



**LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)  
ARCHITECTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE  
FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 2005 AGENDA  
100 Australian Avenue  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Executive Conference Room, 3:30 p.m.**

1. Opening comments by Zoning Director
2. Introductions
3. Select Chair and Vice Chair
4. Review meeting procedures
5. Review topics for committee to review
6. Discussion on roof top mechanical equipment
7. Discuss next meeting agenda
8. Open discussion
9. Adjourn

# Architectural Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

August 19, 2005, 3:30 – 4:30 PM  
PZ&B Executive Conference Room

## **Present:**

### Subcommittee Members

Ron Last  
Thomas Kastner-Chair  
Scott Worley

### Zoning Staff

Jon MacGillis, Director  
Robert Buscemi, Principal Planner  
David Flinchum, Principal Planner  
Izabela Aurelson, Planner II  
DG McGuire, Site Planner II  
ED Nessenthaler, Site Planner II

## **Interested Parties:**

Robert Currie-Vice Chair  
John Strandberg  
Mark Beatty  
Peter Magyar  
Jerome Baumoehl  
Tom Glidden  
Edna Trimble  
Rene Tercilla  
Lance Uhley

Meeting began at 3:40 p.m.

Mr. MacGillis began the meeting with brief opening comments on the goals of Subcommittee and their role in the code amendment process. Members and staff introduced themselves and their organizations. Mr. Thomas Kastner, AIA, Song & Associates, was elected Chair and Mr. Robert Currie, Currie, Sowards Aguila Architects a Vice Chair of the Subcommittee.

Mr. MacGillis explained the procedures for voting and making recommendations to the LDRAB. Mr. MacGillis provided the members with a copy of the "July 18th AIA/Industry Meeting Follow-up" and discussed staff's recommendations that addressed each item. He also, explained which items the subcommittee would be asked to review and comment on. This led into a discussion on Unique Structure and the approval process.

Mr. Kastner stated that in dealing with Unique Structure several issues need to be addressed:

1. Definition of Unique Structure
2. Recognizing the Use of Unique Structure (ie Science Museum)
3. Formulating a process on how to develop unique structures

Mr. Buscemi, Principal Planner, stated this committee would need to assist staff with developing standards guiding Unique Structure and the procedures of the Board, as well as the scope of their authority. Several members stressed that unique structures should be encouraged in PBC, and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) should become a vehicle facilitating an easy process for their review.

# Architectural Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

August 19, 2005, 3:30 – 4:30 PM  
PZ&B Executive Conference Room

Mr. Buscemi requested committee members help him outline the process, which would consist of the following:

1. Determination what qualifies as Unique Structure
2. Submittal requirements for projects determined by ARB to be a Unique Structure:
  - a. Full explanation from applicant why this is a unique structure
  - b. Assessment in context with the environment
  - c. Visual analysis-3-D, perspective drawings, models, landscape and site plan, and whatever the applicant feels is applicable to present their justification to the ARB.
3. Context to Neighborhood

Mr. Buscemi also asked the Subcommittee to consider the following questions: how would the ARB be selected, how would voting be determined, what professions would be represented on the Board?

Mr. Kastner requested staff to prepare the following for the next meeting: research other Unique Structure Ordinances in the country, especially look at Los Vegas, look at definition of Unique Structure, and Board composition. Mr. John Glidden, OGS & P Architects, informed the Committee that he had provided staff his ideas on this topic last year and recommended staff share his ideas with the Chair.

Mr. Buscemi brought up the last item on the Agenda "roof top mechanical equipment". Mr. John Glidden, offered some recommendations to address issues raised by industry in order to allow alternatives for complete screening of mechanical equipment:

- a. Screen to top of equipment
- b. Frontage-determine where you do not want to see equipment. All rights-of-ways or all property lines?
- c. Materials-what materials are permitted? Compatible with existing materials? Alternative materials?

It was agreed that this topic needs further discussion in order to resolve. Several Architects felt current code language was sufficient, while Mr. Rene Tercilla felt it was too costly and needed flexibility.

Mr. Kastner, asked when next meeting would be held and what the topic would be. Mr. MacGillis, suggested each member look over the AIA follow-up chart and check off what they were interested in participating on, then staff might create two subcommittee meetings. One would focus on AIA issues and another on Unique Structure. Staff would contact members next week to schedule an agreeable time for meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15