

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

Topic: Tripartite Architecture & Design, Exhibit B – pages 19 to 32		
<p>Appropriate:</p> 	<p>Summary of Staff Proposed Code:</p> <p>Intent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote architecture and design that strengthens the unique character and sense of distinction in the Historic Core Overlay. • Foster visual interest and opportunities for pedestrian engagement. • Visibly anchor and complete buildings. <p>Specificity: Defines and includes proposed standards for the three portions of the structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base – focus, distinction, variety • Middle – rhythm, character • Cap – distinction and complete building <p>Other Aspects: Incorporates some additional and maintains other flexibility for architects, designers, and builders to implement the code such as through use of a variety of design treatments.</p>	<p>Summary for Comparison to Current Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citywide design criteria requires Building Scale Articulation to reduce the apparent scale of buildings. Tripartite articulation, described below, is listed as one of seven techniques for achieving this requirement. Examples of other techniques include window treatments, materials, upper story setbacks and landscaping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide tripartite building articulation (building top, middle, and base) to provide pedestrian scale and architectural interest.
<p>Inappropriate:</p> 		<p>Design Review Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Felt that the proposal would ensure suitable architecture and design in the Historic Core.

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

Topic: Building Material – Exhibit B, pages 6 to 10		
<p>Appropriate:</p> 	<p>Summary of Staff Proposed Code:</p> <p>Intent: To ensure that materials used on the exterior of new construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the time period when the individual structure was built and create a sense of timelessness through the use of high quality material; • Complement materials used on historic and landmark structures; • Achieve visual interest and distinctive architecture and design, and emphasize tripartite form; and • Support a comfortable, consistent and engaging pedestrian experience along the street front. <p>Specificity: Would require use of distinctive masonry over at least 60 percent of building exterior.</p> <p>Would not allow use of exposed/unfinished concrete, corrugated metal, mirrored glass, or vinyl siding.</p> <p>Other Aspects: Allows for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Material variation, including allowing for new material and innovative design treatments. • Deviations from standards for material would need to be approved by the Design Review Board. 	<p>Summary for Comparison to Current Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires residential facades in Downtown to be clad with superior exterior cladding materials on 100 percent of the facades. • Encourages vernacular architecture and materials similar to existing historic structures: brick, stucco, wood, and stone. • Requires architectural detailing reflected in Old Town with design details consisting of contrasting material or color. • Requires details around windows in brick and stone structures. • Preferred colors reflect the historic pattern of Old Town with allowances for other complementary colors.

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

<p>Inappropriate:</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintaining similar color preferences though introducing some opportunity for variability and use of contrasting colors for accent.	<p>Design Review Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Believed proposed code should require use of distinctive masonry though with no specific minimum amount.• Also believed certain materials should not be allowed such as vinyl and mirrored glass.• Suggested maintaining opportunities for variation and flexibility in design treatments; the Board could work with the applicant to finalize the preferred building materials and design.• Felt that proposal should accommodate future use of new high-quality materials and innovative design treatments.
--	---	---

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

<p>Topic: Pedestrian System Map, Exhibit B – Attachment 3</p>		
	<p>Summary of Staff Proposed Map Amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add pedestrian connection through Historic Core, between Cleveland Street and Redmond Way, to/from Downtown Park and to/from 164th Avenue NE. Not to include mid-block crossings. • Change sidewalk standard for Leary Way to reflect sidewalk width of 12 feet, as currently built. • Change Gilman Street classification to reflect ROW width, combined ped/vehicle street, and wider sidewalk. 	<p>Summary for Comparison to Current Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leary Way (Type D): A 14 foot urban walkway with 4-feet for tree grates and pedestrian amenities, an 8-foot sidewalk, and a 2 foot setback area for planters and building modulation. • Gilman Street (Type VII): A 30-foot wide shared pedestrian and vehicular lane.
		<p>Design Review Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff did not consult with the Board on this proposed amendment though did consult with staff from transportation planning, parks, economic development, fire, utilities, development review and traffic operations and following evaluation, consensus was to recommend this change