



**ACTION REPORT
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DECEMBER 7, 2010**

- 1) Call to order and Pledge
- 2) Introduction of Board Members
 - Members present: Vince Pisano, Terry Herr, Mark Mekes, Kathi Cook
- 3) Approval of November action minutes
 - Motion to approve: Mark Mekes
 - 2nd: Vince Pisano
 - Vote: 3-0, 1 abstained, Motion passed
- 4) **Courtesy variance review: V10-015**, 14150 Hopewell Road, Brent Boyd
 - To allow an attached garage to encroach into the minimum front yard and the minimum side yard setback (Article 64-416.b,c.1)
 - Comments:
 - CPAC is exploring options for ways to expand setbacks from Hopewell Road, in order to keep the rural character. Prefer a 100' unbuildable setback/viewshed corridor.
 - Approval of this variance would create the closest structure along Hopewell Road; this would be against the Comp Plan.
 - The size of the proposed garage would create even more of a distraction.
 - The Arborist states that the black walnut tree is not an official specimen, but cutting it down would require recompense.
 - The applicant stated that he plans on planting trees along Hopewell Road for screening and safety.
 - The Board suggests that the applicant explore other locations for the garage. With 2.7 acres, there should be enough room to keep the structure out of the setbacks. Why not behind the house? To the left of the carport? On the other side of the house?
- 5) **Courtesy variance review: V10-016**, 340 Ranchette Road, James and Esther Gowin
 - To allow a guest house to exceed the 1,500 maximum square footage
 - To allow a guest house in the side yard (Article 64-1598. 3,5)
 - Comments:
 - Addition should match main house in material, color and style
- 6) **Courtesy variance review: V10-017** 13340 Morris Road, Javad Oskoei
 - To reduce the minimum rear perimeter setback from 35 feet to 26 feet (common area, lot 108, lot 107) (Article 64-669.3)
 - Comments:
 - Change has no impact on surrounding properties; no issues.

- 7) **Courtesy variance review: V10-018**, 1960 Redd Road, William Clements
- To allow a pool and pool deck to encroach into the 75 foot impervious setback (Article 20-426.2)
 - Comments:
 - There seem to be other areas where the pool can be moved—to the east? North? Retaining walls may be necessary.
 - Explore other designs, locations.
 - Not in favor of supporting the variance.
- 8) **Courtesy variance review: V10-019**, 12700 Deerfield Parkway, Harold Buckley
- To allow the equipment area screen wall to be constructed of 100% CMU block.
 - To reduce the requirement for 75% brick/stone and 25% other accent material to 0% brick and 100% other accent material (tilt up concrete) on the west elevation.
 - To reduce the requirement for 75% brick/stone and 25% other accent material to 23% brick and 77% (EFIS & tilt up concrete), on the south elevation.
 - To reduce the requirement for 75% brick/stone and 25% other accent material to 48% brick and 52% other accent material (glass, tilt up concrete, and EFIS) on the east elevation.
 - To reduce the requirement for 75% brick/stone and 25% other accent material to 74% brick and 26% other accent material (EFIS), on the north elevation. (Article 64-1095, p,q,r)
 - Comments:
 - Board does not support request for CMU screen wall; painted CMU will look too different from brick. Would prefer tilt up concrete, with brick forms liner.
 - Can support variance for west elevation since there is no potential for future development between building and Wal-Mart/Fry's/Home Depot.
 - Board does not support variance for south elevation; Percentage of brick is much lower than preferred. Essentially a strip of brick across the top; the rest is tilt up concrete.
 - Board does not support variance for east elevation; This elevation can be seen from the street.
 - Board does not support variance for north elevation; No reason why the 75% requirement cannot be met.
 - Board suggests using Kohl's in Deerfield Place as an example as it is a concrete tilt-wall construction project that utilizes brick form liner to replicate the look of brick.
 - The use of paint in an attempt to match the color of a brick wall on a structure is not desired and has never proven to be acceptable.
- 9) **Courtesy review:** Milton Gateway Signs, Michelle McIntosh-Ross
- Final designs
 - Board prefers horse in medallion and engraved letters on four-board horse fence
- 10) Other business--none
- 11) Adjournment