ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MEETING
July 18, 2005 AGENDA
100 Australian Avenue
4th Floor Large Conference Room
Time: 1:00 p.m.

Topics of Discussion

1.   Introduction

2.   Background Information

3.   List of Issues with Possible Solutions

   a.   AC and roof mounted equipment screening
   b.   Architectural Review Submittals/Process
   c.   Coordination between Architect, Applicant, and Staff
   d.   Compatibility
   e.   Visual Impact Analysis
   f.   Generators
   g.   Volunteers needed to sit on Unique Structure/Architectural Committee

4.   Open Discussion and Input on Zoning issues

5.   Discussion on Building Division Electronic Permit Submittals - R. Caldwell

   Adjournment

Issues	Recommended Solutions	Implementation Date
1. Need registered Architect on staff.	Staff changes: Ed N. & Linda F. - Arch by training? (JPM)	
	This has come up before in Engineering and Building. Licensed staff are not needed to review plans and reference Code requirements. Suggestion was made to have outside Architect on retainer or AIA appointed Committee to hear appeals of interpretations. (DF)	
2. Need definition in ULDC that explain terms like harmony, form, proportion, scale and Compatibility. Local AIA working on Design Guidelines that we can link to or reference in ULDC. Concern was these terms used every day in application/enforcement of code. We need their definition.	Ching book *Architecture: Form Space and Order* is possible recourse. AIA working on Design Guidelines that we can link to or reference in ULDC. (DGM)	Code revision
	Staff to look at definition terms in the ULDC or refer to good source where information can be found. AIA working on book staff might be able to reference. (JPM)	
	If local AIA can agree on definitions, they can be considered with upcoming Code Amendments. (DF)	
3. Thresholds-were they changed since 2001 adoption of the Ordinance. What the Subcommittee approved and what the BCC adopted were different, but staff can research Bill W folder in my office on this to clarify.	Staff to review what the Subcommittee approved and what the BCC adopted as documented in the Bill W folder in my in Jon's office (DGM)	Need to pull both/send to Mr. McCraney Code revision
	Do chart showing what subcommittee approved and final BCC adopted ordinance. (JPM)	
	Check original Arch Committee Version with BCC adapted text. Contact Thuy to help fill in blanks. (DF)	
4. Screening mechanical-too costly, must be other solutions to achieving same goal. Staff to work with industry on solutions.	Review other options or solutions to achieving same goal. Work with industry on solutions. (DGM)	
	Industry or subcommitte to provide staff alternative. Add this to LDRAB subcommittee agenda. (JPM)	
	Costs become excessive if not anticipated with construction drawings. Fixes during permit review or pre-submittal most effective time. Staff can also keep file of other Architects' solutions for reference. (DF)	
	Design data and Code should be shared between the design professionals throughout the building's design. (EN)	

Issues	Recommended Solutions	Implementation Date
5. Review Process-other options to make it easier for industry and staff? Peer Review sign off based on established performance standards? Have new Arch Review Board review projects where they challenge staff's interpretation. Bob B.	Options to make it easier for industry and staff? Peer Review sign off based on established performance standards? Have new Arch Review Board review projects where they challenge staff's interpretation. Frustrating when staff says they "don't have time to review" (DGM)	
	Review process internally and make recommendations to subcommittee. Review process we currently have - Use flowcharts: Peer Review, Unique Structure and BCC/DRO/Permitting. (JPM)	
	Final DRO Review can have checklist of items to correct before building permit submittal. Unfortunately it's rarely same Developer or Architect involved later in permit review. (DF)	
	Pre and courtesy reviews are offered to presubmitted projects. (EN)	
6. Unique Structure process-subcommittee to look into this summer. Subcommittee Meeting: Friday August 19th, 2005 @ 3:30pm	Subcommittee to look into this summer. Got several volunteers. (DGM)	
	Add to Subcommittee - Code staff to meet w/Jon, MMK, DF prior to going to subcommittee to formulate plan. Review what staff prepared in 2004 for Code Revision. (JPM)	
	Subcommittee could serve as interim appeals board. Some volunteers have specific issues (roof-top screening) and will not likely be qualified for Unique Structure determinations. LDRAB Committee 08/19/05. (DF)	
	Members on the subcommittee should have a Degree and or registered in a building design field. Members associated with any project before the committee in any way should recuse themselves from that review. (EN)	

Issues	Recommended Solutions	Implementation Date
7. Compatibility-need to clarify definition. Currently, too broad. What if NO character exists and yet staff require owner to make new building look like existing undistinguished character.	Ching book *Architecture: Form Space and Order* is possible recourse. AIA working on Design Guidelines that we can link to or reference in ULDC. When NO character exists is staff requiring owner to make new building look like existing undistinguished character? (DGM)	Pull Definition - Work on
	Need to address first among staff. Do we move this back to Article 5. How do you define compatibility when area has none. (JPM)	
	Move Compatibility back to Article 5 with clear definition. Need to also address infill situations. (DF)	
	Compatibility needs to have defined guidelines for existing and infill projects. (EN)	
8. DRO approval vs Permit-Need to come to agreement on what is approved by DRO and "minor" modifications are allowed at permitting without having to go back to DRO.	Review code language concerning revisions. Check with staff how revisions are handled. (DGM)	Need Consistent Standards - PPM/ULDC?
	Review this process with Arch Review and DRO. Establish clear thresholds so Industry and staff is clear. (JPM)	Ed - Change out some windows
	Minor changes should be allowed provided they are equal to or better than previous approval. (DF)	
	A list of what are minor modifications should be developed. (EN)	
9. Staff comments-look at project once throughly and do not keep going back and making new comments. Frustrating when staff says they "don't have time to review" or didn't review this the first time around. How do we ensure consistency and through review?	Verify with staff how the current process works. Ensure that a system is provided for applicants to have a "single" review. Frustrating when staff says they "don't have time to review" or didn't review this the first time around. How do we ensure consistency and thorough review? (DGM)	
	Jon.DF to review and develop strategy to address. (JPM)	
	Revised submittals often bring up new issues. Emphasize importance of pre-review before submittal. (DF)	
	Projects are reviewed by the amount of detail and the projects' adherence to the Code's guidelines. Resubmittals may trigger new Certification Issues. (EN)	

Issues	Recommended Solutions	Implementation Date
10. Meetings with client, arch and staff-Jon requested better coordination on everyone's part. Staff making improvements.	Meeting minutes are to be forwarded to the appropriate participants. Staff making improvements. (DGM) Staff to encourage joint meetings when possible to resolve issues with all parties. Follow-up with an e-mail or letter outlining what has to be done for project to move forward. Establish process to monitor these open projects. (JPM) Additional paperwork slows review time of other projects. (EN)	
11. Reasonable accommodation to projects. Steve McCraney stated staff needs to have flexibility when enforcing provisions, such as why require a bond, sent to Code Enf.	Steve McCraney voice staff needs to have flexibility when enforcing provisions, such as why require a bond, sent to Code Enforcment. Review with staff to verify the types of minor deviations would be requested. (DGM) Consistency critical to process. All parties should be made aware of code and permitting procedures to avoid delays. (JPM) Bonds last resort for Certificate of Occupancy. Usually cause problems and often extended. Code Enforcement best solution with Developer and Architect required attendance. (DF)	