

September 19, 2018 CAC Meeting Notes/Minutes

Recap: Staff moving forward with 200 ft area of adjacency, promote design variability, improve code language

Code Improvements - work through these standard by standard, find consensus. Start with **Massing/Articulation**.

Cameron: Existing stepback is a 35% angle. A simplified idea would be a ten foot average stepback—would not require exact angle. It would be an average of ten feet so some places could be zero feet and some twenty feet. Want some variability to avoid bathtub ring effect.

Per: How similar is ten feet to the 35 degree angle?

Cameron: It is similar. We are trying to avoid just having a ten-foot stepback on every building at the same story.

Maren: With that in mind, also have the contextual height stepback.

Cameron: This allows for transition from smaller existing buildings to taller buildings. The stepback would be required at the allowable height. Canyon District is where we will see this happen most often because of the allowable height differences between different sides of the street. We are only looking at public streets, not alleys.

Per: I think this makes sense from a preservation sense.

Maren: After our conversations, it seems like we are looking at not doing the 10 ft stepback as a historic preservation add on.

Per: Originally, the 10 ft stepback was a response to a proposed zero stepback.

Meg: Since it is an average, they could theoretically go 20 ft back somewhere else and be up against the historic building. We need to make sure historic building protected.

Maren: We do have something about that in the massing and building articulation for our codes. This add-on will force people to address historic building. Relying on adverse effect definition in Municipal Code.

Matt: If you stay true to the adverse effect definition then it is based on eligibility and would be good.

Chris: Have you ever had great debate about adverse effect? (Karen, no, example would be Cortina)

Per: Not just a height issue, this is about proportions.

James: Good point about needing separate stepback to project adjacent.

Tom: Downtown code is only streets; Historic code is for streets and alleys.

Matt: Elizabeth Hotel as an example? Does it still work? (Meg, yes.)

Tom: The way it is written now, it would require setback along all historic buildings so it could be the whole elevation.

Meg: How about changing it to be across perpendicular alleys?

Chris: So not a back alley, but a side alley.

Tom: That would help clarify.

Chris: Would that be here or in DDS?

Maren: That would be us in 3.4.7. We'll think through language, but understand intent. We are not adding in setback about 10 ft. Should we get away from "minimize adverse effect" language?

Chris: Is this a purpose statement or standard?

Maren: Vagueness makes it a purpose statement.

Per: Do not need a required setback to achieve massing strategies.

Maren: Alright, we will flag this and re-visit. Moving on, more about massing and articulation with maximum wall length.

Chris: I think these work well, obviously don't want either alone, but this is a good start.

Maren: No issues with that one? Okay. Moving on to **building materials**.

Cameron: We made a slight amendment to Downtown building base materials (read aloud).
Emphasizing materials that can be repaired.

Matt: If we have a situation where a wood, lap sided house next to office building, is the expectation that we are actually putting wood, lap siding on the building?

Cameron: No, we are not mandating having the same kind of material.

Chris: I don't understand the "and" portion.

Maren: It is now obsolete with Cameron's addition of human scale in his portion.

Per: That "pre-cast material" is troubling.

Meg: What about something that matches pattern of historic materiality? There's more to it than just the material, it's about how it is applied to. We can add pattern to the list.

Maren: Add pattern and dimension to address comments on dimensionality.

Matt: How do we treat glass? Or is it part of solid to void ratio? Many downtown buildings actually have glass as dominant material. Is that okay?

Maren: It is about dominant overall building material, not just façade material.

Conversation about glass being appropriate: Chris, Matt, and Meg.

Chris: First sentence concerning—making something be the same material?

Matt: No, opens up opportunity to change as well.

Chris: Adding dimension and pattern?

Per: Dimension instead of “texture.”

Matt: Seeking clarity: if something went in where Perennial Gardener, I just want to make sure we’re talking about finished materials i.e. glass and wood rather than brick.

James: Thinks windows and doors should be excluded from definition of “primary building material”

Chris: in urban setting, front elevation is most important; backside doesn’t matter because we can’t see those other sides.

Per: Yes, you could make a completely glass building there; using different types of glass. You could easily do an all glass building.

Meg: Still unknown, if First National has two predominate materials, are we making them reference one or both of those materials? Are we just saying one predominate? Need to make that clear.

Chris: We don’t want just one material up for three floors.

Maren: Intention needs to be clear that we’re allowing flexibility.

Meg: Why two out of five?

Maren: One was not enough, three was too many.

Meg: Unsure if Ginger and Baker addition would fit new standards.

Matt: Worried EIFS could be allowed rather than hard stucco; separation of the word authentic and stucco might allow for people to use fake stucco.

Maren: Moving on to **façade details**. Historic addition for codes asks for at least of the following, use exist design references and use of sills and lintels similar to abutting if appropriate.

Per: So cornice, corbels, etc. don’t have to align to sometime. Horizontal detail is important, and it probably relates to old building.

Chris: Why don’t we have these as five options, rather than a pick one and two mandatory?

Per: Window patterning is just a strong reference to historic buildings. Doesn't think sills and lintels need to be on there. Horizontal or vertical reference lines as a separate standard.

Matt: Looking at façade standards, could Ginger and Baker be approved?

Per: The horizontal references are there and the planes being referenced.

Chris: This gives the designer options.

Karen: Going back to what Matt asked—would Ginger and Baker meet the following: --

Per: Yes, similar window pattern.

Karen: Horizontal or vertical references?

Per: Yes, definitely.

Chris: Base matching, horizontal references there.

Maren: We haven't talked about this, but for non-abutting category (within 200 ft, not abutting) do we want a façade detail category for those buildings?

Chris: Either same rules or none. Third option would be saying you can do one of the following OR horizontal/vertical references.

Per: yes, that makes sense, should be less restrictive.

Maren: Would windows be enough?

Chris: The hard part for me is the limitations by saying just windows, especially when it could be parcels away.

Matt: Could set up incompatibility for block face; we have to think about future historic resources. Take this out of historic code and make sure architectural compatibility is addressed with Cameron's code.

Per: Argues for windows, at the very least should be window pattern. Does not feel saying none is sufficient. Three parcels away isn't that far away. Doing windows is easy.

Matt: Feels that philosophically we have an issue because now we're ignoring that abutting building.

Anita: Not sure what else to add.

James: Doesn't think we don't need to have area of adjacency standards for this category. Not sure where that leaves him with Uncommon/Armstrong situation though.

Matt: Windows still seems too restrictive. Think of River District—couldn't match window patterns for a residential property. Windows are too narrow. Needs to have a broader option. I don't understand our fixation on just windows.

Chris: Especially within a 200 ft boundary.

Matt: I think you need something in 200 ft buffer, but not something so specific.

Chris: suggest some sort of typology, even if it is eclectic just pick.

Meg: Giving them an option between being compatible with massing and articulation OR building materials or façade details OR historic features OR building typology.

Chris: Yes, include typology.

Maren: Going back to Matt's initial comment—windows were chosen because that's one of the strongest character defining features on historic buildings.

Brian: We have all these what ifs, what if someone just comes in with a bad design? Are we going for check box approach or excellence? With so much variety, it's hard to keep excellence standard with check boxes.

Matt: I think doing the "or" for the 200 ft does get to my point.

Maren: I'm just wondering if this would even impact design enough to continue trying to use the buffer.

Karen: Next meeting, please bring in examples of non-compatible buildings, let's talk real life examples.

Matt: I think we definitely need the buffer.

Meg: Pick two out of all the categories.

Chris: I agree with Meg.

Matt: I don't think it would be a waste of time, we leave it open to interpretation, but also provide guidance to acknowledge Maren's comment.

Matt: Language of visibility of historic features does not reflect intent. Work on that.

Karen: Next, let's broaden this to neighborhoods. What happens when we have a neighborhood of small, flat roofed one-story buildings, but now we have proposed 3-5 stories next to it.

Chris: For question of height of existing, you should consider using building department's story.

Karen: Have we addressed this for neighborhoods?

Meg: We need an example of an infill property that has adjacent properties, but not abutting. We need to have real life examples.