



CITY OF PHILOMATH

980 Applegate Street
PO Box 400
Philomath, OR 97370
541-929-6148
541-929-3044 FAX
www.ci.philomath.or.us

Mission: To promote ethical and responsive municipal government which provides its citizenry with high quality municipal services in an efficient and cost effective manner.

PLANNING COMMISSION

September 21, 2020

6:00 p.m.

MEETING AGENDA

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. CALL TO ORDER | 5 min |
| 1.1. Roll call | |
| 1.2. Warm up Activity “good news” | |
| 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES | 5 min |
| 2.1. Aug 17, 2020 | |
| 3. REPORTS (as needed) | 10 min |
| 3.1. 2040 Advisory Committee update (Stein, Yoder) | |
| 3.2. Downtown Streetscapes (Conner) | |
| 4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS | 20 min |
| 4.1. Being better communicators | |
| 4.2. Results from our letters to the Council | |
| 4.3. Downtown Design Manual (Depa) | |
| 5. NEW BUSINESS | 10 min |
| 5.1. Council liaison (Bernardini) | |
| 6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES | 5 min |
| 6.1. Staff update (staff) | |
| 6.2. Proposed next meeting date: October 19 6:00 PM | |
| 7. COMMUNITY COMMENTS | 5 min |
| 8. ADJOURNMENT | |

Total 60 minutes

Reminder – If able, please help us save time by reading the draft minutes and emailing any corrections to Ashley before the meeting.

Meeting Access Information

This meeting is being held electronically via Zoom. Prior to the meeting, participants will be provided with the Zoom meeting link. Citizens may watch the live feed of the meeting on the City's public Facebook page at <https://www.facebook.com/cityofphilomath>. No Facebook account or login is required to access the page. Contact City Hall to make viewing arrangements if you do not have access to the internet.

NOTICE: Given 2 business days' notice, an interpreter will be made available for the hearing impaired or those with limited English proficiency. Contact person: Ruth Post, (541) 929-6148.

Point person: Bernardini

Time limit: 5 minutes

What is this all about?

We've received feedback from the community that we could be doing a better job of communicating with the public. Additionally, it is hard for the public to reach the Planning Commissioners.

During our August 17 meeting we discussed the possibility of asking Staff to provide more information on the City website. Mr. Workman stated that Staff did not have the resources to help at present. The City is however planning on a website revision. The Commission asked Joseph Sullivan to act as a point person to gather news that should be shared with the community.

Joseph had a talk with City attorney David Coulombe in which Mr. Coulombe explained that the Planning Commission is considering a difficult task since public communication can be seen as advocacy if conducted by a quasi-judicial body like a planning commission. Although in our case it was approved by the State, it is not normal (or easy) for the Planning Commission to also be the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI). This doesn't mean we can't do the job, but it does mean we have to be thoughtful.

In light of all this, Joseph created the website www.philomathcitizen.com as a private citizen and not as a formal act by the Planning Commission (unless the Commission desires otherwise). He intends to run it on a volunteer, not-for-profit basis to share public information until it becomes redundant with the new City website.

Objectives

1. Decide if anything further needs to be done, or not.

Notes:

Email from David Coulombe dated 9/16/2020

All:

I'm happy to provide support and explanation related to the proposed agenda items. Of course, that will take some time from the agenda and the important planning work to be done. Whether time is provided at this meeting or a future one, I would like to offer some advance guidance. As Joseph correctly noted, item 4.1 communication intentions will be difficult to put in practice for a body with quasi-judicial functions. That said, I do want to respond to the parenthetical thought that the Commission may formally adopt the website Joseph created for communication purposes. I need to be clear, the Commission may not. In addition to a host of public meeting and public record issues, here's the more thorough explanation:

First, the Planning Commission authority is not self-authorized, or self-initiated. Rather, it is subject to City Council direction. State law does not require a city to have a Planning Commission, but if a city does, then state law permits that commission to exercise limited authority. We need to be careful not to read permissiveness in the state law as mandate or state authorization not otherwise subject to City Council.

Second, the City has provided authority to the Commission when it adopted an ordinance expressing authority and limitations now codified at PMC 2.30.

PMC 2.30.060 provides:

The planning commission shall have the authority which is now or may hereafter be assigned to it by charter, ordinances, or resolutions of the city of Philomath and ORS 227.090, and other applicable state laws." Let's look at the identified state law.

That law--ORS 227.090, provides: (1) Except as otherwise provided by the city council, a city planning commission may:

(a) Recommend and make suggestions to the council and to other public authorities concerning: ***** [a host of topics]

Now let's consult local law. The City Council has "otherwise provided" in PMC 2.30.050 which says, in relevant part: "The commission may make and alter rules and regulations for its government and procedure consistent with laws of this state and city charter and ordinances." In that same section, the City Council said: "The city council shall assign to the commission an office or headquarters in which to hold its meetings, transact its business and keep its records." The City Council has assigned a meeting location for the Commission to transact business and keep its records.

In conclusion, unless the City Council were to amend local law, the Commission is not empowered to transact its business and keep its records in private email accounts or a Commission endorsed or adopted alternative website.

Recognizing the existence of this same hierarchal structure, provides guidance to item 5.1 Council liaison. The Commission should note that it has no authority to demand a role or place at the Council table. The Commission could decide it would like to have a member attend and report back to the body

information gleaned at Council meetings. It would seem to me to be more beneficial to utilize the liaison the Council has provide to the Commission. That liaison can provide information from the Council and make reports to or ask question this body seeks answer to from the Council.

I hope this sheds some light on these two agenda items.

David

Point person: Sullivan

Time limit: 5 minutes

What is this all about?

We've sent several communiqués to the City Council and have not received any reply. What now?

- June 15 letter listing the goals stated by council members and requesting any corrections
- July 20 letter requesting the Council address the City Manager's behavior
- Same July 20 letter requesting further action on the discontinued TGM grant

Objectives

1. Decide date, if any, for further action(s)

Background / How to prepare

Joseph will be emailing Mayor Niemann to see if there is any progress and will share the results.

Notes:

City Manager Response to 4.2 "Results from our letters to the Council"

This submittal is in response to Mr. Sullivan's request to prepare a written statement about the TGB debacle. As shown in the excerpts below, the City Council and Planning Commission were more than aware of the intent to proceed with the DLCD Technical Assistance grant back in November, and there has never been an attempt to mislead the Commission otherwise.

Letter from City Councilor Ruth Causey providing a timeline of events:

From: Ruth Causey <Ruth.Causey@philomathoregon.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2020 9:52 AM
To: Chris Workman <Chris.Workman@philomathoregon.gov>
Cc: Eric Niemann <Eric.Niemann@philomathoregon.gov>; Joan Swanson <Joan.Swanson@philomathoregon.gov>
Subject: TGM Code Assistance Program

Good Morning Chris,

After last night's meeting of the Planning Commission, I recalled a discussion by the City Council of the TGM Code Assistance Program and the thought that it was not well suited for Philomath. This morning I reviewed my City Council meeting materials in an effort to determine when that discussion took place. I believe it was prior to or during the October 14 work session of the City Council. I am copying Joan because I know she is involved with the City's grant application process and recall her making comments very similar to the ones you made last night. I have attempted to reconstruct a timeline of the related events.

August 12, 2019 City Council meeting - the TGM Code Assistance Program is introduced and discussed. (Agenda item E-05). Council unanimously moves to instruct staff to apply for the grant.

September 9, 2019 City Council meeting - the City Manager suggests and Council agrees to a work session on October 14 to discuss the Streetscapes Project. (City Manager Staff Report)

October 14, 2019 City Council Work Session on the Downtown Streetscapes Project.

October 14, 2019 City Council meeting - the Council unanimously moves to establish the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee and adopt resolution 19-12 supporting Oregon DLCD Technical Assistance Grant. (Agenda items I-3 and J-1).

November 12, 2019 - Lori Gibbs submits a written request from the Planning Commission to the Council to postpone the decision on agenda item H-01 (Formation of 2040 Comprehensive Plan Advisory Group) until the November 25 City Council meeting. This request was read by Peggy Yoder and honored by the Council and Staff. The request also congratulates the Council on resolution 19-12, but makes no mention of the TGM Code Assistance Program.

It would seem that any concerns regarding the TGM Code Assistance Program should have been raised in conjunction with the Planning Commission's November 12 request, not seven months later. Nonetheless, in the interest of transparency I would like to suggest a quarterly report to City Council by the Director of Finance specifically listing grants considered by the City, those discarded and why, those applied for and the status. Hopefully this would not create an undue burden for the Finance department.

There may be other Councilors who recall the discussion of the TGM Assistance Program. I will defer to you and Mayor Niemann as to whether further discussion of that issue is warranted, but I would like to ask that the above request be considered at the June [July] 13 Council meeting.

Thank you for your consideration. Feel free to call me if you would like to discuss this.

Sincerely,

Ruth Causey
Philomath City Council

Excerpts from Meeting Minutes and Packets:

PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

June 15, 2020

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS & STAFF UPDATES

6.1 Staff Updates - Mr. Depa discussed the concept of a downtown design manual. He explained that the manual would list code specific to building designs and the theme that is chosen. He explained that this manual would allow the Planning Commission to enforce the code to ensure congruence. He discussed the Planning Commission gathering information on elements of designs from other cities that they would like to present to the public.

Commissioner Yoder asked about what happened with the staff meeting with Laura Beuhl to discuss her involvement and partnership with the downtown design.

MOTION: Commissioner Yoder moved, Chair Sullivan second, to have City staff answer the question of what happened at the August meeting when they were requested to use Laura Beuhl's offer. Motion APPROVED 6-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Conner, Bernardini; No: None).

Note that staff was not asked to explain what had happened to the TGM program, the Commission jumped right to passing a motion to ask the question.

PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

June 29, 2020

4.2 Inquiry, Action on Transportation Problems - Mr. Workman discussed that the Department of Land and Conservation Development approached the city with an offer for a free program to review and do an audit of the development code. He explained that after discussing that offer with Mr. Depa, they both agreed that it would be a good idea discuss and pursue with the Planning Commission. He explained that the idea was then presented to the City Council. He explained that after his and Mr. Depa's review of the model development code from DLCD, they determined that it seemed metro-centric and tailored more to larger cities with larger downtown areas. He explained that he and Mr. Depa felt they could develop a better fitting development code tailored to the city. He explained that the opportunity to first get the comprehensive plan updated came up, and then the focus could be to draft the development code so that it matches the goals and policies in the updated comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Yoder read from August City Council meeting minutes and explained a motion addressed by the City Council granting authority to city staff to apply for the TGM Assistance grant and work with the Planning Commission to update the city's development code.

Mr. Workman explained that he would go back to the City Council and explain his reservations on moving forward with the DLCD program.

Commissioner Yoder explained that she spoke with Laura Beuhl at DLCD and that Ms. Beuhl explained that she was anticipating working with the city but had not heard from staff.

Mr. Depa discussed writing a development code that would regulate commercial districts in the downtown area. He explained that city staff, at the time the grant from DLCD was offered, was unsure of whether or not the budget would allow for a comprehensive plan update, which needed to be done before the development code. He explained that the correct order of process is to first update the comprehensive plan and then follow with the development code, never the opposite. He explained that with city staff experience and the help of the Planning Commission, a more tailored development code can be written for the city instead of using model code from DLCD.

Commissioner Yoder explained that Ms. Beuhl works with cities that have extremely old comprehensive plans and that bringing in a professional who is offering free services may help alleviate staff hours.

Mr. Depa explained that as a professional himself with several years of experience, his participation with the current state of Philomath provides a more insightful perspective allowing for a more customized development code.

Chair Sullivan asked Mr. Depa to review DLCD's sample development code again.

Mr. Workman explained that the current priority is updating the comprehensive plan and ensuring policies are set in place before a development code is written. He stated that the grant being discussed currently is not the same program that was spoken about a year ago when originally presented. The original program was to review and audit the current development code and staff chose to pass on that program so that the comprehensive plan could be updated

first. He explained that when the city finishes updating the comprehensive plan and ensuring policies are set in place, they will then be ready to move forward with DLCD and the development code.

Mr. Workman explained that the City Council has directed him to now work on a comprehensive plan grant and that he will not be able to work on both grants at the same time. The comprehensive plan grant must come first.

There was discussion of a letter being drafted by Commissioner Yoder to the City Council, that would explain that Mr. Workman did not notify the Planning Commission or City Council that he was halting on pursuing the Transportation Growth Management grant.

Note that the discussion surrounded the timing and lack of notification to the Commission and City Council that the decision had been made to not pursue the TGM code audit program. There is no mention of poor behavior or dishonesty.

PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES July 17, 2020

5.2 Inquiry – Action on TGM offer

There was discussion of the letter presented by Commissioner Yoder.

MOTION: Commissioner Boggs moved, Commissioner Stein second to send the letter to the City Council for discussion. Motion APPROVED 7-0 (Yes: Sullivan, Conner, Boggs, Stein, Yoder, Bernardini, Gay; No: None).

Note that staff was not asked to explain what had happened to the TGM program, the Commission jumped right to passing a motion approving the letter to the Council.

PHILOMATH CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES August 10, 2020

I. **COUNCIL REPORTS**

1. Councilor Causey – Councilor Causey reviewed the Planning Commission’s concerns regarding a Transportation Growth Management grant that the Commission had supported applying for as outlined in the letter from the Planning Commission included in the agenda packet. She stated she has requested the City Manager generate a list of grant applications that have been applied for on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Workman described the timeline of having originally gotten approval of the code review grant followed immediately by the comprehensive plan grants that provided for the update of the comprehensive plan. He agreed that the request for a quarterly update of grants is a good suggestion. He discussed communications with the Council regarding the grant status and the decision not to pursue the TGM grant. Councilor Causey agreed that the current project load would not support pursuing the TGM grant at this time. There was discussion

about tracking grants and applications. There was discussion about bringing the topic back to the next meeting.

Note that the Council discussed the topic in full, and no reprimand was given. A new grant tracking chart is to be provided with future financial quarterly reports.

The only time staff was asked to explain what happened with the TGM grant was at the June 29 meeting of the Planning Commission. A full explanation was provided at that time. There has never been an effort to mislead or lie to the Planning Commission or the City Council, and to use inflammatory and reckless statements that question my integrity in the Agenda Item Detail for this meeting is inexcusable.

At worst, I failed to circle back with the Planning Commission to let them know this was happening; however, as Councilor Causey pointed out, the Commission was aware of this change in direction back in November and there was no confusion at that time.

Point person: None

Time limit: 15 minutes

What is this all about?

Our city planner, Patrick Depa, would like to create a Downtown Design Manual. He is hoping that the final version will be enforceable. Tonight he will be presenting his views and asking for our feedback. Patrick has indicated that he will presenting pieces of his proposal over several meetings.

(Mr. Depa is invited to take the floor)

Objectives

1. Listen to the presentation
2. Give guidance to Mr. Depa

Background / How to prepare

Read the related information previously provided by Mr. Depa

Notes:

FAÇADE AND SITE GUIDELINES

Except as otherwise noted, new and renovated buildings and facades along Main Street (Hwy 20/34) and Applegate Avenue between from 12th Street and 15th Street shall comply with the following requirements:

A. Building Entrances.

Building entrances shall follow the following guidelines:

1. All buildings shall have at least one public, pedestrian entrance that faces the main street on the frontage line and is accessible (see Americans with Disabilities ACT, ADA) from the public sidewalk system.
2. All buildings shall retain the original building entrance, if historically accurate.
3. Rear and side entrances are permitted, only if there is a primary entrance from frontage of the main street.
4. Entrances with recessed doors are encouraged for protection from the elements and from doors swinging out into the sidewalk area.
5. Doors:
 - a. Doors shall use transparent glass.
 - b. Doors, measuring between seven (7) and eight (8) feet high are strongly suggested. Doors measuring 6'-8" high and over shall have a glass transom with a minimum height of twelve (12) inches.
 - c. Front entrance doors shall be constructed out of wood, glass, steel, and fiberglass or as approved by the City of Philomath, provided it is compatible with the character of the district.

- d. Aluminum store fronts are prohibited.
- e. The building entry may be either centered or off-centered.
- f. Entrances must be barrier-free and accessible to persons with disabilities.

B. Building Placement.

The placement of buildings shall follow these guidelines:

- 1. Buildings should be built to the main front yard setback, or the average setback of other buildings on the block as determined by the City of Philomath Design Committee.
- 2. A side setback is subject to Zoning Variance.
- 3. The setback requirements may be adjusted where strict adherence would serve no good purpose or where the overall intent would be better served by allowing an alternative setback, provided the conditions listed in a. through c. below are found to exist. Such modification may be made by the Design Committee, or whomever is designated by future Zoning Ordinance Amendments, if all of the following are found to exist:
 - a. That a modification in setback, or variance of a setback altogether, will not impair the health, safety or general welfare of the City as related to the use of the premises or adjacent premises;
 - b. That variance of the setback along a common parcel line between two premises would result in a more desirable relationship between a proposed building and an existing building; and,
 - c. The adherence to a minimum required setback would result in the establishment of non-usable land area that could

create maintenance problems.

C. Building Height and Mass.

The various elements of building heights shall be as follows:

1. The minimum height of all new buildings shall be two (2) stories or 24 feet.
2. The maximum height of a two (2) story building shall be 34 feet.
3. The minimum height of a three (3) story building shall be 35 feet.
4. The maximum height of a three (3) story building shall be 46 feet.
5. The City of Philomath may allow the construction or renovation of a one story building if the architectural style includes a parapet or other appropriate architectural embellishments that are compatible with adjacent buildings. In such instances, the Design Committee may allow the minimum height of the one story building to be 18 feet in height. All stories shall contain habitable commercial, office, or residential spaces.
6. First floor height of all 2 story buildings or greater shall be a minimum of twelve (12) feet.
7. A transition or expression line shall be provided between the first and second stories.
8. Height Exceptions: Special architectural features (e.g. corner towers cupolas, entry treatments, chimneys, steeples, belfries, turrets, flagpoles, parapet walls, etc.) will be allowed to exceed the above height requirements if:
 - a. The feature is located at a corner (the intersection of two public right(s)-of-way); or,
 - b. The building is located at a designated “gateway”; or,

- c. The feature is deemed to be necessary to the type, use, or style of the building in question.
- d. Special architectural features shall not exceed the height of the remainder of the building by more than thirty-five percent (35%).
- e. The height of any new building shall not exceed the height of any immediately adjacent new or existing two story or three story building by more than fifteen percent (15%) unless the building is on a significant corner property and is approved by the Design Committee.

D. Front Facade Design.

All building facades that face a street shall conform to the following design criteria:

1. Street Face: Walls facing a public street shall include windows and architectural features customarily found on the front façade of a building such as awnings, cornice work edge detail or decorative finish materials. Blank walls shall not face a public street. Significant protrusions (more than 6"), such as awnings, cornice lines, details at the top of windows and sills are encouraged to create shadow lines or bands on the façade. Any building that terminates a view shall provide distinct and prominent architectural features of enhanced character and visibility to reflect the importance of the building's location.
2. Storefront Opening: The storefront opening shall be a rectangular opening ten (10') feet to twelve (12') feet high and approximately seventy (70%) of the width of the storefront or bay. The opening shall be almost entirely glass (window or showcases) with few subdivisions. The

glass framing system shall be wood or metal (aluminum or pre-painted steel). Recessed openings are encouraged.

3. Facade Pattern: Large, long facades shall be subdivided into bays, through the location and arrangement of openings and architectural treatments that are compatible in size and scale to existing buildings. The maximum wall length without modulation shall be thirty feet (30'). The bay width shall be 16'-to 30'.
4. Facade Height to Width Ratio:
 - a. One-story buildings: Single bay facades or individual bays of multiple bay facades, are not to exceed 1:2 without the Design Committee's approval.
 - b. Two-story buildings: Single bay facades or individual bays of multiple bay facades, are not to exceed 1:1 without the Design Committee's approval.
5. Roof Type: Many of the commercial roof configurations in the corridor are "flat" (less than 3:1 roof slope) with parapets that conceal the roof itself:
 - a. Existing flat roofs and parapets shall be maintained.
 - b. All new retail/office buildings shall have flat roofs and parapets.
 - c. Sloping roofs, gabled (6:12) or hipped may be allowed as special architectural features, particularly for residential townhouse development subject to review and approval by the Design Committee.
 - d. Parapets may be stepped.
 - e. Mansard roofs, geodesic domes and A frames are prohibited.

6. Fenestration or Window and Door Openings: All facades visible from the street must be glazed with transparent glass. Opaque glass applications are prohibited. Glazing on first floor (retail space) to occur generally 1'—to 2'-6" above the finished floor. Thus, a minimum 1'—to 2'-6" bulkhead is required beneath a storefront display window. Façade glass areas shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. First floor window area: minimum 40% of façade to 70% maximum.
 - b. Second floor window area: minimum 25% of façade to 60% maximum.
 - c. Butt-joint glazing is prohibited.
 - d. The use of shutters is discouraged on commercial buildings.
 - e. Mullion systems are encouraged.
 - f. Windows and doorways shall be integrally designed.
 - g. Façade openings including windows, doors, porches and colonnades shall be vertical in proportion.
 - h. Sliding doors and windows are prohibited along frontage lines. Roll up windows may be allowed subject to approval by the Design Committee.

7. Building Materials:
 - a. Buildings: The buildings are to be constructed from permanent materials that will weather handsomely over time, such as brick, stone, masonry, or other natural materials. The use of bare metal, aluminum or vinyl siding, mirrored glass and plastic shall not

be allowed. Imitation stucco (Dry-Vit, Sto-Wall, E.I.F.S. and other brands) shall not be allowed below 11' height. Imitation stucco type products may be allowed above 11' in height with special approval by the Design Committee provided the architecture is in character with the district. The use of metal panels, wood siding, and cement board siding are generally discouraged but may be allowed by the Design Committee if the architecture is in keeping with the character of the district.

- b. Facade Frame: The facade frame, or wall, shall be brick or stone masonry constructed principally in a single plane. The top of the parapet wall shall be flat or step slightly to accentuate end piers unless a sloped roof is permitted by the Design Committee. The facade frame shall be capped by a stone coping. Brick or stone shall be laid primarily in running bond with decorative detail.
 - i. Brick: Shall be standard modular brick with common tooled mortar joints. Untooled joints, or irregular shaped brick are prohibited. Brick color (commonly red or tan) and texture (smooth or glazed to rough) shall be subject to review and approval by the Design Committee. Decorative CMU or stucco may be used, subject to review and approval by the Design Committee, on rear or side facades.
 - ii. Stone: Stone materials shall be smooth finish stone (limestone or sandstone). The stone shall be light to medium buff color. Pre-cast limestone manufactured to simulate traditional limestone

or sandstone may be used with the Design Committee's approval.

- iii. Metal: Aluminum or painted sheet steel may be permitted after review and approval by the Design Committee. Color and finish shall coordinate with that of the window framing system.

c. Parapet Cap:

- i. Brick: The brick shall be standard modular brick with common tooled mortar joints. Untooled joints or irregular shaped brick are prohibited. Brick color (commonly red or tan) and texture (smooth or glazed to rough) shall be subject to review and approval by the Design Committee. Decorative CMU or stucco may be used, subject to review and approval by the Design Committee, on rear or side facades.
- ii. Stone: The stone shall be smooth finish stone (limestone or sandstone). The stone shall be light to medium buff color. Pre-cast limestone to simulate traditional limestone or sandstone may be used with the Design Committee's approval.
- iii. Metal: Metal shall be aluminum or painted sheet steel if permitted after review and approval by the Design Committee. The color and finish shall match that of window framing system.

- d. Storefront Opening:
 - i. Framing System: Wood is preferable, however, aluminum or pre-painted steel storefront glazing system is acceptable.
 - ii. Glass: Glass shall be clear. Reflective, mirror, heavily tinted, or unusually colored glass is prohibited.
- e. Canopies:
 - i. Fascia Trim: Fascia trim shall be natural finish aluminum, bronze or painted metal.
 - ii. Soffit: The soffit shall be metal or cement plaster.
 - iii. Support Rods: The support rods shall be metal.
Design: Canopies shall be narrow in elevation, six inches (6") to twelve (12") and flat or slightly angled. Typically, the canopies shall be flat or slightly angled so that the overall height dimension does not exceed eighteen inches (18"). Canopies shall be self-supporting or supported by tension rods. Canopy projections shall be limited to forty-eight inches (48").
- f. Awnings:
 - i. Design: Awnings shall be traditional in design and must be made from fabric or similar material, rather than metal, plastic or rigid fiberglass. Awnings shall not be made of high gloss, shiny or translucent materials.
 - ii. Size: Awnings shall be proportional to the window opening and compatible in height, length, depth and bulk with the building façade. Awnings shall not obscure the architectural features of the building but

rather the awnings shall respect the overall building façade.

- iii. Shape: An awning that is triangular in section sloping outward and down from the top of the awning or half round is generally preferred. The Design Committee may approve other awning shapes, such as round top, box or other unusual shapes, where such shape is appropriate to the integral architectural design of the façade.
- iv. Frame: The frame shall be a traditional historic frame. Wood or metal support structures shall be painted or bronzed. Fabric:
- v. Fabric shall be standard cloth fabrics in either solid, stripe or patterns.
- vi. Color: Color shall be a solid through color with the underside of the awning the same color as the exposed face. A maximum of 3 colors on the awning shall be allowed. Awning colors must be complementary and compatible with the building façade.
- vii. Location: Awnings shall not cover distinctive architectural features of the building façade. All awnings shall be attached directly to the building, rather than supported by columns or poles. First floor awnings shall not be located higher than the midpoint between the highest level of the first floor and the window sill of the second floor. First floor awnings may

encroach upon the frontage line but must avoid street trees and must provide a minimum clearance of eight (8') feet of vertical clearance from the sidewalk surface grade.

Awnings must also be setback a minimum of two (2') feet from the road curb. Upper floor awnings shall be permitted only on vertically proportioned windows, provided the awning is only the width of the window and encroaches on the frontage line no more than three (3') feet and is not used as a back lit sign.

- viii. Lighting: Internally illuminated or back-lit awnings are prohibited.
- ix. Awning Signage: Awnings with lettering, symbols and/or other graphics shall be considered signage and shall be subject to the City's signage regulations.
- g. Balconies, Railings and Porch Structures: Balconies, railings and porch structures shall be metal, stone, wood or pre-cast limestone.
- h. Windows:
 - i. Front facing windows shall be clear glass, not reflective or tinted glass or plexi-glass. Side and rear facing windows may be faux, to break up long building facades if appropriate, after review and approval by the Design Committee.
 - ii. Second story windows shall maintain the height and width of the original historic window openings.

- iii. Window muttons shall be wood or metal and shall be painted or bronzed.
- iv. Curtains or blinds may be permissible subject to review and approval by the Design Committee.
- v. Window opening shall not be blocked or covered with a solid material.
- i. Security Systems:
 - i. Security systems shall not cover distinctive architectural features on the façade.
 - ii. Laminated glass or security film must be installed on the inside of the window or door glass.
 - iii. Security bars, solid metal security gates or solid roll-down windows shall be prohibited.
 - iv. Link or grill type security devices shall be permitted only if installed from inside, within the window or door frames. With special permission by the Design Committee, link or grill type security devices may be installed on the outside if the coil box is recessed and concealed behind the building wall. Security grills shall be recessed and concealed during normal business hours. Models that provide a sense of transparency, in light colors, are encouraged. Other types of security devices fastened to the exterior walls are prohibited. The preferred location for the link or grill type of security system is behind the window

display so merchandise is still visible after hours.

- v. Burglar alarms or security cameras shall not be visible from the street.
 - vi. Any exterior security lighting shall be installed per the Lighting Section of these Design Guidelines and must meet the lighting requirements of the City.
8. Building Colors: Exterior colors shall be compatible with the colors on adjacent buildings and subject to review by the Design Committee. Proposed colors shall be specified on the plans. Traditional paint colors are encouraged and typically no more than three colors shall be used without permission from the Design Committee. Gaudy or fluorescent colors are prohibited. The painting of brick or stone is not encouraged. The removal of paint on building surfaces is encouraged but must be performed in such a way that the original masonry and mortar is not damaged.
9. Air Conditioners and other Utility Systems: Air conditioning units shall not be permitted on the front façade of any building or building façade where there is a pedestrian entry. Air conditioning units on side or rear walls shall be flush with the building walls and screened with decorative grills. In no instance shall the air conditioning drain onto walkways.
10. Mechanical Equipment: Roof top mechanical equipment shall be hidden from view from adjacent properties and from the rights-of-way.

E. Side and Rear Façade Design.

Whenever a side or rear façade is visible from a public street, or if parking is located at the side or rear of the building, the façade shall be designed to create a pleasing appearance, in accordance with the following design criteria:

1. Design: Rear and side storefronts shall be similarly designed as front facades described above.
2. Parapet: If a parapet is used, the top of the parapet wall shall be flat or stepped slightly to accentuate end piers. If no parapet is used, downspouts shall be located at the outer sides of the facades, not in the middle of the façade.
3. Materials: Materials and architectural features similar to those present on the front of the building shall be used on the side or rear façade. Acceptable materials include brick, stone and precast limestone. Decorative CMU (concrete masonry unit) or stucco may be permitted with permission by the Design Committee. The buildings are to be constructed from permanent materials that will weather handsomely over time, such as brick, stone, masonry, or other natural materials. The use of bare metal, aluminum or vinyl siding, mirrored glass and plastic shall not be allowed. Imitation stucco (Dry-Vit, Sto-Wall, E.I.F.S. and other brands) shall not be allowed below 11' height. Imitation stucco type products may be allowed above 11' height with special Design Committee's approval provided the architecture is in character with the historic nature of the district. The use of metal panels, wood siding, and cement board siding are generally discouraged but may be allowed by the Design Committee if the architecture is in keeping with the historic nature of the district.
4. Service Areas: Trash receptacle and service areas shall be completely screened with landscaping, a fence, a wall, or a combination thereof.

5. Open Space: Open areas shall be landscaped with lawn, ground cover, ornamental shrubs and trees. On every site involving new development or redevelopment, foundation plantings adjacent to the building may be required at the discretion of the Design Committee. The species and design shall be identical to or compatible with the landscaping schematic for the approved Streetscape.
6. Streetscape: The area within the right-of-way between the curb and building shall be identical to or compatible with the approved streetscape scheme.
7. Roof Top Mechanical Equipment: Roof top mechanical equipment shall be hidden from view from adjacent properties and from the rights-of-way.

Point person: Bernardini

Time limit: 10 minutes

What is this all about?

Councilor Causey has been graciously attending our meetings as a council liaison. Do we want to have one of our members attend Council meetings for the same purpose?

Objectives

1. Decide whether we want to take action on this matter

Background / How to prepare

Notes: