

2025 Façade Application Scoring Rubric

Property Address: _____

How well does the project fit the definition of "facade" or "public entrance due to parking in the rear of the building"?

1	2	3	4	5
Poor fit; does not focus on a true facade or has minimal visibility	Somewhat misaligned; partial visibility but may include side or rear elements	Adequate fit; primarily focuses on public-facing elements but lacks prominence	Good fit; focuses on public-facing elements that are visible to passersby	Excellent fit; fully aligns with a front-facing, highly visible facade

Does this project go beyond routine maintenance to provide a substantial facade improvement/enhancement?

1	2	3	4	5
Routine maintenance only; no noticeable enhancement to the facade's appearance or character	Primarily maintenance with minor improvements; limited visual impact	Moderate improvements; includes some noticeable enhancements but still maintenance-focused	Substantial improvement; includes clear enhancements that go beyond basic upkeep	Major improvement; fully transformative with significant, lasting aesthetic impact

How would you describe the visual impact of the project on Gladstone's downtown?

1	2	3	4	5
Minimal visual impact; changes are unlikely to enhance the area significantly	Low impact; slight improvement, but effect is limited or isolated	Moderate impact; noticeable improvement that benefits the immediate area	Strong impact; clear enhancement of the downtown's appearance	Significant impact; transformative and highly beneficial to downtown aesthetics

How likely is this project to increase foot traffic or economic activity in the downtown area?

1	2	3	4	5
Minimal likelihood of attracting additional foot traffic or business	Low likelihood; project adds limited appeal or use for visitors	Moderate likelihood; project could attract some additional business or foot traffic	High likelihood; project likely to draw more visitors and engagement downtown	Very high likelihood; project is expected to significantly increase downtown activity

How well-designed is the project, and does it use high-quality, durable materials?

1	2	3	4	5
Poor quality; design and materials are low-end or poorly suited to the facade	Basic quality; standard design with limited durability or unique design features	Good quality; adequate design with reasonable quality materials	High quality; thoughtful design with durable materials	Exceptional quality; premium design with high-quality, lasting materials

Does the project encourage placemaking in the downtown?

1	2	3	4	5
The project does not contribute to placemaking in any meaningful way.	The project offers little to no placemaking benefit. It may improve a private space but doesn't meaningfully connect with the public realm or enhance the downtown experience beyond its immediate footprint.	The project has some placemaking value, but its impact is limited or unclear. It may enhance the visual character of the building but lacks a strong tie to community engagement or identity-building.	The project positively supports placemaking with noticeable contributions to the downtown environment. It shows intent to improve aesthetics and/or foster connection but may not be fully developed or integrated with broader placemaking goals.	The project strongly encourages placemaking and will significantly enhance the identity, vibrancy, and appeal of the downtown. It invites community interaction, improves the visual landscape, and contributes meaningfully to a shared sense of place.

To what extent does the project preserve or enhance the building's historic character?

1	2	3	4	5
No preservation of historic features; modern alterations that conflict with historical character	Minimal preservation; modern look with few historic elements retained	Moderate preservation; some attempt to incorporate historic elements but not fully cohesive	Strong preservation; well-balanced blend of historic and modern features	Excellent preservation; fully honors and enhances historic character of the building

Confidence in the project coming to fruition?

1	2	3	4	5
Very low confidence; major concerns about project feasibility or applicant's ability to execute	Low confidence; some concerns about project completion or resources	Moderate confidence; neutral, with some areas that could go either way	Good confidence; minor concerns but overall a positive impression	Very high confidence; strong expectation of project success and sound planning

Has the applicant provided a thorough application?

1	2	3	4	5
The application is substantially incomplete or disorganized. Most or all of the required components are missing. It does not meet the basic threshold for review.	The application is incomplete, with several key documents or pieces of information missing. Organization is lacking and multiple clarifications are needed. The intent of the project may be difficult to understand from the materials provided.	The application is partially complete. Some required components are missing or unclear. The submission may feel rushed or incomplete, requiring additional communication to fill in gaps.	The application is mostly complete, with minor missing details or small areas lacking clarity. All required documents are included, though some may be less organized or require minimal follow-up for clarification.	The application is fully complete, well-organized, and clearly written. All required documents are included, labeled, and professionally presented. Any optional or supplemental materials (e.g., letters of support, design sketches, or additional photos) have also been submitted. No clarification is needed.