



**DOWNTOWN HISTORIC DISTRICT – DESIGN GUIDELINES UPDATE  
AD HOC ADVISORY GROUP MEETING**

**Summary**

**March 16, 2018**

**8:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.**

1. Welcome. Those present included:

*Advisory Group:*

Brandon Marshall  
Trevor Macenski  
Tim Reynolds (HPRC Commissioner)  
Pat Donaghue  
Bendrew Jong

*Public:*

Toni Haughey (HPRC Commissioner)  
Kathleen Catton (Planning Commissioner)

*Staff:*

Shawna Brekke-Read – Community Development Director  
Suzanne Thorsen – Principal Planner  
Adrian Lopez – Assistant Planner

2. Staff overview of Design Review framework.

City staff provided background information about the regulations and policies that govern design review in the Downtown Historic District.

3. Discussion.

The advisory group was provided a discussion prompt worksheet in the agenda packet for this meeting. The worksheet formed the basis for the group's discussion, which generally focused on project types that are exempt from Design Review. Comments are summarized below.

*Routine Maintenance.* There is general agreement that routine maintenance should be exempt from design review. It is important to clearly define the parameters of routine

maintenance; consider thresholds such as whether a building permit would be required or whether the work would require the expertise of a contractor. An overarching comment is that maintenance should be encouraged and this exemption should not be unnecessarily complicated to administer.

*Repairs of an Emergency Nature.* The group commented that this exemption should really be focused toward stabilization of an unsafe condition, but that at the earliest opportunity there should be review by the HPRC if the repair would result in a change to the structure. There is a need to educate people about the types of activities that require a building permit. The term “emergency” should be defined.

*Reroofing with Same Material.* The group had consensus about re-roofing as an exempt activity but clarified that it should not result in changes to the pitch, eaves, overall appearance. Some consideration for solar shingles and reversion to historical materials should be provided.

*Painting.* The participants commented that the current structure of exemptions for painting does not make sense. They commented that in general, painting should be an exempt activity and that more informational resources about period-appropriate paint colors should be available. Again, an overarching theme of the discussion was to avoid creating barriers to maintenance. A suggestion was made to put this information on the city webpage. There were some comments that a change in paint colors in the commercial downtown should require design review.

*Windows and Doors.* There was general consensus that it is discouraging to require Design Review for replacement of aluminum windows with wood and that more staff discretion should be provided to facilitate the changes that are encouraged. Like-for-like replacement should not require design review; if the replacement is of the same material and generally consistent appearance it should be exempt. Some participants commented that there should be an emphasis on the visual context and overall appearance rather than the material of the window or door specifically. Historic doors should be retained where feasible.

In addition to the discussion prompts, the group discussed an overall interest in providing clarity around the design review procedures, encouraging early consultation, and establishing administrative or task force level review to avoid public hearings for minor projects.

4. Public Comments (9:25 a.m.)

No additional public comments were provided during this period. Ms. Haughey and Ms. Catton provided comments in the group discussion.

5. Adjourn (9:30 a.m.)