

**AGENDA**

Planning and Zoning Commission  
January 11, 2017  
6:00 PM

**A. ROLL CALL**

**B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Additions or Deletions)**

**C. CITIZEN COMMENTS (OPEN FLOOR TO ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON RECORD)**

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. NOVEMBER 20, 2016 MEETING
2. DECEMBER 14, 2016 MEETING

**E. OLD BUSINESS**

**F. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Public Hearing** on Text Amendments to Article 7.14 “Design Requirements for New Residential Construction” of the Unified Development Ordinance
2. **Discussion** on Video Gaming

**G. CONSIDERATIONS**

**H. FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

**I. REPORTS / ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

## MINUTES

### CITY OF DEKALB

#### Planning and Zoning Commission

November 30, 2016

6:00 PM

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on November 30, 2016 at City of DeKalb Municipal Building, 200 South Fourth Street in the Council Chambers.

Chair Christina Atherton called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

#### A. ROLL CALL

Natalie Nelson called the roll. Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission present at roll call: Chair Christina Atherton, David Castro, Matthew Crull, and Jerry Wright. Absent: Deborah Nier

Also present from the City of DeKalb were: Community Development Director Jo Ellen Charlton, Interim Principal Planner Dan Olson, and Administrative Assistant Natalie Nelson.

#### B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Additions or Deletions)

Chair Atherton requested a motion to approve the agenda for November 30, 2016. D. Castro motioned to approve the agenda, J. Wright seconded the motion, and the motion was approved by voice vote.

#### C. CITIZEN COMMENTS (Open Floor to Anyone Wishing to Speak on Record)

None.

#### D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Atherton requested a motion to approve the minutes for November 16, 2016. D. Castro requested correction of three small typographical errors on pages four and five. N. Nelson will make the requested corrections. J. Wright motioned to approve the minutes as noted, D. Castro seconded the motion, and the motion was approved by voice vote.

#### E. OLD BUSINESS

None.

F. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **Public Hearing** (continued from November 16, 2016 meeting), on requests by Pearl Street Commercial represented by Steven Schwartz for a proposed Lincoln-Peace Planned Development resubdivision which requires a zoning map amendment to PD-C Planned Development Commercial zoning and approval of preliminary plats/plans for the subject property located at 2111-2131 E. Lincoln Highway, DeKalb.

At 6:02 PM, Chair Atherton re-opened public hearing.

Representing the petitioner, Pearl Street Commercial, Jim Stoddard of the firm Klein, Stoddard, Buck & Lewis, located at 2045 Aberdeen Ct. and resident at 740 W. State St., both in Sycamore, Illinois, addressed the Commission. He introduced Steven Schwartz representing Pearl Street Commercial LLC, Ryan Swanson from ARC Design Resources Inc., and Lauren Downing also from ARC Design. He also introduced the present owners of the property in question, James Kaelin, his family, wife, and daughter Sally Kaelin Mullis, all of whom are in support of the proposed development.

Mr. Schwartz of 2519 Fielding Dr., Glen Ellyn, Illinois, and principal at Pearl Street Commercial, addressed the Commission. He stated he was the developer of the Dunkin Donuts-Jersey Mike's location on Annie Glidden and W. Lincoln Hwy. Over the past 9 months, he has worked with the City and the Kaelin family to prepare the proposed preliminary development plan presented. He hoped to be able to move forward with City Council consideration of the final plan in January. He thanked the Kaelin family for their presence at the meeting and commended them upon their over 60 years' presence in the community at on the property, running their florist business while raising their family.

He displayed aerial photos of the site on the screen at the northwest corner of Peace Road and Lincoln Highway, occupying 4.96 acres. The site includes the existing storage facility, the floral shop and greenhouses, the original currently-uninhabited Kaelin family home, and a retention area. He noted that the floral shop will close December 23<sup>rd</sup>. The proposed plan will consolidate three curb cuts into one on the west end of the site. He pointed out the zoning of the site and the surrounding properties.

The proposed plan requests to subdivide the property into two lots: one for the existing storage facility on the north end and one for the development of a Casey's General Store on the south end. A non-mountable median will be placed in the middle of Peace Road to prevent left turns into and out of the lot. Design elements, including building materials and signage, were also presented. He stated they have worked diligently with City staff to make their plans conform to the City's UDO.

Ryan Swanson of ARC Design Resources in Loves Park spoke regarding his experience with working on Casey's stores in several different locations. He

displayed on the monitor the locations on the site of the 4,400 square-foot convenience store, a canopy covering eight fuel dispensers, 14 parking stalls, delivery area, the driveways, trash enclosure, and underground storage tank locations. Improvements on Peace Road include extending the south-bound right-turn lane about 200 feet to facilitate entering the facility. He pointed out the location of features of the development, including planned underground water retention, landscaping, and lighting. The architecture of the convenience store will be similar to the Sycamore store, but larger, with antique red brick walls, red shingled roof, and additional windows. The canopy columns will match the building's brick. The ground sign for Casey's will be no larger than the 50-square-foot maximum, as required by the UDO.

D. Castro requested City staff to present comments and background.

### **CITY STAFF REPORT**

Planner Dan Olson summarized the proposed development. He mentioned the developer's willingness to comply with the City's requests for modifications to the architectural elevations and landscaping. He also confirmed adherence to the City's UDO and Comprehensive Plan guidelines. The recommendation from City staff to the Commission is approval with the conditions listed in the staff report and supporting materials. He requested that the Commission also to include in its approval the new details for the Casey's and Casey's/Self-Storage ground signs, submitted and dated November 30, 2016, which include an additional fuel type and price area. In addition, he requested the recommendation include the removal of self-service storage from #21 of the prohibited use list in the staff report.

### **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

At 6:26 PM, Chair Atherton invited members of the audience to comment. No public comments were made. Chair Atherton closed public comments at 6:27 PM.

### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioners asked for clarification of certain aspects of the proposal.

City staff confirmed that the Commission may recommend to City Council approval of both the zoning map amendment and the preliminary plats/plans at the same time in the same motion.

City staff confirmed that City Council will conduct a public hearing and take action upon a proposed amendment to the 2004 Annexation Agreement after the Commission makes its recommendations.

The petitioner confirmed that the original Kaelin home on the site is uninhabitable and will be demolished, along with the other existing buildings on site. The currently occupied Kaelin home, located west of the site, will remain.

City staff explained to the Commission that they should not consider the developer's agreement to donate funds to the City for future installation of ornamental street lighting and a City of DeKalb monument sign in its deliberation of the current proposal. Staff noted that when presented to City Council for consideration, the annexation agreement amendment will address these items.

Chair Atherton asked if access to Lincoln Highway from the remaining Kaelin home will go through the Casey's property. The petitioner explained that the land on which the driveway is situated was licensed through Com Ed by the former owner of the land when it was one large parcel. The Kaelin family has renewed this license through 2019, and they may continue to do so. The petitioner added this arrangement is not a problem for Casey's and will continue as long as Com Ed desires. If Com Ed decides to remove the driveway, they would be responsible for constructing a new driveway to provide access directly to Lincoln Highway.

The petitioner confirmed that the proposed convenience store will likely seek to operate 24 hours. City staff was not aware of any regulations that may prevent this, but they will research and provide feedback at the next Commission meeting and when presenting to City Council.

D. Castro asked if sidewalk installation along the right-of-way will be required as part of the current proposal. He recommended that the Commission consider the importance of connecting sidewalks throughout the City as land is developed. City staff replied that the current proposal includes reconstructing the current sidewalk, which is in poor condition.

Chair Atherton asked if the proposed median will cause additional traffic problems to an already accident-prone intersection. J. Charlton reported that the City's Design Review Team (DRT) expressed a similar concern. A fully landscaped island was suggested initially but ultimately not recommended due to possible future area improvements and lane alignment challenges. The petitioner stated that the proposed median was designed according to IDOT standards with a ramp up to six inches and rumble strips at each end.

Chair Atherton voiced support for the proposal and thanked the developers and City staff for working together to make it happen. She stated that the loss of the floral shop was unfortunate. She also confirmed that both the Commission's recommendation and an amendment to the annexation agreement would be considered at the same time when heard by City Council.

Chair Atherton requested a motion to approve a zoning map amendment and preliminary plat/plan.

## **MOTION**

M. Crull presented a motion: Based upon the submitted petition and testimony presented, he moved that the Planning and Zoning Commission forward its findings

of fact and recommend to the City Council approval of a zoning map amendment from the "GC" General Commercial and "LI" Light Industrial Districts to the "PD-C" Planned Development – Commercial District for the subject property and approval of a Preliminary Plat and Preliminary Development Plan as described in Exhibit I and subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Lot 1 will be permitted to have a gasoline service station with associated convenience store. Uses listed in Exhibit II of the staff report shall be prohibited. No additional outdoor storage, sales or activity shall be permitted except adjacent to the proposed convenience store building and no storage shall exceed 4 feet in height, block any windows and a 3 foot wide minimum pedestrian access shall be maintained.
- 2) Lot 2 will be permitted to have a self-storage facility. Uses listed in Exhibit II of the staff report shall be prohibited with the removal of self-service storage facility from the list. No additional outdoor storage, sales or activity shall be permitted, and no outdoor storage of vehicles, trailers, RV's or other items shall be permitted.
- 3) Final Engineering Plans and a Final Plat shall be submitted with proper applications.
- 4) That the remaining comments as listed in Exhibit III shall be addressed to the satisfaction of staff or outside agency.
- 5) That a waiver of Article 13.07.02 (3) Business Signs – Wall, to allow for three (3) wall signs on the south building elevation including one 64 square feet "Casey's General Store" sign and two (2) "Home To Go" wall signs not exceeding 8 square feet each in lieu of the allowable 105 square foot sign be approved per the details provided in the Casey's Sign Packet dated 11-23-16.
- 6) That waiver of Article 13.07.05 (1) Gasoline Station Canopy Signs, to allow three (3) 17.5 square foot Casey's General Store canopy signs in lieu of the allowable two (2) canopy signs at a maximum of 10 square feet be approved per the detail provided in the Casey's Sign Packet dated 11-23-16.
- 7) No other permanent signs are allowed on the subject property and temporary signs shall only be allowed per Article 13.05.06 of the Unified Development Ordinance.
- 8) Sign details dated 11-30-16 shall be added to Exhibit I.

J. Wright seconded the motion.

## **VOTE**

A roll call vote was taken. Aye: D. Castro, M. Crull, J. Wright, Chair Atherton, Nay: none. The motion was approved 4-0-0 by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

## **G. CONSIDERATIONS**

None.

## **H. FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

Staff noted the December 14<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting agenda will include the Casey's final plan/plat approval. This will allow City Council to consider the whole proposal in January so that the petitioner can hopefully begin construction in early spring 2017. Also on the agenda will be a Concept Plan Review for the DeKalb Sanitary District plant expansion on Sycamore Road. This meeting is for public information only, not a formal public hearing. Surrounding property owners will be notified of this informational meeting as a courtesy. A formal public hearing is planned for January, 2017.

## **I. REPORTS / ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING**

None.

## **J. ADJOURNMENT**

Seeing and hearing no further comments, Chair Atherton requested a motion to adjourn. D. Castro motioned to adjourn, J. Wright seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 6:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Natalie Nelson, Administrative Assistant

Minutes were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on [DATE].

**MINUTES  
CITY OF DEKALB  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
December 14, 2016**

The Planning and Zoning Commission held a Meeting on December 14, 2016 at the City of DeKalb Municipal Building, 200 S. Fourth St., DeKalb, Illinois.

Chair Atherton called the meeting to order at 6:20 PM.

**A. ROLL CALL**

Brenda Hart called the roll and the following members of the Planning and Zoning Commission were present: Matthew Crull, Jerry Wright and Chair Atherton. Members absent at roll call were: David Castro and Deborah Nier.

Also present were: JoEllen Charlton, Community Development Director and Dan Olson, Interim Principle Planner.

No quorum was present; therefore, no official business could be conducted.

**B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – ADDITIONS / DELETIONS**

None

**C. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

None

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

None

**E. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**F. NEW BUSINESS**

None

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

---

Brenda Hart, Administrative Assistant



**City of DeKalb  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Staff Report**

**DATE:** January 6, 2017

**TO:** Planning and Zoning Commission Members

**FROM:** Dan Olson, Interim Principal Planner

**SUBJECT:** Text Amendment to Article 7.14 “Design Requirements for New Residential Construction” of the Unified Development Ordinance

**GENERAL INFORMATION:**

Since last summer, the Mayor and City Council have been working on and approving changes to the City’s various boards, commissions and committees to consolidate duties, avoid duplication and help the groups function more effectively and efficiently. One of the committee’s that was looked at was the Design Review Committee (DRC). The DRC’s duties and responsibilities are covered in Chapter 48 of the Municipal Code and their intent is to assure the compatibility of new residential construction with the character of the City’s neighborhoods. Due to the slowdown in the housing market and other factors, the DRC has not met in over 7 years and the intent is to eliminate the committee and transfer its duties. Article 7.14 “Design Requirements for New Residential Construction” of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) describes the duties of the DRC in the review of new homes. Since the intent is to dissolve the DRC, the UDO needs to be amended.

**ANALYSIS:**

Per Article 7.14 of the UDO, the DRC reviews all new residential dwellings proposed in the City. For subdivisions approved after January 1, 1990, only new homes proposed after 90% of the development is built out require review by the DRC. Each proposed new home is reviewed based upon the Design Guidelines and Checklist in the UDO, which is Appendix 7-A (attached). The guidelines use a scoring system to determine the appropriateness of the design of the new home.

For new homes proposed in a Historic District or designated a Local Landmark, the application is referred first to the Landmark Commission for review and comment prior to a decision by the DRC. The definitions for Historic District and Local Landmark are located in Chapter 44 “Landmark Commission” of the Municipal Code.

The DRC has not met in over 7 years because there has not been any new homes proposed in the Historic District or on a site designated a Local Landmark. In addition, there have been no new homes proposed in areas outside the Historic District or in a subdivision approved after January 1, 1990 that is beyond 90% built out. Since the DRC has not met in several years, the intent is to absorb the DRC’s duties into the Landmark Commission or carried out by the Community Development Director or designee.

The proposed text amendments would require that new homes proposed in a Historic District or a designated Local Landmark, would be reviewed by the Landmark Commission. The Landmark Commission’s purpose is promoting preservation issues in the City and one of their current duties is providing comments to the DRC on new dwellings proposed in a Historic District or which is a Local Landmark. For new homes outside a Historic District, not designated a Local Landmark or in subdivisions approved on or after January 1, 1990 that are beyond 90% built out, the Community Development Director or designee would review the application.

It is proposed that both the Landmark Commission and the Community Development Director or designee would use the current Design Guidelines and Checklist located in Appendix 7-A of the UDO in their deliberations regarding the appropriateness of new home designs. In addition, the language in Article 7.14 allowing an applicant to appeal a negative ruling to the City Council will be maintained.

Text amendment procedures are described in Article 20 of the UDO. They are subject to public hearing, review and recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and approval of an ordinance by a 2/3 vote of the City Council. The granting of this text amendment does not authorize approval for any specific property.

Once the Planning and Zoning Commission makes their recommendation regarding the text amendments to the UDO, the plan is to prepare Ordinances deleting Chapter 48 “Design Review Committee” in its entirety and amending Chapter 44 “Landmark Commission” and the UDO to absorb the duties of the DRC.

**SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the submitted petition and testimony presented, I move that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of the text amendments to Article 7.14 of the UDO to absorb the Development Review



Committee's duties into the Landmark Commission or the Community Development Director or designee as indicated in Exhibit I.



# EXHIBIT I

## **7.14 Design Requirements for New Residential Construction in Older Neighborhoods** **(ORD 06-94 & 09-31)**

The intent and purpose of this Article is to assure the compatibility of new construction with the character of the City's residential neighborhoods, in order to protect, preserve and enhance the architectural character, protect and enhance property values, and to promote the health, safety and welfare of the City and its residents.

### 7.14.01 Applicability

- a. These regulations shall apply to all new residential construction in the City of DeKalb, as further outlined below;
- b. For lots created on or after January 1, 1990, the terms of the covenants of the subdivision, annexation agreement, Planned Development or other conditions of approval of the subdivision or Planned Development, shall apply. However, the provisions of this Article shall apply to any construction of new principal residential structures occurring after 90% or more of the residential lots within that subdivision have been improved;
- c. In the case where these provisions conflict with the provisions of existing covenants or terms of approval, the more restrictive shall apply;
- d. In the case where these provisions conflict with the provisions of the Landmark District Commission regulations or other Municipal Code provisions, the more restrictive shall apply.

### 7.14.02 Provisions

Each proposed new residential principal structure shall be reviewed based upon the ***Design Guidelines & Checklist*** set forth in Appendix 7-A, attached hereto and made a part of this Ordinance, and shall be referred to the Design Review Committee Landmark Commission or Community Development Director or designee for approval.

### 7.14.03 Process

- a. All building permit applications for new residential dwellings shall be referred to the Design Review Committee Landmark Commission if located. ~~If in a Historic District, or if the property is a Local Landmark, the application shall be referred to the Landmark Commission for review and comment prior to referral to the Design Review Committee.~~
- b. ~~b.~~ All building permit applications for new residential dwellings shall be referred to the Community Development Director or designee if not located in a Historic District, or if the property is not a Local Landmark.
- ~~b.c.~~ An applicant shall provide supporting materials as outlined in the Design Review ~~Process letter~~ Application Form.
- ~~c.d.~~ The Design Review Committee Landmark Commission and Community Development Director or designee shall consider the application and supporting materials based upon the *Design Guidelines & Checklist*. ***A minimum score of 75% is required in each of the applicable guideline categories for project approval.***

### 7.14.04 Powers of the Design Review Committee Landmark Commission and Community Development Director or Designee

After review of a proposal, the Design Review Committee Landmark Commission and Community Development Director or designee may approve, approve with conditions, or deny an application. Denial of the application shall

be based upon the failure of the application to obtain sufficient points on the ***Design Guidelines & Checklist***.

7.14.05 Effect of Denial, Appeal

- a. If the permit is denied the applicant may submit a revised plan. In the case of submittal of a revised plan, the procedure shall be the same as a new design review application.
- b. In the case that the applicant has been denied, and the applicant disagrees with the ruling of the ~~Design Review Committee~~Landmark Commission or Community Development Director or designee, the applicant may appeal the ruling to the City Council. The City Council shall have the final determination on the proposed residential structure.
- c. In the case that a building permit was denied for reasons other than the ruling of the ~~Design Review Committee~~Landmark Commission or Community Development Director or designee, any appeal shall follow the due course set forth in the appropriate code for which the permit was denied.

## Design Guidelines and Checklist


City of DeKalb, IL

**Instructions:**



*A minimum score of 75% is required in each of the Guideline Categories for project approval. Any individual criteria which is not applicable to a particular project will not be included in the scoring process.*

**Applicant Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address of Project:** \_\_\_\_\_

GUIDELINE #1 - STREETScape RHYTHM: New infill construction should attempt to maintain the existing overall pattern and rhythm of the streetscape. The following characteristics define how well the building will meet this rhythm:	Maximum Points	Applicant	CD Director or Designee	Landmark Commission	EXAMPLES
1.1. <b>Massing and Scale:</b> The massing and scale of new buildings should follow the predominant pattern of the neighborhood. The scale and volume of the new building should respect its neighbors and not overwhelm them or stand out due to inappropriate size. If the infill building is larger than those nearby, consider adjusting the massing to allow large roof forms to be articulated and broken down into smaller well-scaled components.	10				
1.2. <b>Setbacks:</b> The new building should follow the predominant street setback and side yard setbacks of existing properties on the street and adjacent properties.	5				
1.3. <b>Building Height:</b> The new building should be similar in height to the houses on the street. Consideration should be given to the height of the building at both the eave of the roof and at the ridge of the roof.	10				
1.4. <b>Floor Elevations:</b> The new building should emulate the predominant levels of floor elevations on the street.	5				
1.5. <b>Public – Private Transitions:</b> Some neighborhoods have very specific patterns of transition from the public street to the private interior of the home. Porches and stoops are part of the pattern and create a transition from a semi-private porch to the private zone of the interior. The new building should honor the pattern on their street for open porches, covered stoops, or other forms that may be predominant on the street.	10				
<b>Guideline #1 Total:</b>	<b><u>40</u></b>				
<b>Guideline #1 Minimum Points Required:</b>	<b><u>30</u></b>				

<b>GUIDELINE #2 - SITE DEVELOPMENT:</b> Lot coverage and placement of the house and garage shall be consistent with predominant successful patterns in the neighborhood and shall conform to the other Design Guidelines outlined herein. In addition, site development should maintain existing trees, provide opportunities for new landscaping, and not overwhelm a site.	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>CD Director or Designee</b>	<b>Landmark Commission</b>	<b>EXAMPLES</b>
2.1. <b>Lot Coverage:</b> The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) may allow a larger square footage than is compatible with criteria 1.1. If the footprint size of the homes in the neighborhood is less than the maximum area allowed in the UDO, the lesser square footage shall be followed.	10				<div> </div> <p>Appropriate: Recessed garages is downplayed, emphasizing house at streetfront</p> <div> </div> <p>Inappropriate: Garage-dominated "snout" house.</p>
2.2. <b>Placement on Corner Lots:</b> Set backs on corner lots shall respect and utilize the rhythm on both streets. Placement of garages and accessory structures and use of landscaping for corner lots is of particular importance.	5				
2.3. <b>Garage Location:</b> Location of the garage and driveway shall follow the predominant patterns of the street. Houses located on alleys should have drives and garages sited at the back of the house.	10				
2.4. <b>Preserve Significant Trees:</b> The size, location and type of trees of 6" caliper or larger shall be indicated on a site plan. The placement and design of the house should take into account the tree canopy, root zone and site grading to avoid disturbing top soil. Trees on adjacent properties shall also be included in the evaluation for potential disturbance due to construction operations.	10				
2.5. <b>New Landscaping:</b> Infill housing typically occurs on streets with mature trees and landscaping. The use of new trees, shrubs and planting areas shall be included in the building design process and be considered part of the overall streetscape and "good neighbor" criteria.	5				
<b>Guideline #2 Total:</b>	<u>40</u>				
<b>Guideline #2 Minimum Points Required:</b>	<u>30</u>				

<b>GUIDELINE #3 - ARCHITECTURAL DETAIL:</b> Use architectural detail to create visual interest and support the best architectural patterns of the neighborhood.	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>CD Director or Designee</b>	<b>Landmark Commission</b>	<b>EXAMPLES</b>
<b>3.1. Entry Features or Front Porches:</b> Porch and entry feature details shall be consistent with street elevation character rather than mimic backyard deck construction.	10				
<b>3.2. Façade Scale and Character:</b> The façade shall create visual interest, human scale and reflect good elements of the surrounding neighborhood. Doors, windows, and roof elements shall be proportional to the façade. Use of bay windows, gables and other roof variation can be used to avoid large blank walls or monolithic roofs. The size, proportion, and type of windows should be consistent with the predominant pattern of windows on the street.	10				
<b>3.3. Architectural Detail/ Appropriate Materials:</b> Façade details such as window and door trim, corner boards, frieze and fascia boards, columns and brackets can go a long way to creating character and a sense of authenticity. Material selection shall also be consistent with the size, scale and style of neighboring structures.	10				 <p>Appropriate: Details are consistent on all sides</p>
<b>3.4. Utilize Four-sided Architecture:</b> The character and detail of the façade shall be consistent on all sides of the house, and recognize that all sides are visible and affect the character of the street. Window size and proportion, use of materials and detailing should be consistent on four sides and work to create an authentic presence on the street. Roof forms, windows styles, siding and detailing all are elements of four-sided architecture.	10				
<b>3.5. Garage Design:</b> Style, mass and use of detail for the garage shall be consistent with the character of the main structure. Dormers, windows or gables shall be used to break up large roofs or walls. Single doors are preferable to double doors. Avoid using standard "one-style-fits-all" garage packages for detached garages. Attached garages with second floors should avoid monolithic, two-story appearance by using gables, dormers or partially recessed rooflines at the second floor to avoid the appearance of a large box.	10				 <p>Inappropriate: Details and material use are not consistent.</p>
<b>Guideline #3 Total:</b>	<u><b>50</b></u>				
<b>Guideline #3 Minimum Points Required:</b>	<u><b>38</b></u>				



<b>GUIDELINE #4 - GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICIES:</b> New infill projects should be designed to be a "good neighbor" to adjacent properties and the surrounding neighborhood. In addition to visual design compatibility, other considerations should be addressed, including maintaining privacy and access to views, light and air.	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>CD Director or Designee</b>	<b>Landmark Commission</b>	<b>EXAMPLES</b>
4.1. <b>Obstruction:</b> Locate taller portions of buildings to minimize obstruction of sunlight to adjacent yards and rooms.	5				
4.2. <b>View:</b> Consider neighbor's views in placement and size of new building elements.	5				
4.3. <b>Privacy:</b> Windows, balconies and decks should be located to respect privacy of neighboring properties. Consider using landscape elements and fences to buffer views and maintain privacy.	5				
4.4. <b>Exterior Lighting:</b> Minimize the impact of exterior lighting on adjacent properties. Use recessed down light fixtures or shields. Avoid floodlights and non-shielded point source lights. Use motion sensors and timers to control fixtures. (see 10.05 of the UDO)	5				
4.5. <b>Fencing:</b> Fencing design, material and height should be consistent with the principle building(s) on the subject and adjacent properties.	5				
<b>Guideline #4 Total:</b>	<u>25</u>				
<b>Guideline #4 Minimum Points Required:</b>	<u>19</u>				

<b>GUIDELINE #5 - PROXIMITY TO LANDMARKS:</b> New construction located adjacent to or near a designated historic structure or district shall be respectful of such designation. This guideline shall only be considered part of the checklist if applicable.	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>CD Director or Designee</b>	<b>Landmark Commission</b>	<b>EXAMPLES</b>
5.1. <b>Preserve Quality:</b> The quality of nearby landmarks or historic districts shall be preserved by avoiding excessively similar or dissimilar newly constructed buildings that detract from a landmark or district's character.	10				
5.2. <b>Obstruction:</b> Landmarks should not be dwarfed or obstructed from view by nearby buildings.	10				
5.3. <b>Recommendation:</b> The recommendation(s) of the Landmarks Commission have been met.	10				
<b>Guideline #5 Total:</b>	<b><u>30</u></b>				
<b>Guideline #5 Minimum Points Required:</b>	<b><u>23</u></b>				

<b>Total Maximum Points</b>	<b><u>185</u></b>			
Required Minimum Score				
<b>Guideline #1: 30</b>				
<b>Guideline #2: 30</b>				
<b>Guideline #3: 38</b>				
<b>Guideline #4: 19</b>				
<b>Guideline #5: 23</b>				