



AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Agenda Item number: 3e

Title:

Discussion regarding Design Guidelines and Standards for Traditional Residential Districts

Presenter:

Russell Colby

Meeting: Planning & Development Committee

Date: December 11, 2017

Proposed Cost: N/A

Budgeted Amount: N/A

Not Budgeted:

Executive Summary (if not budgeted please explain):

On October 9, 2017, the P&D Committee discussed a proposal from Plan Commission to modify the Design Review Standards and Guidelines for the RT Traditional Residential Districts. The proposal would create a new Plan Commission review and approval process for buildings proposed with non-traditional architectural styles within the RT districts.

Staff presented background information in October. This information is attached, along with minutes from the Committee discussion.

The Committee requested that staff return with additional information regarding a potential General Amendment. Staff prepared the attached outline for the Committee’s consideration.

Attachments (please list):

- Staff outline of RT Design Review Process proposed by Plan Commission
- Background information presented at the 10/9/17 P&D Committee meeting
- Minutes from the 10/9/17 P&D Committee Discussion
- “Design Review Standards and Guidelines” from Chapter 17.06 of the Zoning Ordinance

Recommendation/Suggested Action (briefly explain):

Any change to the code would require filing of an application for General Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. This process would require a public hearing before Plan Commission, followed by P&D Committee review and City Council vote on an ordinance amendment.

Provide direction to Staff:

1. Direct staff to file a General Amendment based on the Plan Commission recommendation, which includes:
 - Rewriting the RT Standards and Guidelines to require traditional building styles (form, roof type, materials, etc.) as a baseline.
 - Requiring buildings that do not meet the baseline standards (for example, different architectural styles, flat roofs, non-standard building materials, etc.) to be reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission.
2. Direct staff to research other alternative scenarios for a Design Review process, and return before the Committee for further discussion.
3. Leave the code as is (no further action at this time). If the code is to remain as-is, at some point over the next year, staff intends to propose changes to further clarify the existing requirements in order to reduce the potential for future appeals based on the requirements being unclear or open to interpretation.

Outline of proposed RT Design Review Process

(prepared by Staff, based on discussion by the Plan Commission in August 2017)

1. Application

- a. A property owner, architect or contractor contacts the City for information regarding a new house or an addition to an existing house in an RT zoning district.
- b. The Design Review Standards and Guidelines are provided. The Standards and Guidelines require Traditional Architectural Design, such as:
 - i. *Pitched gable or hipped roofs with shingles*
 - ii. *Traditional style double hung or casement windows of similar proportion on all sides of the house in a generally symmetrical pattern*
 - iii. *Brick or horizontal clapboard siding material as the primary exterior materials.*
- c. The applicant can either:
 - i. Follow the Standards and Guidelines and apply for a building permit, or,
 - ii. Propose an alternate design, and request a Design Review by the Plan Commission.

2. Plan Commission Design Review

- a. The applicant would submit architectural elevations, material and color details, and a rendering of the building showing how it would appear in the neighborhood.
- b. A letter would be sent to surrounding property owner informing them that a Design Review is being conducted for the property at an upcoming Plan Commission meeting.
- c. The applicant would present the information at a Plan Commission meeting. The Plan Commission would review the plan and have an opportunity to question the applicant or request additional information.
- d. The Plan Commission can negotiate with the applicant to revise the design.
- e. In order to approve a design that deviates from the Standard and Guidelines, the Plan Commission would need to make the following finding:

The overall design is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood based upon the use of complementary design elements, materials or colors.

More detailed criteria to support the finding will need to be developed by the Plan Commission. The Plan Commission would need to provide responses to each criterion and support the finding by citing specific aspects of the design.

3. Approval and Permit Issuance

- a. The Plan Commission approval would be documented in the form of a resolution.
- b. Once the Design Review approval is obtained, the applicant can then receive a building permit for the project.
- c. OPTIONAL: If the Design Review is denied by the Plan Commission, an applicant could have the ability to appeal the decision to the Planning & Development Committee.

Background Information from October 9, 2017 P&D Committee Summary

Background

Single-family residential zoning districts in the City are divided between two types: RT- Traditional Districts (areas primarily constructed before World War II) and RS- Suburban Districts (constructed later). RT-zoned neighborhoods are characterized by smaller, narrow lots and detached or less prominent garages.

When the City was rewriting the Zoning Ordinance in 2006, the trend of teardown and infill development was beginning, and the decision was made to write zoning requirements tailored to the older neighborhoods. New regulations for building size, height, setbacks and garage location were created based upon data from existing neighborhoods.

At that time, there was also a discussion regarding exterior architectural design. A decision was made not to regulate architectural design in RT neighborhoods, but rather create a staff-level advisory process (“Residential Architectural Consultation” or RAC) to share comments with building permit applicants on how plans could be revised to be more compatible with older neighborhoods. This advisory process was in effect from 2006 to 2015.

In 2015, staff and Plan Commission reviewed the buildings that had been constructed under the staff RAC review, and concluded that the process had been somewhat effective, but could be improved by creating specific Standards and Guidelines. Standards and Guidelines would provide clearer direction to permit applicants and City staff conducting the review.

Standards and Guideline for the RT districts were added to the Zoning Ordinance in 2015. The Standards and Guidelines do not require specific architectural styles or exterior building materials; rather they are written to encourage incorporation of design features that are found in traditional neighborhoods, addressing items such as appearance of a garage, front door location, distribution of windows, and use of consistent siding materials and trim on all elevations. The code includes many “Guidelines” which are more advisory in nature, and only a few “Standards”, which are binding requirements that must be complied with.

Recent appeal regarding property on S. 3rd St.

The Plan Commission recently reviewed an appeal to the staff interpretation of the Design Standards and Guidelines as applied to a house being constructed out of metal shipping containers on S. 3rd St. Staff identified the plans submitted for building permit did not comply with a standard that requires “360 degree architecture”, which requires buildings to have a consistent appearance when viewed from all sides. This Standard is intended to prevent a building with a front elevation that greatly differs from the side and rear elevations. The Plan Commission affirmed the staff interpretation, and the permit applicant was required to modify the plans to comply with the Standard as directed by staff prior to the building permit being issued.

Plan Commission Discussion

In response to the issues raised during the appeal, including comments received from residents of the neighborhood, the Plan Commission asked staff to schedule a discussion regarding the RT Design Standards and Guidelines. Two main discussion points were identified:

- The Standards and Guidelines do not regulate architectural style, but they require design elements that are characteristic of traditional building styles, which creates conflicts in the review of a building with a modern architectural design.
- The Standards and Guidelines do not require that buildings be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of style, building form, roof type, materials, etc. Rather, these items are listed as “Guidelines” which are advisory and meant to be applied with flexibility.

The Plan Commission discussed this topic on 8/22/17. Minutes are attached. The consensus of the Plan Commission was as follows:

- **The Standard and Guidelines should be rewritten to require traditional building styles (form, roof type, materials, etc.) as a baseline.**
 - If staff reviews a permit application and finds that the plans conform to all of the requirements, then the permit can be issued administratively, without any further review by a Commission.
- **Buildings that do not meet the baseline standards (for example, different architectural styles, flat roofs, non-standard building materials, etc.) would need to be reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission:**
 - The review process would require a permit applicant to submit supplemental information in support of their proposal, including an explanation of how the plans meet the intent of the Design Standards/Guidelines and a rendering or streetscape view showing how the building would appear within the context of the neighborhood.
 - The Plan Commission would function like an architectural review board, and could negotiate with the applicant to improve the design or make it more compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Neighboring property owners would receive a letter from the City notifying them that plans for a house would be reviewed at a meeting. (This would be a letter only, not a public hearing notice.)
 - The Plan Commission felt this process would not be seen as onerous because a permit applicant has the option of simply following the Standards/Guidelines and bypassing any Commission review.

Staff Perspective on Plan Commission proposal

Staff sees potential benefits to this type of process that could extend to other code regulations and other zoning districts. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance includes specific numerical requirements for building and landscape design with little flexibility for design alternatives. Staff devotes a significant amount of effort assisting developers on meeting these requirements, which often do not greatly improve the quality of a project. The type of Design Review process proposed by the Plan Commission would give applicants a simpler option to request a Commission-level design review for unique projects, without needing to request a deviation be granted through a PUD, which is a lengthy and burdensome process.

Note that the City has two Commissions with expertise in the areas of architectural review- the Plan Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission. Both could conduct this type of review. Staff sees a benefit to having the Plan Commission with this review authority, because the design review may overlap into other areas of zoning regulation that the Plan Commission is more familiar with, such as landscape requirements.

Roll was called:

Ayes: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Gaugel, Vitek

Absent: Stellato, Bancroft, Lewis

Recused:

Nays:

Motion carried 6-0

c. Discussion regarding Design Guidelines and Standards for Traditional Residential Zoning Districts.

Mr. Colby said this discussion was prompted by the recent review of a house to be constructed out of metal shipping containers on S. 3rd St. However the topic tonight is whether the city's design standards and guidelines for the RT zoning districts should be modified; particularly given the experience with that specific building on 3rd St. The city's current regulations have been adopted over the years by taking incremental steps in regulating design of single-family residential buildings. He then showed a PowerPoint Presentation showing those adopted policies:

CBD-2 is lumped into the RT zoning districts; which are the areas adjacent to the downtown core. The RT districts are the older neighborhoods characterized as:

- Pre- World War II era development (pre-1945)
- Narrow, deeper lots
- Alley-access or detached garages
- Entry doors and porches are prominent features

RT zoning districts were established in 2006 and the older neighborhoods were separated from the newer neighborhoods; which are the RS Suburban districts. This was in response to teardowns and infill houses being constructed, there was a perception that those were out of scale for the existing neighborhoods; which is where the intent statement came from: "Preserve medium to higher density single family residential development in older neighborhoods of the City, and to accommodate new neighborhoods with a similar character."

Within RT zoning districts:

- Building coverage, setbacks based on existing houses
- Limitations on front-load garages
- Bonuses for detached garages, open front porches

In 2006- An advisory review process; Residential Architectural Consultation (RAC), was created to address architectural design in RT districts:

"Preserve the character of older neighborhoods by providing applicants advice and guidance on the appropriate design and location of residential structures to maximize their compatibility within older neighborhoods and to enhance long-term viability."

- Staff would provide advisory comments as a part of the building permit review
- In effect 2006 to 2015.

During that time there wasn't a significant amount of new home building, there wasn't much of that from 2006-2012, but were more in the years preceding 2015.

In 2015 we went back and looked at the process of regulating design in the RT Districts:

- Plan Commission reviewed buildings constructed since 2006; generally felt designs were appropriate
- Staff suggested formal standards/guidelines:
 - To provide direction to applicants before submitting for permit
 - To assist staff to be more objective and consistent in reviews
- Standards/Guideline were adopted in 2015:
 - Purposefully open-ended (many guidelines, few standards)
 - Specifically avoided dictating style
 - Did not include lists of permitted/prohibited items

During the review of the house on S. 3rd St. some issues were identified through Plan Commission as well as neighbors:

- Although architectural style is not regulated, but “traditional” design elements are required.
 - Conflicts in the review of “modern” style architectural designs.
- Compatibly with the surrounding neighborhood is cited as the “intent” of the regulations; however this is not directly enforceable.
 - Building form, roof type, materials, etc. are “guidelines” which are more advisory. We found the guidelines were meeting the intent of the regulations to help provide more consistency with existing development.

Plan Commission held a discussion on standards and guidelines and came up with the following actions:

- Re-write Standard/Guidelines to require traditional building styles (form, roof type, materials, etc.) as a baseline.
 - If requirements are met, building permit can be issued without any Commission-level review.
- Buildings that do not meet the baseline requirements would need to be reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission:
 - Review would be triggered by: Use of non-traditional architectural styles, flat roofs, non-standard building materials, etc.
 - Applicant would need provide a rendering or streetscape view showing the building in the context of the neighborhood.
 - Neighboring property owners notified of the review by mail.
 - The Plan Commission would function like an architectural review board, and could negotiate with the applicant.

Considerations:

- Applicant has the option of following the Standards/Guidelines and bypassing any Commission review.
- Staff sees potential to extend a similar process to other zoning districts where we have design requirements. Staff may have some ability to take some of our binding requirements and turn them into a process where unique designs could be reviewed by

Plan Commission based on what's being proposed for a specific project. They could then approve those designs without going through a PUD process for any kind of deviation from design requirements.

Next Steps:

- Any change to the Zoning Ord. requires a General Amendment application be filed.
 - Process requires a public hearing before Plan Commission, review by P&D Committee, City Council vote on an ordinance.

Staff is seeking direction for one of the following:

- Proceed with amendment to code per the Plan Commission recommendations.
- Research other alternatives.
- Leave the code as is (no further action).

Aldr. Payleitner said the advisory review is a great idea, but asked for a reminder as to where the architectural expertise comes in on the Plan Commission. They are all gifted in their own ways by doing their "findings of fact" charge, but as far as opinions on architecture; she needs a reminder as to how they qualify in that regard. Mr. Colby said we do have 1 architect on the Plan Commission, but this wouldn't necessarily be a situation where the Plan Commission is simply critiquing the quality of the architecture. We would need to establish criteria they would use for review, similar to the findings of fact; it wouldn't be open ended. Criteria would be developed with Plan Commission and it would then be important for Committee to review.

Aldr. Vitek asked if there is a requirement for Plan Commission to have someone with architectural experience. Mr. Colby said there is a list of qualifications of professional backgrounds which includes: planning, landscape architecture, architecture, etc. It's not necessarily a requirement, the language states to try to achieve a mix of those who have professional and technical experience and those who are community members who have a resident perspective. Aldr. Vitek said she's fine with the Plan Commission doing the review, rather than developing another committee for that, but is there a way to pay attention to that skill set; to guarantee expertise. Mr. Colby said we'd be changing the code significantly by adding a new power to the Plan Commission that we don't currently have. Going forward as appointments are made to the Commission it would be an important consideration than it has been.

Aldr. Gaugel said he'd be in favor of seeing a draft; from what he remembers from 2015 discussion was putting those guidelines in place to try and alleviate this exact situation from coming up, and here we are with something rather unique. He's not a fan of overregulation and review of things, in this context it may be good, but his hesitation is preventing something from happening that we might want because it doesn't fit that standard. The container house is a unique situation and he doesn't know how we reasonably could have avoided it in the first place; it gives him pause to go forward and put more things in place because of 1 isolated situation.

Aldr. Lemke said the Historic Preservation Commission members have good insight into architecture; maybe it does add too many layers of review but if there were clean guidelines people would know they could not do this again. He said option 1-the General Amendment would give us a chance to look at these and avoid somebody deciding to live in a roll-off.

Aldr. Silkaitis said it's a good proposal, he can support it, but he doesn't want to review every window or every bit of siding; that's too much government involvement. I understand we have to be careful but this goes back to the "beekeeping" ordinance; for 1 person we were going to regulate everything, he doesn't want to do that with this either. A little more review is fine for advisory, but not mandatory. He asked if that container home be approved under this new ordinance. Mr. Colby said we haven't drafted the actual "standards or guidelines", he can't answer that. Plan Commission didn't have the ability to work with the applicant to modify the plans or better understand how the design fit the site or how it could be made more contextually appropriate, because right now this is a "staff only" process. The only reason it went before Plan Commission was because they were appealing an interpretation of that staff regarding the 360 degree architecture standard. He thinks there are opportunities to be more flexible with how some of the requirements are applied to find alternatives to better fit, without necessarily imposing more restrictions. Aldr. Silkaitis said he doesn't want to start overreaching our authority; he doesn't want to be the architectural police. Mr. Colby said that's going to be a matter of how we write these guidelines; the intent is to look at the big picture items, not the little details. Those things are not as important when you're talking about how well a building fits in a neighborhood; that's staff and the Plan Commissions intent and thoughts.

Aldr. Payleitner asked if we are equipping an appeal process, or does everyone come in and submit plans. Mr. Colby said if the applicant meets all the standards and guidelines they would completely bypass any review process. If you're proposing something different there would be an application process created to appear before the Plan Commission, who would then review that against the criteria. It wouldn't even necessarily be structured as an appeal, but more like a review process to identify what needs to be submitted and what requirements need to be met.

Aldr. Payleitner asked about the Historic Preservation Commission's expertise. Mr. Colby said we have an architect on that board as well; they have quite a bit of experience dealing with residential building design; that's one of the major areas they review for. They too have appropriate background to handle this process; however we thought it made sense to keep it with the Plan Commission because if it expands outside of the RT district it has potential to overlap into the commercial districts. Aldr. Payleitner said they're a group that didn't want to take down George's, but then approved the red awning at Gordy's; she wonders where their expertise is.

Aldr. Turner asked for clarification on the appeal for the container home. Mr. Colby said staff's review comment back to the applicant was that it didn't comply with the standard for 360 degree architecture. The container house had different materials on the front versus the side, different layout out of the windows on the front versus the side; it has to be consistent to meet that standard and at that point we couldn't issue him the permit. Under the code he then had the option to appeal the review comment to state that city staff didn't interpret the requirement correctly, which is what the Plan Commission was assessing; and they agreed that staff had been interpreting it correctly. The applicant was then required to modify the plan to meet the comments before they were able to receive the building permit. Aldr. Turner said that's what he would expect to happen if we didn't have a process in place, and to him we already have that process in place and he doesn't think we need another set of regulations. Mr. Colby said the Plan Commission's review scope was only as to whether it met that 360 degree requirement, they didn't have the authority to assess its appropriateness in the neighborhood or the context; right now we don't have a process for that. Aldr. Turner said there's not a process in place now, but as far as the dept. is concerned, this does not fit the standards that are in place right now. Mr. Colby said correct, the ordinance allows us to administer it, he just thinks there were some reactions based on that process and

the outcome of that was not what everyone had hoped. The ordinance is functional the way it is, it's just setup a little different.

Aldr. Lemke said we're fortunate they didn't meet the 360 requirement and had it not been for that there could be a bunch of these and tear down neighborhoods. He'd argue supporting the proposal to consider roof lines, gables and types of materials to not only have the 360 be the only reason to ask for Plan Commission review.

Aldr. Vitek asked if other cities have architectural review committees. Mr. Colby said there are some out there, but those that do, it's a standalone body and they review everything that occurs within a certain district. We're proposing to not significantly add to the work load of the commission because they wouldn't be reviewing everything. We don't have that much activity in the course of the year, and a standalone committee would be another group to manage. We don't think it's necessary, but it could be done.

Aldr. Turner said if we leave the code as is; can he not build this container house. Mr. Colby said the permit has been issued for the house, after the Plan Commission review, they had to modify the plans to meet the 360 degree requirement, which they did by modifying exterior materials and windows; so yes he can now build that house. Aldr. Turner said this is just to make it a little more clear to those who have unique or outlier designs. Mr. Colby said correct.

Aldr. Silkaitis said he's like to see a draft first.

Aldr. Turner said he thinks staff's process worked, but if Plan Commission wants to be a bit more full, he'll take a look at the draft too.

Aldr. Gaugel said the process worked, but the container house is still being built and should we put something in place it would be very difficult for another container house to be built in the city if we go through with new design standards. Mr. Colby said not necessarily, they can be disguised and constructed as something else, or take steps to have it blend better with the neighborhood. It would more difficult and they'd need to take more steps to be compatible than they had to in this situation. Aldr. Gaugel said so if they wrapped it in cedar siding nobody would know the difference, but it's still a container house; that would add insurmountable costs that they wouldn't want to incur. Everything worked properly but the container house is still being built; he fielded numerous phone calls and emails as a result of that. He agrees with Aldr. Silkaitis in seeing a draft first. Aldr. Vitek said she also would like to see a draft of the criteria. She also added that this is not for or against "container houses"; we need to talk about the process of this committee outside of container houses; she doesn't want to end on that note. Aldr. Bessner said the Plan Commission proposal is a good first step, but as a previous member of the plan Commission he's trying to figure out how they will pull out their mind set of following ordinances, finding of facts and tradition and non-traditional, to be able to make a good judgement of something so modern, in an unbiased way, or not feel pressure from the community. Mr. Colby said that's really where they criteria will come into play.

Mr. Colby asked if Committee would like to see additional information before proceeding with the process of presenting this to Plan Commission. Aldr. Lemke asked how a General Amendment would be written to have it implemented and have issues come to them based on it. Aldr. Payleitner asked if we are talking about coming back with a process or specifics. Mr. Colby said he could come back to

Committee with an outline and general parameters of what this amendment might look like, and then give us direction to proceed and we will then go through the public hearing process with Plan commission. Chairman Bessner said that would be helpful.

- d. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Amending Title 2 of the St. Charles Municipal Code, entitled "Administration", Chapter 2.25 "Housing Commission" by amending Section 2.25.020 "Purposes" and Section 2.25.050 "Powers and Duties".

Aldr. Payleitner made a motion to approve an Ordinance Amending Title 2 of the St. Charles Municipal Code, entitled "Administration", Chapter 2.25 "Housing Commission" by amending Section 2.25.020 "Purposes" and Section 2.25.050 "Powers and Duties". Seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried. 6-0

4. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS-None.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION-None.

6. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, STAFF OR CITIZENS-None.

7. ADJOURNMENT- Aldr. Turner made a motion to adjourn at 7:47pm. Seconded by Aldr. Silkaitis. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried. 6-0

17.06.010 – How to use this chapter

1. Standards and Guidelines

The Standards and Guidelines of this Chapter shall apply to applications for Building Permits and Site Development Permits as provided in Section 17.04.230 (Design Review). The Standards and Guidelines of this Chapter shall also apply to applications for Special Uses (Section 17.04.330) and Planned Unit Developments (Sections 17.04.400, et seq.).

The provisions of this Chapter include “Standards” and “Guidelines”, both of which must be addressed in order to obtain Design Review approval. “Standards” are specific requirements that must be met. A Standard typically offers little flexibility unless options are provided within the Standard itself. A Standard may establish requirements not otherwise contained in this Title, or may refer to other requirements more fully set forth elsewhere in this Title or the St. Charles Municipal Code. “Guidelines” are descriptions of design characteristics intended to be applied with flexibility. Where a proposed design does not precisely follow the guideline, it may still be acceptable if the applicant can show how it meets the intent for that group of standards and guidelines and the purpose and intent of this Title, in particular Section 17.04.230.

2. Applicability of Building Design and Material Standards to Existing Buildings

Existing buildings that do not comply with the building design or building materials standards of this Chapter shall comply with the following standards:

1. Building alterations or additions constructed primarily at the side or rear of a building may be constructed with the same design and materials as the remainder of the building, provided an addition does not exceed 50% of the gross floor area of the existing building.
2. Any building additions to, or reconstruction of, street-facing building elevations shall comply with this Chapter to the extent practical to achieve a cohesive architectural design for the building. The Director of Community Development may grant exceptions where an applicant can demonstrate that conformance would be incongruous with the architecture of the building or would be impractical to construct (for example, re-facing a building façade with masonry material where no foundation exists to support the masonry).

[\(2011-Z-1](#) [1]: § 3 and 4)

DESIGN STANDARDS & GUIDELINES

For single and two-family dwellings in the RT-1, RT-2, RT-3, RT-4, and CBD-2 only.

A. Site Layout and Context

Intent: To ensure building placement is compatible with neighboring properties and reflects the development pattern of the surrounding neighborhood.

Standards:

1. Buildings facades shall be oriented to the street. Front facades should squarely face the street and should not be set at an angle. However if adjacent homes are set at an angle the new home may be similarly sited.
2. Site grading shall be consistent with that of adjacent properties. The slope and elevation of the property shall not be altered in such a manner that results in an artificial change of grade.
3. The amount of front or exterior side yard covered by driveways shall be limited per Section 17.24.070.Z

Guidelines:

1. Setbacks (front, side, rear) should generally follow the averages for the block on which the new house is located. Front and exterior side yard setbacks may be reduced based on averaging of existing principal building setbacks along the street frontage of a block- See Table 17.12-2 for setback requirements.
2. Building and site layout should be compatible with existing topography and vegetation. Preservation of existing trees, particularly older growth trees, is recommended.
3. The coverage of driveways and parking areas in the front and exterior side yards should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

B. Garages

Intent: To reduce the appearance and prominence of garages in order to maintain a pedestrian friendly streetscape.

Standards:

1. Garages shall meet the provisions of Section 17.22.020 Accessory Buildings and Structures, including but not limited to: requirement to provide access from a public alley; limitations on garage door width; and requirements to set back street-facing attached garages from the remainder of the building.
2. Detached garages shall be consistent with the architectural style of the house. Use of similar window styles, exterior materials, and trim detailing is required.

Guidelines:

1. Detached or rear-loaded garages are recommended. A Building Coverage bonus shall be provided where a detached garage or an attached garage accessed via an alley is provided. See Table 17.12-2.
2. Street-facing doors on attached garages should incorporate glass panel windows.
3. The use of individual bay doors (single stall) is preferred over double-wide doors, particularly for street-facing attached garages. Stepped back, separate garage doors should also be considered to further soften the impact of a street-facing attached garage.

C. Massing and Proportion

Intent: To reduce the appearance of mass and to encourage new houses to match the scale of the existing neighborhood.

Standards:

1. Buildings shall comply with the Bulk Requirements provided in Table 17.12-2 (including setbacks, building coverage, and building height).

Guidelines:

1. Scale, proportions, and height, should be compatible with adjacent homes and with the general characteristics of homes in the surrounding neighborhood. For example, effort should be made to limit the height, or reduce the appearance of height, of a two-story house constructed among single-story houses.
2. Simple building forms and shapes are encouraged.
3. The following methods may be incorporated to reduce the apparent mass of a home:
 - a. Step back portions of the home. For example, set the second story back a number of feet from the first story or add an unenclosed porch on the first story.
 - b. Use dormers to break up roof mass, if consistent with the architectural style of the home.
 - c. Incorporate horizontal design detailing to visually break up flat walls. Examples include wide skirt boards, mid-section trim between stories, frieze boards along roof eaves, partial or complete gable returns, or a change in siding or masonry patterns or materials.

D. Roofs

Intent: To encourage roofs and rooflines that add character and interest to a home, while blending with the roof forms found throughout the existing neighborhood.

Guidelines:

1. The form, pitch, and scale of roofs should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Roof form, pitch, and scale should match the architectural style of the house.
3. Simple gabled and hipped roof forms are preferred.
4. Eaves that extend a sufficient distance to create shadow lines are encouraged if appropriate for the architecture of the structure.
5. The roof of the garage and other accessory structures should mimic the roof of the house in both form and pitch.
6. Mansard and flat roofs should be used only if appropriate for the architectural style of the house.

E. Architectural Details

Intent: To promote architectural interest and design that complements the traditional building styles found in older neighborhoods.

Standards:

1. “360 degree architecture” is required, meaning that facades must be designed to be viewed from all directions. At a minimum, the same window types and similar trim detailing to the front elevation must be used on the side and rear elevations.

Guidelines:

1. Use of masonry should be consistent on all façades. Use of masonry on the front façade only is discouraged.
2. The use of exterior trim detailing is recommended. In addition to window casing, such detailing includes: wide vertical corner boards, skirt boards, frieze boards, and mid-section trim.
3. The limited use of decorative elements such as gable trusses, exposed rafters, arched doors and windows, quoins, pediments, etc. is encouraged, provided such elements do not overwhelm or clutter the home’s appearance and are appropriate for the architectural style of the home.
4. All window openings should be articulated by window casing of at least four (4) inches if the primary wall material is siding.

5. Shutters should only be utilized where appropriate for the architectural style of the building. If shutters are used, they should exactly match the window size.
6. Chimneys should be masonry when located on a street-facing elevation.

F. Windows, Doors, and Entrances

Intent: To promote an inviting presence that contributes to the pedestrian friendly character of the neighborhood.

Guidelines:

1. The home's primary entrance should be located at the front of the house, facing the street.
2. The front entry should be the predominate feature on the front elevation. Multi-story entry features should be used only when architecturally appropriate.
3. Open, full-width front or wrap-around porches are recommended to emphasize the front entrance. Porches should be at least six (6) to eight (8) feet in depth and constructed in a manner so as to be fully functional. Porch detailing should be consistent with the architecture of the house.
4. Unenclosed Porches are permitted to encroach up to eight (8) feet into the front, exterior side or rear yards. Unenclosed porches are not included in the calculation of Building Coverage. For the definition of an Unenclosed Porch vs. Enclosed Porch and Building Coverage, see Ch. 17.30. For information on permitted yard encroachments, see Section 17.22.030.
5. Windows should be incorporated on all elevations.
6. Window openings and panes should be similarly proportioned throughout.
7. Windows should be placed in a manner that creates a balanced elevation on all sides of the house.
8. Double-hung or casement windows are preferred. The use of fixed and large, undivided pane windows should be limited.
9. The use of window muntins (divides) should be consistent for all windows.
10. The style of windows and doors (particularly the front door) should complement the architectural style of the house.
11. In addition to window casing, design elements such as window muntins (divides), window sills, and head trim, should be incorporated if such details are appropriate for the architectural style of the house.

G. Additions and Exterior Alterations

Intent: To ensure additions and exterior alterations are complementary to the existing home and blend with the neighborhood.

Standards:

1. Additions and exterior alterations shall abide by the applicable standards and guidelines in Section 17.06.060 A-F.

Guidelines:

1. Additions should match the scale and mass of the original structure.
2. Additions and exterior alterations should match the existing house in exterior materials, color, architectural style and detailing, window proportion and type, and roof form, pitch, and color.