



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, May 16, 2016

Council Chambers – City Hall

6015 Glenwood Street, Garden City, Idaho

I. CALL TO ORDER AT 12:03

II. ROLL CALL

- a. PRESENT: Bev Callaway, Kim Warren, Diana Caldwell and Brett Labrie; Development Services Voting Staff Member: Jenah Thornborrow
- b. Garden City Development Services Staff Present: Jeff Lowe and Erika Akin

III. CHANGES TO AGENDA

IV. CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. **Minutes of 4/4/2016 Caldwell moved to approve as submitted, Warren seconded, all aye.**
- b. **Minutes of 5/2/2016 Labrie moved to approve, Callaway seconded, all aye.**

V. OLD BUSINESS:

DSRFY2016-6 Indoor Shooting Range at 3933 Chinden –Ryan Drew of Larson Architects, representing the owners of the property, is requesting Design Review Committee approval for construction of a new indoor shooting range, conversion of an existing building for customer reception and retail sales of firearms, and required site and landscape improvements. The site is currently developed with an existing commercial structure “The Dive Bar” and asphalt parking areas. The 0.86 –acre site is located at 3933 W. Chinden Blvd and is within the C-1 Highway Commercial Zoning District. The project is in the Green Boulevard Corridor and Mixed Use Commercial area of the Comprehensive Plan. The Committee reviewed the pre application materials on March 7, 2016, formal application on April 4, 2016 and requested revisions for Code compliance.

Cornel Larson, Ryan Drew, Jeff and Susan Lusk and Kyle Dunstan were present to discuss the application with the Committee. City attorney Charles Wadams joined the meeting. Caldwell moved to table the application until the use had been approved/denied by Planning and Zoning Commission scheduled for the following Wednesday evening May 18, 2016. Callaway seconded. Labrie objected, pointing out that the applicants had been to the previous meeting without quorum, had to return and now the Committee had quorum to vote on the application. Labrie stated that the application should be reviewed at the current meeting. Callaway asked a question about the previous meeting and Labrie’s suggestion at that time that the applicants go through the Planning and Zoning hearing before further discussion with Design Review. Labrie answered the applicant had been offered the option but had chosen to seek concurrent reviews and/or approvals in order to expedite the timeline. Thornborrow clarified the City policy allowing applicant to pursue approvals from Planning and Zoning and Design Review Committee concurrently. The approvals are independent of each other and the applicant assumes the risk of conflicting provisions or decisions. Discussion occurred about quorum being maintained if members recused themselves from an application. Thornborrow explained the quorum was preserved for the meeting, even if members recused themselves from voting on an application. Wadams concurred. Warren summarized that the design application can still be reviewed and commented on by the Committee even if the use has not been decided by Planning and Zoning Commission. Caldwell withdrew the motion to table and the

second agreed. In the previous meeting, Caldwell went on record to explain that the project use was against her personal beliefs and although this Committee only looked at the design of the project, she could not approve it due to bias against the use. In the May 16th meeting, Caldwell again recused herself from further discussion of the application and left the room. Callaway requested to do the same. She recused herself and said she will return for the next application. Warren recused herself and left the room. Akin asked if a decision can still be reached and voted on for the application. Thornborrow and Wadams say yes. Discussion returned to the plans. Thornborrow questioned the plans note of "seasonal color by owner". Architect and property owner confirmed the intent is flowering perennials. Thornborrow requested the architect identify what has been done to the building elevations on the Stockton frontage. Drew pointed to the score lines in the stucco, added band and continuation of the design facing the parking lot. Dunstan mentioned the power lines running down Stockton limited their options. Drew created the look with changes in paint color, not material. Labrie asked if they had considered lowering the canopy on the front plaza to a more human scale. Larson mentioned that they had it lower in a previous iteration and could lower it without trouble. Labrie suggested that it be aligned with the band line shown on plans to contribute to the plaza effect. Drew will drop it so that the back of pitch is at the vertical band line, shown in red on the color rendering. The pitch may be changed as well. **Labrie moved to approve the plans with the modification to the plaza canopy as a staff level review and clarification that the seasonal plantings are perennials to provide maximum interest. Thornborrow seconded, none opposed.**

DSRFY2016-1 Vehicle Washing Facility: J's Car Wash, represented by Josh Howa of Howa Design, is proposing to expand the current vehicle washing facility at 3756 West Chinden. The proposal requires Design Review Committee approval to add a traffic/stacking lane onsite, modify existing landscaping, add a vehicle access to Chinden Blvd., remove fencing, add on to the existing building and redesign the site. The applicant is proposing the addition of landscape areas to adjacent properties through the removal of asphalt along the existing Chinden sidewalks. The DR application includes site design, landscaping plan, building elevations and schematics. The project is zoned C-1 Highway Commercial zoning district and Mixed Use Commercial and Green Boulevard Corridor Comprehensive Plan designation. The Design Review Committee heard the application on January 19, 2016 and made requests for Garden City Code Compliance.

Josh Howa of Howa Designs and Bill Martin owner of J's Hand Car Wash were present to discuss the application. The staff report had questioned the flow of traffic on the site and potential conflict with pedestrians. Martin explained the process from the time a customer entered the site to exit. The waiting area for customers is accessible directly from their cars and customers do not drive around to the detail area; J's staff members drive the cars to the detail stalls if needed and deliver the vehicles to customers in the spaces adjacent to Jacksons. Howa said the flow of the site was not changing with this application. Akin explained that a substantial modification and intensification to a site required the Committee to review the whole design and possibly improve functioning not just for their use but future businesses or tenants. Howa addressed the concern that adjacent property owners may not allow the proposed landscaping on the plans. He met with Jacksons and Baird Oil and ITD. He said ITD does not want trees in their landscape areas so he will need to modify the landscape plan from what was in front of the Committee. Thornborrow questioned whether ITD was aware that the proposed landscaping was at the back of sidewalk. Howa said Jim Morrison at ITD was aware of that but any future widening or work would not want to navigate around larger trees. Thornborrow referenced IDAPA guidelines that trees are allowed outside of the clear zone. Safety is a large concern on Chinden. She explained that the existing asphalt strip is being used as sidewalk since it is removed from the road and feels safer to pedestrians. Trees make sidewalks feel safer for people. Street trees are required on the property. Howa told the Committee that a company had been found that could relocate the existing trees on the site into the landscaping area on site for compliance with tree mitigation requirements of GCC. Martin will be paying for installation of landscaping improvements of adjacent sites as well as maintenance but the neighbors do not want trees. Labrie pointed out that the Committee could only review the improvements on the application's site for compliance with GC Code; the Committee could not require Jacksons or Bairds to come into compliance as a result of J's Car Wash improvements. Thornborrow agreed but questioned whether the neighboring improvements were proposed as mitigation for deficiencies on J's site. Akin answered that the landscaping on Jacksons and Bairds was proposed as mitigation the added access to Chinden. Labrie stated he felt the reduction

of the access to a single lane resolved his concern with the access point. The exit only escape lane was required to be larger to accommodate the turning radius of an RV. Thornborrow asked if the escape lane will be gated. Martin was open to a visual deterrent for the access to discourage misuse. She then asked if the apron could be reduced when reconstructed. The architect affirmed it would be rebuilt to ADA compliance and reduced to a single lane width. Warren inquired about a provision in Code to insure the trees would survive the relocation procedure. Akin said the viability of the trees would be a condition of DR approval and if they were to die, the caliper must be mitigated on site.

Caldwell commented on the design of the building, indicating she appreciated the modern clean lines and integration of the existing architecture into the new. Labrie asked if the pedestrian connection to the street might make more sense shifted to the west so that it connects the customer waiting area to the sidewalk instead of requiring them to cross at the congested area of the payment. He mentioned that if pedestrians were to cross at the end of the stacking lanes, furthest from the congested pay point, they were less likely to encounter vehicle traffic. Scoring the concrete as a crosswalk was suggested. Martin agreed that it would be safer and a good idea to move it. The cross access agreement requested from the applicant was discussed. Committee member requested an easel or smart board for display and to facilitate discussion of larger plans. An easel was procured. Thornborrow explained the vehicles exiting from J's onto Jacksons required a signed document to allow cross access. It protects both the property owner and the City that this site will continue to function with traffic flow across adjacent property even if the owners or uses change. Martin said the cross access was not a problem. He referenced an email from Cody at Jacksons stating they would sign the agreement. The discussion then focused on the treatment of Osage. The building elevation had been updated to include metal siding, scored stucco, fresh paint and roofline articulation. Due to incidents of theft from customer's vehicles and neighboring vehicles using the back of the property for a shortcut to Jacksons, the chain link fence along the rear of the property was requested to remain by the owner. Pedestrian access was allowed through the fence at the property edge. The Committee agreed to allow the fence but requested the slats be removed. Owner agreed and will insure the fence is well maintained.

Summary of Committee comments:

- Reconstruct apron on access for single lane width onto Chinden. Insure ADA compliant sidewalk across property.
- Ensure that the relocated trees survive; if they do not, replace with equal caliper.
- Consider moving the pedestrian connection to the customer waiting area from the public sidewalk and clearly delineate connectivity with change of material or paint.
- Remove slats from existing rear fence and insure it is in good repair.
- Provide a signed cross access agreement for entering and exiting onto adjacent property
- Revise the landscaping plan and submit for Code compliance review. If staff determines revisions are not compliant in landscaping provisions; GCC 8-4-1, or substantially different than the plan approved by DR, the Committee may be required to review and approve the changes.

Architect requested that staff be allowed to review changes. **Caldwell moved to approve the application with the list of conditions and the ability for staff to review the changes. Callaway seconded all aye.**

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

DSRFY2016-11 Service Provider New Commercial Construction: Chad Vincent of Renaissance Remodeling, represented by Adam Joslin of ALC Architecture, is proposing to construct a new office and storage facility on currently vacant land at 108 East 42nd. Although the address is on East 42nd, the lot fronts on Osage. The DR application includes site design, landscaping plan, building elevations and floor plans. The project is zoned C-2 General Commercial zoning district and Mixed Use Commercial Comprehensive Plan designation. The applicant is required to receive approval of a conditional use permit through the Planning and Zoning Commission in addition to Design Review Committee approval.

Chad Vincent of Renaissance Remodeling was present to discuss the application. He explained his business and needs. He discussed the design of the building and the layout of the site. The building is proposed as a two story office space with three bay garage attached. Along with his office, he plans to have several designers onsite and a showroom for clients to visit. The warehouse space is proposed to stage the building materials before

installing them on the individual job sites, materials such as kitchen cupboards, tile, plumbing fixtures. He identified the two access points, one approximately 20 feet wide and the second approximately 43 feet wide as necessary due to the narrow width of Osage and required radii of both truck delivering building supplies and his own employees tandem vehicle. He had not received any feedback as of yet from ACHD. Thornborrow asked if the parking lot surface was to be asphalt or concrete. He planned to install concrete since it looked better and lasted longer. Caldwell questioned whether the front door should be moved to face Osage Street. As long as the layout met GC Code, Warren like the direct connection to the parking lot and clear sense of front entry as currently drawn. Callaway agreed that the front door was an obvious entrance. Thornborrow suggested bringing the landscaping up to the front and narrowing the access points. Labrie agreed that the narrow access point would be better. Vincent said the turning radii are limited by a building across Osage that is five feet off the street and blocks access. He said the small lot size and tight constraints have dictated the layout of the site. He provided more than the required 5% landscaping required to enhance the aesthetics of the site. Warren indicated that she was less concerned with the expanse of parking up front because it was concrete and not asphalt. She felt that would create a more pedestrian feel. She encouraged the applicant to add score joints in an interesting pattern or grid to enhance this plaza effect. Caldwell questioned what materials were to be used on the roof and siding. Vincent said the roof will be architectural shingles, the siding a combination of vertical and horizontal elements with rock at the base as wainscoting. He planned to use the building to display options for customers' homes. Callaway asked how far the pergola extended over the garage. Vincent answered that it was approximately two feet in width and had been added to give some depth and dimension to the garages. Labrie asked the applicant to consider adding more articulation to the front facing Osage. He suggested adding windows, wrapping the front column, enhance the alcove, etc. to add more human scale elements to the front entry. **Caldwell moved to approve with the following changes:**

- Place more emphasis on the front façade and entrance by adding one or more of the elements discussed.
- Consider tighter grid of score joints for the concrete to create a plaza effect.
- Add another window on the front façade.
- Consider narrowing the access and bring the landscaping to the street.
- Add bike parking (2) near the door to the plans.
- Submit turning radii on the plans if the access is the minimum required to function and the access cannot be narrowed or landscaping along Osage not increased.

Labrie seconded, all aye. Staff can review changes for compliance with Design Review Committee requests.

Pre application and Feasibility Meeting for Potential Multi Family Development: Ward Schwider of Architectural Productions is requesting a pre-application meeting with the Design Review Committee to discuss a proposed 51-unit multi-family development. The 1.4-acre site is located at 6017 State Street, and is within C-2 General Commercial zoning district and the Residential Low Density and Green Boulevard Corridor Comprehensive Plan designations.

Ward Schwider of Architectural Productions was present to discuss a concept plan for apartments at 6017 State Street. His primary question for the Committee was the stringency of the parking requirements of Code for multi-family development. He proposed a 51 unit apartment complex with 91 parking spaces provided (a deficiency of 27 spaces). Thornborrow inquired whether he could acquire a cross parking agreement as well as a cross access agreement with the neighboring property of small office buildings so the future tenants could use the stoplight to enter State Street. Schwider indicated he did not want to commit to closing the existing access onto State Street at this time. He thought that if he had a cross access agreement in place, the existing access could be denied. Labrie encouraged him to explore the parking agreement instead of requesting a parking reduction from the Committee. Parking for multi family is determined by Code and the Committee cannot circumvent Code. Since the project is still in conceptual stages, the Committee requested he return when more of the framework of the project was in place.

VII. ADJOURNMENT AT 2:08