



---

## CITY OF GARDEN CITY

---

6015 Glenwood Street ☐ Garden City, Idaho 83714  
Phone 208/472-2900 ☐ Fax 208/472-2998

~ Minutes ~

### Design Committee

12:00 PM

Monday, February 1, 2016

Garden City Council Chambers – City Hall  
6015 Glenwood Street, Garden City, Idaho

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER: 12:03 PM**

**II. ROLL CALL**

- a. Present: Kim Warren, Brett Labrie, Bev Callaway
- b. Absent: Diana Caldwell
- c. Garden City Development Services Staff: Erika Akin, Jenah Thornborrow, Jeff Lowe

**III. CHANGES TO AGENDA: None**

**IV. CONSENT AGENDA:**

- a. **Minutes of 1/19/2016 – Labrie moved to approve the minutes with changes identified by Warren; Callaway seconded. All aye**

**V. OLD BUSINESS:**

**SUBFY2016-1: Parkway Station:** Parkway Station LLC, represented by Hutchison Smith Architects, is requesting Design Review guidance for a planned Mixed-Use Development consisting of multi-family and single-family residential and commercial uses. The 4.07-acre site is located at 4232 Adams Street and 418 & 500 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and is within the M Mixed Use and C-2 General Commercial Zoning Districts, and the Mixed Use Residential and Transit Oriented Development areas of the Comprehensive Plan.

Doug Crowther, Jimmy O'Connor and Bob Smith were present to discuss the residential component of the Parkway Station Subdivision. The Design Review Committee reviewed the application previously on December 7, 2015. The applicants discussed the motivation to mirror the streetscape they installed with the Trailwinds Apartments and reflect the scale and massing to transition from the future commercial sites fronting Adams Street to residential and the Boise River. The proposed development includes one and a half story single family detached cottages in the interior of the site adjacent to the park, stepping up to three story attached townhomes grouped in sets of four interior to the site and arranged as eight attached homes facing 42<sup>nd</sup> St. The height transition is intended to maintain views for residents and provide a strong street presence on 42nd. Since the previous meeting, a narrow landscaping strip has been added to the western boundary as requested. This is comprised of several trees at the end and middle

points with trellised climber vines and boxwood in between. Applicant indicated they did not want to install a wide barrier of landscaping in order to keep options open if the adjacent property were to redevelop.

Warren approved of the design choices in recognition of the constraints for the small space available in the landscape buffer. Labrie questioned the lack of definition in the community garden shown on the plans. Crowther explained that the garden is envisioned as a shared space to promote community and provide a food source. He stated that the CC&R's will stipulate the maintenance of the garden. Committee discussed the seasonality of a vegetable garden and difficulty of shared maintenance and decisions amongst neighbors. Suggestions to define the space include adding raised beds, hedges as hardscape, intermixing perennials and flowers or providing a manicured edge treatment to avoid the garden resulting in an eyesore. Committee requested the applicant provide revisions for the community garden space. Warren questioned the choice of trees at the edge of the garden and suggested that the trees may block the relationship with the park. Callaway acknowledged considerations of openness versus privacy. Labrie requested additions to the plant choices for the pedestrian connection through the development to accentuate the pathway instead of edging the entirety in a single varietal groundcover. Fencing along the park was discussed. Applicant initially proposed a short fence between the community garden and the park and taller solid fences alongside the homes. Committee encouraged a more permeable division and landscaping instead of rock mulch on the park side. Thornborrow recommended the applicants look at some of the homes in Garden City with rear yards adjacent to the Greenbelt for creative fencing ideas that provide delineation of yard without creating a strong visual barrier.

Discussion of the building elevations included color choices, garage elevations and location of HVAC units. A palette of earth tones with bright painted front doors is shown; applicant identified the goal of complementary tones to Trailwinds but not as bright and modern. Lowe and Labrie discussed the addition of fenestration to the garage doors as an improvement to the rear elevations. Warren requested the applicant address the street where elevations are visible to traffic flow (no requirement for addition to the garages that face each other across interior access road). Thornborrow mentioned the Garden City Code provision prohibiting blank walls facing the street. Applicant was asked to revise plans to address these concerns. HVAC unit placement for townhomes is indicated as rooftop. Applicant advised GCC required screening of service equipment.

Summary of Committee discussion points:

- Further definition of the treatment of the community garden space was requested. Suggestions included perennial infrastructure for a vegetable garden, integration of raised beds as hardscape, addition of hedging and/or lawn treatment into the garden space for delineation of space.
- Consider adding fenestration or other architectural elements to garage elevations.
- In the pedestrian corridors, add interest to the singular groundcover with small trees, shrubs and different groundcover varieties.
- Clarify fencing types along Park side of cottages and townhomes. A visually permeable barrier is encouraged rather than a solid fence.
- Address the side of the building elevations seen from the public right of way, especially the sides of the townhomes to add visual interest and address the street (no blank walls).

- Revise landscaping plan to reflect changes discussed and remove artifacts of earlier versions.
- Landscape the sides of the cottages and townhomes adjacent to the Park.
- Re-visit the Committee before the application moves to Council for recommendation of approval.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS:**

- VII. DSR2016FY-3: WestVet Clinic**, represented by Leslie Brown with Golden West Advertising, is proposing a Master Sign Plan for a previously approved Animal Care Facility. The project is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Chinden Boulevard and 50th Street at 5000 Chinden Boulevard and 5024 and 5019 Sawyer Avenue. The Master Sign plan was a requirement of the Planned Unit Development approved in 2015.

Leslie Brown with Golden West Sign Company and Dr. Jeff Brouman from WestVet were present to discuss the Design Review application for a Master Sign Plan for WestVet Animal Emergency Care and Specialists. Dr. Brouman gave some background about the WestVet practice and their new building. The current application included wall signs, directional signs and a monument sign to be placed on the Chinden frontage. Brown identified elements of the signs designed to mirror architectural aspects of the building (colors, arches and stone). She presented different versions of the signage in various sizes. The sign proposed for the Chinden frontage is a multi-tenant sign. The Committee questioned whether multiple tenants could fit on the sign. Thornborrow advised the Committee that a future tenant would also be allowed a wall sign on the new building. The Committee reviewed the various signs proposed in the application. Discussion followed regarding the definition of one sign versus multiple (distance between the letters), how many were allowed per frontage (10% of frontage max), what size was allowed and what materials constituted distinctive. A 3-D rendering of the new building was presented by the applicant and helped Committee members visualize the whole project and scale. The Committee was generally supportive of the larger signs proposed but unable to interpret Code to approve as presented. Suggestions were made to reduce the size to comply with Code, separate the signs to achieve compliance or consider material change to distinctive category. Landscaping at the base of the monument sign was encouraged to avoid a top heavy look. Applicant was cautioned to avoid a potentially looming presence to pedestrians if the sign became too massive. The small monument sign proposed to indicate emergency entrance was allowed as a directional sign. Thornborrow requested that the address be added to the sign as required by Code.

The Design Review Committee requested the applicant address these considerations and resubmit for approval.

**VIII. DISCUSSION**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**