Mr. Leoncio stated that the tower would not be changed, but the color of the tower is similar to the color that is proposed with the new building.

Mr. Elroweny suggested that the corners be painted in a darker shade. The northeast corner should be wrapped with paint, 20 feet from the corner on either side. It should be repeated on all four corners to the score line of the panel.

Mr. Pancoast stated that the landscaping plan is very good.

Mr. Balint asked if there are any wall-mounted lights.

Mr. Leoncio stated that the wall packs were deleted per staff's request. The lighting for the loading docks will be concealed.

Mr. Zbikowski asked if there will be any fence installed.

Mr. Leoncio stated that the property is already fenced and monitored 24-hours per day.

Mr. Teo stated that the fence along the front has been improved from a chain link fence to a decorative aluminum fence with an aluminum rolling gate. The remaining fence is chain link, but it has been supplemented with landscaping to screen the chain link.

**MOTION** by John Pancoast and seconded by Salah Elroweny to approve the plans as submitted, subject to the conditions provided by the Committee. All voted in favor of the above motion.

### Conditions:

- 1. The body of the building shall be Sherwin Williams Simplify Beige (SW 6085). The office will be painted Sherwin Williams Modest White (SW 6084). Sherwin Williams Nuthatch (SW 6088), will be painted on all corners of the building to the score line of the panel, subject to staff approval. The doors will be painted Sherwin Williams Modest White (SW 6084). The railings will be bronze to match the window frames.
- 2. The sign plan will come back to the Architectural Appearance Committee for review prior to approval of building permits.

## F. OTHER BUSINESS

Staff requests discussion on the following matters:

### 6. SUPPLEMENTAL CRITERIA

Staff has prepared a comprehensive update to the 1998 Supplemental Criteria. The revisions reflect current terminology, and language that reflect trends in architecture, site design and associated technology that is focused on sustainability.

The proposed Supplemental Criteria was presented to the Architectural Appearance Committee at the April meeting. Revisions have been incorporated based upon feedback from the Committee from that meeting.

Staff is seeking approval from the Architectural Appearance Committee on the Supplemental Criteria, which requires adoption by the City Commission.

Ms. Stanton stated that staff is looking for the Committee's approval of the Supplemental Criteria. She presented a sample of the checklist staff will be using during their reviews. This checklist will be added to the Development Application.

Mr. Elroweny asked what is meant by "info needed".

Ms. Stanton stated that the checklist is to be used by staff to review the submissions and certain criteria may not apply to all development.

Ms. Aycock asked why there is a section promoting pervious pavement when the code requires solid pavement.

Ms. Stanton stated that it is meant for overflow parking.

Mr. Elroweny asked if there could be more time to review the criteria. He is worried that there have been too many restrictions on the architects. As an architect, he feels that it is difficult to deal with the restrictions and requirements from different cities. He would like to see architects come in earlier to discuss the plans before the civil plans are created so that dramatic changes to building placement won't cause the applicant to have to scrap all of the drawings.

Ms. Stanton discussed the approval timeline for the Supplemental Criteria. She explained that the checklist is a tool the Urban Design Planners will use to ensure that the projects that are presented to the Architectural Appearance Committee will be to the standards of the Committee.

Mr. Zbikowski stated that the way the Committee currently does reviews is personable. He is concerned that when there is a requirement that the applicant meets certain requirements on a checklist the products will be harder to approve. The projects are made better by the committee, but he doesn't want to make it too difficult for the architects.

Mr. Elroweny stated that there are two kinds of submissions: those with a great design and those with a bare-minimum design. He doesn't want to make it harder for the ones who do a great job because of the ones who do only the minimum, but there should be a complete package when it gets to AAC review.

Mr. Zbikowski stated that he feels good about the new Supplemental Criteria because he wants the projects to be better when they are presented.

Ms. Stanton stated that certain applicants question whether or not the Architectural Appearance Committee has the authority for certain changes, and the new criteria will allow staff to resolve most of the issues and explain the function of the Committee more clearly.

Ms. Aycock stated that she would like staff to add a definition of Vernacular Design Alternative.

Mr. Balint would like the Committee to approve relief based on a Superior Design Alternative and not be held to only a Vernacular Design Alternative.

**MOTION** by Tobi Aycock and seconded by Salah Elroweny to approve the revised Supplemental Criteria as submitted, subject to the conditions provided by the Committee. All voted in favor of the above motion.

#### Conditions:

- 1. The Supplemental Criteria will clarify that the promotion of permeable pavement will be only for uses that are allowable by the Zoning Code.
- 2. The definition of Vernacular Design Alternative will be added.

# G. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Committee, **MOTION** by John Pancoast and seconded by Joby Balint to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM.

Approved at the meeting held on July 28, 2016.

Robert H. Zbikowski

Chairman

Architectural Appearance Committee