

# **CITY OF CRAIG PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**

Meeting of July 22, 2021  
7:00 p.m., Craig City Council Chambers

## **Roll Call**

Sharilyn Zellhuber (chair), John Moots, Kevin McDonald, Barbara Stanley

## **Approval of Minutes**

1. June 24, 2021 Minutes

## **Public Comment**

1. Non-Agenda Items

## **Public Hearing and New Business**

1. Request for Proposals – Craig Cannery Site Harbor and Upland Concept A/E Services

## **Old Business**

1. Historic Zoning Discussion – Items H1 and H2

## **Adjourn**

*The meeting will be available by teleconference for both the public and planning commissioners. To call into the planning commission meeting call 1-800-315-6338, code 63275#. Commissioners can participate and vote by phone if they wish.*



## **CITY OF CRAIG MEMORANDUM**

To: Craig Planning Commission  
From: Brian Templin, City Planner  
Date: July 16, 2021  
RE: Request for Proposals (RFP) – Cannery Site Concept Design A/E Services

---

The Craig City Council included \$50,000 for planning activities related to the Cannery Site development in the current FY budget which started July 1<sup>st</sup>. Jon and I have been discussing the highest priority needs for planning and have decided that it is important to have conceptual drawings done for both harbor and upland development in order to get better public input, public outreach, and to start to make some decisions about disposition of buildings and other planning efforts.

We have settled on a couple of items that we would like to see up front:

1. Concept drawings of the harbor and upland development based on the planning commission and harbor committee recommendations adopted by the city council in 2020.
2. A broad overview of the viability of restoration or use of the high priority buildings identified in the recommendations.
3. Some low-level historical documentation of the high priority buildings (using the National Park Service Historical American Building Survey format).

This RFP does not include any significant engineering services, site contaminant studies, detailed building condition surveys, cost estimates, etc. The intent of this RFP is to help us visualize the overall site development and start the process of historical documentation of the cannery buildings. Other requests for bids and proposals will take place in the future that accomplish more specific goals.

Please review the attached draft RFP and provide input. Staff's intent is to begin advertising the RFP starting Friday, July 23<sup>rd</sup>, hold a pre-award meeting with potential firms on August 10<sup>th</sup>, and open proposals on August 17<sup>th</sup>.

The RFP includes requirements for a general public meeting, a meeting with the planning commission/harbor committee, and a final meeting with the city council to fine tune the concept drawing. We would like the work to be done within 60 days of awarding a contract, but meeting schedules may draw that out some.

It is our hope that we can accomplish this work with the \$50,000 available in the current budget, but if the proposed work costs more we will work with the potential contractor to adjust the scope of work and/or work with the council for additional funds.

Recommendation: Review the attached RFP and move to direct staff to begin advertising the RFP starting July 23<sup>rd</sup>.



City of Craig Harbor Concept Design – Architectural/Engineering (A/E) Services  
Request for Proposals  
Proposals Due No Later than 3:00 pm, August 17, 2021

### **Section 1: Scope of Work**

The City of Craig is currently seeking proposals to complete concept design services and initial engineering reviews of the Craig Cannery Site as part of the ongoing Craig Harbor Project Development in Craig, Alaska. The City of Craig intends to develop tidelands and adjacent uplands at the Craig Cannery Site to include a new harbor and upland improvements. The city has been working with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in the study and design of the General Navigation Improvements (GNI). GNI includes a 10.1-acre harbor basin and 1,900 linear feet of rubble mound breakwater. Final design of GNI (primarily breakwaters) will be complete by December 31, 2021 and the USACE anticipates award of a construction contract for the breakwaters in the first calendar quarter of 2022.

Design and engineering services covered under this scope of work include concept drawings, reports, and other A/E services related to future development of the Local Support Facilities (including floats, access, utilities, parking, restrooms, and other upland support facilities). The purpose of these drawings and reports is to assist the city with public outreach, planning, and development of the site.

A pre-bid conference for the RFP is scheduled for August 10, 2021. Firms may attend the pre-bid conference in person or by Zoom. A Zoom link will be sent to all bidders registered prior to the pre-design conference. Go to <https://www.craigak.com/planning/page/craig-harbor-concept-drawings-request-proposals> for full information regarding this proposal, backup documents, and to sign up for changes, addendums, and the pre-bid conference information. Scope of work for this bid is as follows:

1. Conduct pre-design meeting with the City of Craig.
2. Prepare a DRAFT conceptual drawing for a new harbor layout based on USACE drawings and recommendations for the harbor design adopted by the Craig City Council on January 16, 2020. Drawing set should include:
  - a. general site plan
  - b. artistic rendering of the concept harbor
3. Prepare a DRAFT conceptual drawing for upland access, harbor access points, parking, restrooms, and other facilities detailed in the harbor design recommendations adopted by the Craig City Council on January 16, 2020. Drawing set should include:
  - a. general site plan
  - b. artistic rendering of the concept upland improvements

4. Conduct at least three public meetings to take additional comment from the public regarding the proposed concept drawing. One meeting should be scheduled at noon and the other two meetings should be scheduled on consecutive evenings to allow for full comments.
5. Meet with the Craig Planning Commission and Craig Harbor Advisory Committee in a public meeting to review the concept design and make modifications based on this input from the planning commission and harbor committee.
6. Meet with the Craig City Council to present the final concept draft. Make modifications to the drawings based on input from the city council.
7. Prepare a report that includes a general review of high priority buildings identified in the Upland Development Recommendations adopted by the Craig City Council on January 16, 2020 summarizing the viability of preservation or restoration of the structures. Structures are identified on page 24 of the Ward Cove Cannery Site Land Development Plan – Phase 1, dated April 2007 and shown on the Draft Craig Harbor Improvements Plan View Sheet. High priority structures include the web loft (structure 1), administration building (structure 7), maintenance shop (structure 4) and boiler/retort (located adjacent to the northwest corner of the administration building). NOTE: The city does not require a detailed engineering study of the buildings at this time. This report should speak in broad terms based on a walk-through of the facilities.
8. ALTERNATE BID ITEM: Prepare a modified version of the National Park Service (NPS) Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation to include a Historical Report using the HABS History Guidelines Outline Format as a guideline for the high priority buildings noted in item 7.

Completion of the public meetings, drawing sets, general engineering report on viability of high priority buildings, and HABS documentation (if included) should be completed no later than 60 days after notice of award is issued. Additional time will be allowed to accommodate planning commission, harbor advisory, and city council meeting schedules if necessary.

The City of Craig will provide the following documents related to this project:

- “DRAFT” Craig Harbor Navigation Improvements Plan View showing breakwater and harbor basin design
- January 16, 2020 City Council Adopted Cannery Site Recommendations
- April 2007 Ward Cove Site Development Plan
- 2019 Harbor Layout

## **Section 2: Project Manager/Contact**

Questions or comments regarding this request for proposals should be directed to the City of Craig’s project manager at the information below:

Brian Templin (Project Manager), Craig City Planner  
PO Box 725  
Craig, AK 99921

Email: [planner@craigak.com](mailto:planner@craigak.com)

Phone: 907-826-3275

Fax: 907-826-3278

### **Section 3: Proposal Deadline**

Complete, sealed proposals must be submitted to the City of Craig no later than 3:00 pm, August 17, 2021. Proposals may be hand delivered to Craig City Hall at 500 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Craig, AK 99921 OR mailed to City of Craig, PO Box 725, Craig, AK 99921. Proposals must be received by the city no later than the deadline shown above. Proposals may be emailed or faxed with prior arrangement only.

### **Section 4: Qualifications and Submittals**

In order to be responsive to this Request for Proposals, must provide copies of the following with each bid. Each item listed shall be maintained by the Contractor for the entire duration of the project.

- Professional Architect/Engineer licensed in the State of Alaska;
- Rate sheet for services as a part of the proposal.

Proposals should conform to the format shown in section 5. Proposals that do not provide all items shown in Section 5 or do not meet the minimum qualifications shown in this section shall be deemed non-responsive. Late or non-responsive quotes shall not be considered.

The City of Craig reserves the right to withdraw this request at any time, and may reject any and all proposals, in its sole discretion. The City of Craig shall not compensate any firm for preparation of proposals made in response to this request. The City of Craig may choose, at its sole discretion, to award based on the base scope of work, the alternate bid item, or the base bid and the alternate bid.

The City of Craig reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive any informalities or irregularity in the bidding and/or not make an award.

### **Section 5: Proposal Format**

Proposals should not exceed 20 pages and should be formatted as follows:

1. Brief description of firm and principals working on the project
2. Location of the firm's principal offices and staff members assigned to the project.
3. Similar experience and projects
4. Methodology
5. Timeline
6. Description of women and minority employment practices and ownership
7. Submittals shown in Section 4

Provide three (3) original copies of proposals with your submission.

### **Section 6: Scoring Criteria**

Submitted proposals will be scored from 0 – 100 points based on the following criteria:

1. Experience and Staff
  - a. Firm and staff experience with harbor development projects (20 points)
  - b. Firm and staff experience with historical site planning and development (15 points)
  - c. Firm and staff experience with building condition assessments (10 points)
  - d. Firm and staff experience with similar projects in Southeast Alaska (15 points)
2. Method/Timeline
  - a. Description of methodology and ability to complete the project within the timeframe shown in the scope of work. (25 points)

3. Proximity to the project site of the office of the firm and staff person(s) assigned to the project.
  - a. Firm and assigned staff located in Alaska (5 points)
  - b. Firm and assigned staff located in Southeast Alaska (5 points)
4. Employment practices of the firm or person with regard to women and minorities.
  - a. Description of women or minority employment practices (5 points)

The firm's proposal with the highest score will negotiate budget, method, timeline, and any adjustments to the project scope to meet the city's needs. In the event that the city does not feel that the highest scoring firm can meet the city's expectations within the city's budget, the city reserves the right to begin negotiations with the next highest scoring firm.

DRAFT

# CITY OF CRAIG MEMORANDUM

To: Craig Planning Commission  
From: Brian Templin, City Planner  
Date: May 24, 2021  
RE: Historic Zoning Discussion – Draft Zoning items H1 and H2

---

At the April 22, 2021 meeting the planning commission made edits to Section A – G of the draft historic zoning code. The next items that the commission asked to discuss are Sections H1 and H2.

Section H1 identifies a Design Review Board. The purpose of this board is to review all construction or alteration proposals in the zone to determine if they meet the historical design guidelines or requirements. In my research I have found several models used to review historical issues in similar zones.

1. The planning commission may sit as the Design Review Board and review proposed designs as part of regular P&Z meetings.
  - a. This would put some additional responsibility on the planning commission but would make it easier to sit a board.
  - b. Appeals would proceed directly to the city council.
  - c. Regular meetings would reduce delays in development.
  - d. Since the planning commission is broadly represented, it will likely bring less overall bias and more balance to the process.
2. An Historical Commission/Board could be created and placed into municipal code. This board/commission would likely have some range of authority to independently approve/disapprove/modify proposals related to their review authority. With this structure, most proposals that are approved would not see any review by the planning commission or city council.
  - a. This would be a separate board/commission with the authority to approve/disapprove/modify proposals.
  - b. Appeals of this board would likely include the planning commission as an intermediate appeal board and further appeals would then proceed to the city council.
  - c. Meetings could be scheduled regularly, but the number of proposals will likely be low so the meetings may be infrequent. This may delay some development.
  - d. A specific board would likely be more focused just on the historical development perspective and not necessarily on the other aspects of development.
3. An Advisory Board could be formed for the purpose of providing recommendations to the planning commission, with the commission sitting as the approval authority.
  - a. This would be a separate board, but would not have authority to make approvals/disapprovals. That authority would stay with the planning commission.
  - b. Since this board would not be making determinations, there would be no formal appeals. Applicants would be able to make their argument directly



to the planning commission, even if the board recommends disapproval. The planning commission would weigh the board's recommendation and the applications discussion in making the determination.

- c. Meetings could be scheduled regularly, but with the likely low number of applications they would probably be held infrequently. This would also add time to the process by making applicants go through the board and then the planning commission for project approvals.
- d. A specific board would likely be focused on the historical perspective, but since approval would vest with the planning commission, a more balanced decision would result.

Many of these boards and commissions have some specific positions for architects or other professionals. Since there are few (if any) of these professionals to choose from locally this would likely not work. The commission may also discuss ex-officio or ad-hoc members of any body and consultants to any formed body. Ex-officio members would be representatives of another body (i.e. planning commission) who would attend scheduled board meetings, but would not vote as part of the board. Having planning commission members as part of the discussion with another decision-making body may affect that person's ability to serve as part of the appeal process if the decision is appealed. Ad-hoc members are those members added for a specific purpose and generally are not part of the regular appointed body. The commission may also want to discuss the need or place for consultants to the body. This would generate an additional discussion about funding down the road since there is no current funding for this type of work on an ongoing basis.

It is probably a good idea to discuss pulling the Design Review Board (or Historical Commission, or whatever the planning commission decides to name this body) as a separate section in the zoning. The section would most likely identify seats, terms, appointment methods, meeting schedule, authority, etc.

Section H2, Design, Alteration and Construction Guidelines. This section lists five broad guidelines for construction and alterations. This language was likely pulled from some other existing code that I found and some of the guidelines may or may not be appropriate for the cannery site. I have included a copy of the final recommendations made by the planning commission and adopted by the city council for reference. The commission should discuss this section and make any changes. As I read this section, it is intended to have broader brushstroke guidelines rather than a list of very specific features. Section H4 has a number of design standards that probably go hand in hand with Section H2. The commission may want to compare H2, H4, and the commission's own recommendations to see if these can be consolidated into a discrete section.

The commission should discuss these items as shown in the draft zone language and make changes. It is likely that this document will continue to evolve as the commission goes through the rest of the draft zone so it is not necessary to formally adopt any changes at this time. If the commission can come to a consensus on changes, additions, and deletions staff will make changes and bring them back to the commission for further review.

When all sections have been edited the commission can take more formal action to recommend adoption of the zoning code to the city council.

A copy of the updated draft zoning is attached. I will put the date of the draft at the top of each page so that commission members can be sure they are using the correct draft for discussion.

No formal action is required at this time.

# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

## 18.05.060 HISTORIC ZONE – Proposed Purpose and Use Discussion

The purpose of the Historic Zone (HZ) is to accommodate a mix of low intensity\* industrial, marine industrial and commercial uses which will be relatively compatible with existing and proposed residential uses and with the historic nature of the zoned property. It is the intent of this zone to allow structures and uses which are consistent with the historical architecture, appearance and activities of the zoned area and which will promote year around use by visitors and local residents.

### A. Permitted Uses

1. Professional, public, community, newspaper and administrative Services and Offices including Post Offices, banks.
2. Boat storage yards, repair facilities and sale facilities (including boats and motors.)
3. Business Support\*
4. Community facilities including libraries, museum, visitor center, chamber of commerce facilities, Community Education\* and Recreation\* (including indoor recreation, outdoor recreation, theaters, parks, beaches, golf courses, open space and fish and wildlife areas.)
5. Day Care Centers\*
6. Docks, Port facilities\* and harbor facilities and accessory uses including Recreational Boat Marinas, other buildings necessary to the operation of the boat marina, ferry terminals and accessory uses\* and boat charter services.
7. Essential Services\*
8. Government complexes\* and facilities\*.
9. Retail Sales and rentals\*, rental, repair and maintenance.
10. Marine research or experiment stations.
11. Plant nurseries.
12. Public Maintenance Shops.
13. Restaurants and other eating establishments.
14. Taxi stands.

### B. Temporary Uses – See Section 18.06.005 Temporary Use Permit

### C. Conditional Uses

1. Clinics and other medical facilities and offices.
2. Bars, restaurants and other establishments providing for the sale of alcoholic beverages
3. Buildings built above maximum height.
4. Cold Storage plants and facilities.
5. Convalescent Homes, Nursing Homes, Children Homes and other group residential facilities.
6. Fences, walls or hedges over four (4) feet
7. Fish and Seafood Processing

# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

8. Ice manufacture, storage and sales primarily for fishing and fish processing.
9. Laundromat, laundries, dry cleaning establishments.
10. Lodging (Hotels, Motels)
11. Low Intensity\*, light manufacture, warehousing, compounding, processing, assembling, packaging, treatment, or fabrication of materials or property.
12. Off premises signs.
13. Other low intensity\* commercial and industrial uses which satisfy the criteria of Section 18.06.002C, Conditional Use Permits.
14. Other municipal uses in keeping with the character and requirements of this zone.
15. Public utilities and associated low impact buildings or facilities including small electrical substations or transformers.
16. Residential uses (apartments, watchman's quarters, etc.) accessory to\* other permitted uses. Residential uses within this zone must be accommodated within commercial, industrial or public buildings. Residential uses may not occupy street frontage at ground level.
17. Shipyards and marine ways.
18. Vehicle and equipment storage and parking accessory to a permitted use.
19. Lodges and resorts\* including lodges of fraternal orders, labor and social organizations.
20. Veterinary office. (No outdoor kennels)

D. PROHIBITED USES Include but are not limited to:

1. Uses not qualifying as Permitted or Conditional.

E. PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

1. MINIMUM LOT SIZE
  - a. No minimum lot size.
2. PARKING - See Chapter 18.14, Parking
3. SETBACKS\*: Front, rear, interior, and side yard setbacks as required by the Uniform Building Code and State Fire Marshall.

In addition:

- a. When abutting a residential zone, setbacks shall be ten feet for adjacent yards.
- b. Common wall development\* may be allowed.
- d. When structures are placed or constructed in this zone which is not subject to review by the State Fire Marshall, setbacks shall be ten (10) feet from all property lines with six (6) foot interior setbacks

# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

between structures unless both structures are mobile homes in which case the interior setback shall be ten (10) feet.

- e. Front and side setbacks for new construction or additions shall maintain the visual continuity of the streetscape.

## 4. HEIGHT - Thirty (30) feet maximum

MEASUREMENT Building height shall be calculated as the average height of three sides of the building measured from finished grade to the highest point of the roof. See Definitions, Building Heights-Buildings on Piling.

## 5. SIGNS

- a. Must be on premises.
- b. No sign or group of signs may be of a total combined size larger than 10% of the area of the wall on which they are mounted or front with a maximum of 200 square feet of sign per business.
- c. Off-premises signs may be allowed by Conditional Use Permit.
- d. No signs shall flash or move; cause glare on any public way or surrounding residential property; or be illuminated between the hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. unless relating to an establishment open during those hours.

## F. FENCES, WALLS AND HEDGES

Property line fences and walls, not exceeding four (4) feet in height may occupy any portion of a yard except as provided in Subsection G, (Visibility at Intersections) and also provided that such fence, wall or hedge projecting forward of the front yard setback line, shall not obstruct visibility. Fences, walls and hedges exceeding four (4) feet require a Conditional Use Permit.

## G. VISIBILITY AT INTERSECTIONS

On corner lots, no fence, wall or hedge or other planting or structure that will impede visibility between a height of 2 feet 6 inches (2'6") and 8 feet (8') above the centerline grades of the intersecting streets shall be erected.

No vehicle shall be parked within twenty (20) feet of any intersection. If the relationship of the surface of a corner lot to the street is such that visibility is already impaired, nothing shall be done to increase the impediment to visibility within the 20 feet mentioned above.

# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

H. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS. It is the intent of this zone to promote development which protects, reestablishes or reflects the historical architecture, style and construction of the area.

1. Design Review Board. The City of Craig Planning Commission shall act as the Design Review Board for all alterations and new construction in this zone.
2. Design, Alteration and Construction Guidelines. The following guidelines are intended to provide the applicant with an idea of the general criteria the design review board will employ when reviewing proposals for the downtown historic district. They are designed to preserve the characteristics which typify development in the district and provide the basis for the more specific design standards which follow.
  - a. All alterations to existing structures should be performed so as to preserve the historical and architectural character of the historic zone.
  - b. The distinguishing qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or destruction of architectural features should be avoided when possible.
  - c. All buildings, structures, and sites should be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis should be discouraged.
  - d. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site, and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance of their own, which should be recognized and respected.
  - e. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations or additions do not destroy the historical character of the structure. The same will hold true of new construction, that is, contemporary design shall not be discouraged if it does not violate the historical character of the surrounding buildings or the historic district as a whole. Design proposals for both new construction and alterations to existing structures must be compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property, the immediately surrounding structures, and those in the historic district.
3. Submittal Requirements

# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

- a. *General.* The following procedures are for persons who intend to undertake rehabilitation or new construction within the historic district. All submittals must be filed with the Craig Planning Department fifteen (15) days before the next scheduled Planning Commission Meeting
  - i. Building Permit Application is filed with the Craig Planning Department.
  - ii. The department schedules the application for review at the following design review board meeting (held at the next Planning Commission meeting).
  - iii. A notice of hearing is posted in at least three public places, on the city website and mailed by first class mail to all property owners within 300’ of the proposed construction or alteration at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing date.
  - iv. The Planning Commission, acting as the design review board reviews and evaluates the site development plan with consideration of the following:
    1. Preservation of the historical outward appearance and original design if development or work involves modification to existing buildings.
    2. Harmony of scale, architectural style, sidewalk level use, and materials with the existing historical character if development involves construction of a new building.
    3. The design review board may waive the historical preservation requirement and associated design standards if they deem that the proposed alteration or development includes significant historical or cultural design or showcases local building materials.
  - v. The planning department issues a building permit with the board's action.
- b. *Major projects.* The following items are required for major rehabilitation or renovation and new construction within the historic district. These shall accompany the application form and must be submitted to the department for review, including the design review board, and the building department:

# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

- i. The applicant shall submit a building permit application signed by the applicant and, if the premises are leased, by the owner. The location of the property shall be clearly indicated on an attached map.
  - ii. The applicant shall submit current color photographs of the site and existing structures showing both the overall condition of the structures, the materials, and color. The applicant shall also submit color photographs of contiguous sites and structures showing prevalent architectural styles and the character of the area. All photographs shall be marked to indicate the direction of the view and the date that the photograph was taken.
  - iii. Major exterior modification applications shall include three copies of a site plan showing the existing structure and its relationship to the site and all proposed alterations and additions. These drawings must be scale, and contain all elements noted on the building permit application.
  - iv. The applicant shall submit detailed description and drawings of all facades with street frontage and any facades which are visible from the street including proposed fenestration, canopies, signage, exterior equipment, and appropriate architectural detailing. Proposed building materials and finishes must be indicated with color and texture noted.
  - v. Samples of materials and photographs of products to be used in exterior finishing shall be provided. These may include color chips, samples of molding, or photographs of architectural details to be incorporated in the exterior finishing. These shall be keyed to the descriptions and drawings required in subsection (f) of this section.
  - vi. If the design review board requires modification to the submitted exhibition or additional submittals due to unusual conditions, these shall be submitted by the applicant as requested by the board prior to the applicant receiving a site development plan permit.
4. General Design Standards. The following design standards apply to both new construction and alterations to existing structures. The first three standards, for heights, setbacks and roofs, collectively define the form of the streetscape. The next three standards for retail storefronts, windows, and architectural details, are all listed under "front facade." These elements both define the character of a building and contribute to the character of the historic district as a whole. The remaining design standards for finishing materials, color, canopies, signs, and service lines, apply to the



# DRAFT – MAY 27, 2021

exterior of buildings. They also contribute to both the character of the facade and collectively, to the streetscape. The design review board may, in special cases, make exceptions to the design standards provided the alternative does not distract from the character of the district. In such cases, the board's findings must include written justification for granting such exceptions.

- a. *Architectural standard.* The original architectural details such as moldings, cornices, brackets, columns, and pilasters of a building shall be maintained in good repair. If they must be replaced for maintenance purposes or during the course of minor alterations, they should be replaced as nearly as possible with elements of the same type and of similar or compatible materials. If substantial replacement is required due to deterioration or a major alteration to the building, the elements shall conform in dimension and detail to those on the original structure. In the case of new construction, architectural details shall be suitable to the building itself and shall conform in dimension and detail with precedents found on comparable buildings or within the district.
- b. *Finishing material standard.* Finishing materials used in repairing or partially replacing exterior walls should match as closely as possible the materials used on the existing buildings. Where appropriate to the rehabilitation of the building, finishing materials used in major alterations to a building should match as closely as possible the original material used on the building in dimension, texture, and finish. Recommended finishing materials for both new construction and alterations to existing structures are horizontal wood siding, such as shiplap, tongue and groove and clapboard siding.
- c. *Color standard.* All siding, wood trim, and window trim shall be finished with paint or a semi-transparent stain. All colors and the placement of color on the building should preserve or emphasize the structural detailing. All colors and color combinations shall be subject to approval by the design review board.
- d. *Sign Standard.* Lettering style and symbols on signs shall be appropriate to the building's style and compatible with the lettering and style of other signs on the building. The preferred material for these signs is wood, with natural stain or painted finish and externally illuminated only. All signage proposals require approval by the design review board. The board will review plans for dimensions, placement, subject matter, lettering styles, color, materials, legibility and appropriateness of style to the character of the historic district.
- e. At a future date utility lines may be established underground. Conduits for those lines should be supplied from the street to the building in the course of new construction or alterations to existing structures. In the interim, aerial utility lines should be brought into a building as discretely as possible, so as not to detract from the appearance of the building.