

MINUTES

Historic Preservation Code Review: Citizen Advisory Committee

October 4, 2017

Members Attending: Matt Robenalt, Anita Rehner, Meg Dunn, Per Hogestad, Sarah Payne, Brian Cooke, Jennifer Carpenter, Chris Aronson, Steve Schroyer, Leslie Williams, James MacDowell, Sherry Albertson-Clark

Staff: Karen McWilliams, Cassandra Bumgarner, Maren Bzdek, Tom Leeson, Anna Simpkin, Brad Yatabe, Spencer Branson, Pete Wray

- I. General Questions/Comments about Clarion's white paper
 - **Clarify that review is of the exterior of designated Landmarks, and does not include interior work**
 - Difference between Certificate of Appropriateness and Report of Acceptability is that CoA (Certificate of Appropriateness/Acceptability/Approval) is standardized language throughout the field.
 - **General agreement that Certificate of Approval would be ideal phrasing**
 - **General agreement that Landmark Alteration Review fits the process much better than Design Review**
- II. Review of Design Review and Infill in Historic Districts
 - Decision matrix: CAC favorable to matrices; matrices help clarify process.
 - **Develop decision matrices for each of the various review process.**
 - Discussion about historic paint colors
 - Design standards for murals and paint
 - Paint colors and color schemes are important as twofold: could obscure character defining features, and concerns about application onto historic materials
 - With paint and murals, must consider location and materials
 - Must be reviewed on case-by-case basis
 - Discussion about how paint can impact neighborhood compatibility
 - Historic colors vs any choice of colors
 - **Develop decision matrices for paint and for murals. Paint colors should be part of the decision matrix; approval on case-by-case**
 - Question of murals and how those differ from paint
 - Content of murals may be protected by freedom of speech, but appropriateness of paint/materials on historic materials or covering historic features is what LPC reviews
 - **Considerations for murals matrix: % of building covered? Which elevation? Does it minimize/obscure character defining features? How applied to building? Historic colors? Reversibility and material preservation key points.**
 - Design Review Process – Commission Review
 - Discussion about appropriateness of having conceptual design review be optional. DDA limits conceptual reviews to just 1.
 - **General support for making conceptual review optional. Support for offering multiple conceptual reviews. Conceptual review comments and staff recommendations presented at Final Review**
 - **Direction to explore allowing conditional approvals in code for LPC like P&Z does**

- **Offer Design Review Subcommittee meetings as alternate option; LPC members who participate in Design Review Subcommittee should be allowed to participate in Final Review, as done with DDA**
- Notification: Main concern with posting as “conceptual/final” or similar is public missing opportunity for comment because they do not understand that it could be final.
Investigate options.
- Design Review Standards
 - Clarion suggested adopting specific criteria for demolition of designated resources
 - The answer should always be no, except in cases of non-contributing buildings in districts; non-contributing should be reviewed same as infill in district
 - **CAC agrees; general support for Clarion suggestions**
- Design Review Standards – Compatible Infill
 - General support for developing specific Standards for each Landmark district (currently have for Historic Old Town, but not for Sheely or Whitcomb). **Develop district specific design standards**
 - Issue that needs resolution is if there is conflict between compatibility in Chapter 14 and in LUC 3.4.7
 - Does LUC 3.4.7 require replication? No, same language used in both codes.
Make both codes clear that literal replication is not desired, nor is great divergence; what is desired is invention within a style, and abstract reference to context.
 - Height is an issue for all codes, incorrect assumption that all buildings will be taller
 - **Need resolution between compatibility and height allowances**
 - Clarity needed in definitions of compatibility; forthcoming Clarion white paper
 - General questions about Design Review Subcommittee
 - Do they recuse themselves? (Yes)
 - How does knowledge in that meeting get conveyed to full LPC later? (Through staff reports)