ms. Wielgos stated the City sold them the home and it was the first time she was hearing of the requirements.

Committee Member Fox stated if a separate homeowner sold a home it would be up to the new owners to go in and discover if there were guidelines for changes. The seller was not responsible.

Ms. Wielgos stated California was a full disclosure State. If there were guidelines that needed to be followed that was a disclosure that should have been made.

Committee Member Imboden stated every municipality had guidelines that residents needed to follow.

Chair Woollett stated that was not a DRC issue, it was not up to them to decide. The applicant could hire an attorney and sue the City. All they had to decide was if the project before them met the criteria and that was it.

Committee Member Fox stated there were guidelines that were set forth in the Old Towne Standards for the district that the applicant's home was in.

Chair Woollett stated what occurred based on their decision was another matter. The DRC could only decide on the aesthetics of the door. Sometimes it created awkward situations, but that was not their problem. They had been called the Orange Taliban by the OC Register. A resident had put in a step that had not complied and they had to tear it out and they hired an attorney. The DRC could only decide on what was before them; it was an amoral decision that they made and it either had or had not met the criteria, even though they were often sympathetic toward the applicant.

Committee Member Fox stated she was confused as to the decision they needed to make. On page 5, the Staff Report noted the approval of the project was subject to the following conditions and she was confused as to why they would need an approval of the project if they were not approving the request.

Chair Woollett stated Staff's recommendation was to have the original front entry door installed.

Mr. Ryan stated the recommendation was for an Art Moderne door to be re-installed in working condition to maintain the character-defining features of the residence.

Chair Woollett stated what he was hearing the Committee Members stating was that they were okay with having a new door installed, and not necessarily the original door, but something similar to the original door.

Committee Member Imboden stated the value found in the historical significance would be in keeping the original door. It was not the only option.

Chair Woollett asked if he could have a motion?

Committee Member Fox stated it was just weird to state that they were approving the project, but they were not.

Mr. Ryan stated she could reword it, to uphold Staff's findings.

Committee Member Fox made a motion to approve DRC No. 4637-12, Wielgos Residence, subject to the conditions and findings contained in the Staff report, and with the conditions outlined in the Staff Report except that Condition No. 1 be modified to add the phrase "or a new door may be installed that closely matched the original Art Moderne entry door that was removed."

Chair Woollett asked if that was clear to everyone?

Mr. Ryan stated the door would have a little lookout window, a round window.

Chair Woollett stated if a new door was used the old window glass could be used.

Ms. Wielgos asked about the piece that was next to the porthole on the original door?

Committee Member Imboden stated it might be original, but it had not supported the Moderne style of the door, it would not be a make it or break it to have that additional detail.

Committee Member Fox asked if they were going to vote?

SECOND: Joe Woollett

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Joe Woollett

NOES: Craig Wheeler

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

Chair Woollett asked Committee Member Wheeler if he was opposed?

Committee Member Wheeler stated yes.

Ms. Wielgos stated she was confused.

Committee Member Fox stated what they had just done, I don't know if Chair Woollett wanted to explain it?

Chair Woollett stated they had upheld the recommendation that the original door or a duplicate of it be re-installed and the door could be in-swinging.

Ms. Wielgos stated she had been told that per Code, the door needed to be in-swinging for residential.

Chair Woollett stated that he was not certain if that was a Code requirement.

Committee Member Imboden stated it might be with the steps.

Chair Woollett stated it was immaterial to them. It may be that the result of the DRC decision the applicant would have further issue with the City, the sellers of the home, but that was up to the applicant.

Ms. Wielgos stated a non-contributing home means what?

Mr. Ryan stated it was a home that was outside the period of significance that was identified for the historic district.

Committee Member Imboden stated he was not certain the applicant understood what that meant.

Ms. Wielgos stated all she knew was there was a cut off of 1941.

Committee Member Imboden stated the National Register included structures that were built between 1880 up through 1940 and at that point structures had to be 50 years old to be contributing. That was the period of significance. Homes or other buildings constructed after that time frame were in many ways not held to the same standards, but had design standards for modifications that continued to support the original era of when the home was built.

Chair Woollett stated such as the mid-century houses that were built in the 1960's.

Committee Member Fox read from the Old Towne Design Standards: rehabilitation to non-contributing buildings shall use the design features of the building's original period and shall be compatible with its surroundings and respect to size and scale; and that was the phrase.

Ms. Wielgos stated: and because the home was in the district it applied.

Committee Member Fox stated that was the reason; and the reason the applicant could not be held to the exact door, but could use a similar replacement.

Committee Member Imboden stated there had been updates to the inventory of structures in Old Towne, and there had been one that was done during the last five years. The survey included the home of the applicant. The report stated that if the period of significance was updated, the home could be a contributor to the historic district and recognized that due to the home's unique design the home potentially could be listed individually on the National Register. It had a higher rating than most of the homes in Old Towne. The inventory was not the bearing of their decision, the DRC had to view the home as a non-contributor, but the standards required all buildings of all periods to follow the guidelines.

Chair Woollett stated the DRC's decision could be appealed to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ryan stated within 14 days.

Ms. Wielgos stated there was a comment during the discussion about landscaping needing to be era specific and she had not seen any guidelines for that.

Committee Member Imboden stated they were speaking about hardscape.

Committee Member Fox stated the project that was referenced was for a driveway and a lot of hardscape and needed a review because it was a duplex or multi family structure. Because Ms. Wielgos was in the district the guidelines applied to fences and those things.

Ms. Wielgos stated let's say she went through all of it and forgot that they spent \$1,400.00 on the new door and casing; and installed a porthole door and then wanted to put in a screen door. The screen door would obscure the view of the porthole in the dark enclave of where the door would be; it seemed harsh.

Chair Woollett stated he had wondered about that.

Mr. Frankel stated it was the same as hiding vinyl windows behind screens, it was the same situation.

Committee Member Imboden stated it was a tough call, but the City had not wanted to go as far as telling a person that they could not have a screen door.

Committee Member Fox stated for someone that really loved the Art Moderne style and loved the door, they would probably not install a screen door. A new buyer could come in and take the screen door off and still have the porthole door. It would not have been altered to a period that was not consistent with the era that the home was built in.

Chair Woollett stated they had not really spoken too much about screen doors. A screen door could be installed that was compatible to the period.

Ms. Wielgos asked if there was such a thing? There was a ventilation issue in the house and it got really hot.

Committee Member Imboden stated his first suggestion as a design professional would be to look at an alternative to ventilation without installing a screen door.

Committee Member Fox stated there were projects that had screen doors that were designed for the home.

Ms. Wielgos stated a screen door would hide the door.

Committee Member Imboden stated one of the standards that was applied to historic homes, was that changes could be reversible. Later someone could undo things and still have a historic resource in place. Even if something that was installed was non-contributing, it could be removed later without damaging the original resource.

Committee Member Fox stated it reminded her of the Antiques Road Show where someone brought in a piece that had been cleaned because there had been a stain on it, and then they realized the finish had been changed and it reduced the value of their piece. It was counter-intuitive, if the door was maintained it would maintain the value of the home. The applicant probably shouldn't toss the original door away if a new door was installed.

Ms. Wielgos stated it was sitting in the garage.

Chair Woollett stated they needed to end the session and chat later.

Committee Member Imboden stated Ms. Wielgos was asking important questions, and unfortunately there were not more people in the room to hear them.

Chair Woollett asked for a motion to adjourn.

# **ADJOURNMENT:**

Committee Member Wheeler made a motion to adjourn to the next regular scheduled Design Review Committee meeting on Wednesday, July 18, 2012.

SECOND: Carol Fox

AYES: Carol Fox, Robert Imboden, Craig Wheeler, Joe Woollett

NOES: None ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Tim McCormack

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.