

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANT, ISSUES AND CONCERNS:

1. *The proposed use of stone on the front dormer is heavy and not consistent with the architectural style.*

Response:

All stone is removed from the design, please see exterior elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

2. *The entry is not consistent with Residential Design Guidelines 3.6.2 and 3.6.3, and the roof transition at the entry is awkward.*

Response:

Entry feature is removed, roof lines are adjusted per consultant's recommendations, please see exterior elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

3. *The use of stone on the front facade without carrying it consistently around the structure would not be consistent with Residential Design Guideline 3.2.2.*

Response:

All stone is removed from the design. All 4 sides of the house are now proposed to have cement plaster finish, consistent at all elevations, please see sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

4. *The corbel supports on the right side and rear facade projecting bay elements are good, but the detail is incomplete.*

Response:

A wood trim is added per consultant's recommendations, please see elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANT, RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. *Remove all stone facing and replace with materials to match the rest of the first floor.*

Response:

All stone is removed from the design, please see exterior elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

2. *Add board and batten siding on all second floor walls to match the similar existing material on the existing front floor facade.*

Response:

Per additional email correspondence with the city, and per architectural consultant's approval, all wood siding is removed from the design. All exterior walls are now proposed to have cement plaster finish, please see elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

3. *Replace the proposed tall entry form with an under the eave entry similar to the predominant entry type in the immediate neighborhood.*

Response:

Entry feature is removed, roof lines are adjusted per consultant's recommendations, please see exterior elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

4. *Lower applied roof segments on the left side and rear elevations to match the entry eave.*

Response:

Roof line is adjusted per consultant's recommendations, please see elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

5. *Add wood trim above the support corbels on both projecting pop out bays.*

Response:

A wood trim is added per consultant's recommendations, please see elevations on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.

ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANT, ADDITIONAL COURTESY RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. The right side elevation is drawn incorrectly. The front of the bay windows align with the garage face and the roof surfaces align in a single flat plane.

Response:

Drafting mistake is now fixed, please see exterior elevations on A3.2.

B. The placement of the bedroom adjacent to the entry is functionally poor as it relates to its location relative to the nearest bathroom, and that bathroom is only a powder room with no tub or shower. Functionally, the room is more like a Den or Home Office.

Response:

Homeowners are aware of that. This bedroom will indeed be used as an office. No changes made.

C. The very high ceiling over the Living Room is unusual for the Ranch Style of the house and will increase the visual bulk of the house.

Response:

In an effort to avoid visual bulk, this space is buried under the extension of the existing roof. No actual recommendation is made here, so no changes are made. Other recommendations are implemented, and per the consultant's report, implementing them would make the house "fit into the neighborhood comparable to the existing home at the nearby Calrester Drive intersection" (page 7).

D. The applicant should be aware that the drop ceiling over the Living Room is a bit too low relative to eye level on the second floor.

Response:

Homeowners are aware of that. This ceiling is kept at that height to keep it below the existing roof plane. No changes are made. All head-heights are compliant with building code.