



CITY OF GARDEN CITY

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

MINUTES Design Committee

3:00 PM

Monday, January 7, 2019

City Council Chambers – City Hall

6015 Glenwood Street, Garden City, Idaho

I. CALL TO ORDER

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm.

II. ROLL CALL

- A. Appointed Members: Maureen Gresham And Derek Hurd
- B. Planning Official: Jenah Thornborrow
- C. Planner: Chris Samples

III. ACTION ITEM - CHANGES TO AGENDA

- A. Committee member Hurd made a motion to move section VI. Pre-Application Discussions to be acted upon before section V. New Business.
- B. Committee member Gresham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ACTION ITEM - CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Minutes of 11/5/2018
- B. Minutes of 12/17/2018

- i. Committee member Gresham moved to approve the consent agenda.
- ii. Committee member Hurd seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

V. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS-ACTION ITEM

- A. SUBFY2019-1 – SHERRY MCKIBBEN WITH MCKIBBEN + COOPER ARCHITECTS IS REQUESTING PRE-APPLICATION MEETING FOR A 12 TOWNHOME PROJECT TO BE LOCATED AT 3857 N. REED STREET, GARDEN CITY, ID 83714; ADA COUNTY PARCEL R2734520646. THE PROPERTY IS 0.292 ACRES AND IS ZONED R-3 (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL).

- i. Sherry McKibben and Hannah Ball presented the pre-application item.
- ii. Committee member Brett Labrie arrived at 3:16 pm.
- iii. City Attorney Charles Wadams arrived at 3:16 pm.
- iv. The applicant's provided the following additional information:
 1. The applicant will apply for a Minor Planned Unit Development concurrent with a subdivision application.
 2. 2.5 parking spaces per unit will be provided.

3. A pedestrian area will be delineated across lot 5.
4. A shared trash enclosure is desired over having individual services.
- v. The Committee did not provide any additional feedback and indicated the applicant should go forward with a formal application.

B. DSRFY2019-4: JASON JONES WITH WEE BOISE INC IS REQUESTING A DESIGN REVIEW PRE-APPLICATION MEETING FOR A MIXED USE PROJECT THAT WILL BE HOUSED IN 35 RE-PURPOSED SHIPPING CONTAINERS AT 208 & 210 E. 33RD STREET; ADA COUNTY PARCELS R2734541360 AND R2734541374. THE PROPERTIES ARE WITHIN THE MIXED USE (M) ZONING DISTRICT AND THE WORK/LIVE/CREATE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

- i. Jason Jones presented the pre-application item.
- ii. The Committee provided the following requests and comments:
 1. An ordinance currently in the process of being adopted would require fabricated structures lose their appearance of being a prefabricated structure. The structures would need to meet nonresidential design standards including variety of materials.
 2. A parking analysis was requested.
 3. A loading area was requested.
 4. Landscaping, connectivity, perimeter screening, sidewalk and other design related requirements would need to be met.

VI. NEW BUSINESS-ACTION ITEM

A. DSRFY2019-1: DAVID RUBY WITH THE ARCHITECTS OFFICE, PLLC IS REQUESTING MASTER PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL OF NEW RESIDENTIAL SINGLE AND MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING ASSOCIATED WITH PHASE II OF THE RIVER POINTE APARTMENTS. THE 5.0 ACRE SITE IS LOCATED AT 6265 N STRAWBERRY GLENN RD., GARDEN CITY, 83714; ADA COUNTY PARCEL PAR #5455 OF LOT 21, STRAWBERRY GLENN SUB. THE PROPERTY IS WITHIN R-3 ZONING DISTRICT AND THE RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM DENSITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION.

- i. Prior to the applicant presentation, the Committee disclosed the following:
 1. Each member disclosed that they had no conflict of interest and could review and act on the application in an unbiased manner.
 2. Committee member Thornborrow disclosed that she and Committee member Hurd discussed the Boise River Overlay ordinance and determined that mixed use would be required.
 3. Committee member Hurd disclosed that he had contacted the police department regarding written testimony that he found to be threatening and racist.
 4. Hearing procedures were reviewed.
- ii. Tamara Thompson and Sean O'Brien presented the proposed master plan, design review, and waterway tiling. Application representatives Jason Densmere, David Ruby, and Keith Wilson were also present.
- iii. Planner Chris Samples presented the staff report.
- iv. Public testimony was received in neutral was received from:
 1. Maudeane McKee
- v. Public testimony in opposition was received from:
 1. Wendy Carver-Herbert testified as a spokesperson for:
 - a. JoAnn Musholt
 - b. Oliver Thompson
 - c. Linda Butterfield

- d. Margie Rosenberg
 - e. Dale Herbert
 - f. Sybil Leffler
 2. Katie Jennings representing Gail Lysne
 3. Cindy Wyatt
 4. William Howell
 5. Jeanne Jackson-Heim (Representing River's Edge Home Owner's Association)
 6. Charles Kolin
 7. Carrie Witt
 8. Charles Leffler
 9. Kim David (representing herself and representing the Riverwoods Subdivision #1 and #2 Home Owner's Association)
 10. Larry Harrison
 11. Jim Sherman
 12. Sue Philley
 13. Sharon Saul
 14. James Jewett
 15. Charles Knapp
 16. Mark McCormick
- vi. The following individuals signed up in opposition, provided written testimony, and did not wish to provide verbal testimony:
1. Deanna Weeks
 2. Kim Rimington
 3. Christian Kilpatrick
 4. Katie Jennings (testified as spokesperson for Gail Lysne, but provided own written statement)
 5. Adam Jennings
 6. Ray Butterfield
 7. Linda Butterfield
 8. Vanessa Grellas
 9. Linda Hales Sutch
 10. Michael Sutch
 11. Rita Sherman
 12. Lori Ann Cline
 13. Kathy and Michael Stamy
 14. Darcy Beaumont
 15. Rex Beaumont
 16. Tony Andrews
 17. Martha Howell
- vii. Verbal testimony discussed the following concerns:
1. Parking
 2. Building height
 3. Privacy
 4. Imposing nature of structure in skyline
 5. Traffic concerns
 6. Pedestrian safety concerns
 7. Vehicle safety concerns
 8. Suitability to neighborhood
 9. The developer should wait until an Army Corp flood study is complete
 10. Lack of a stop light at Marigold
 11. Property values
 12. Emergency evacuation
 13. Additional greenbelt traffic
 14. Smoking and dogs

15. Too much housing supply already exists and new supply is overbuilt to present and future needs
 16. Possibility of economic downturn and effect on property maintenance
 17. Lack of recycling facilities at Riverpointe Apartments
 18. Weeds and maintenance
 19. Water table
 20. Lack of children play areas
 21. Potential negative impact on library facilities
 22. Water flow and flood potential to neighboring properties if there is a change in water flow
- viii.** The following additional exhibits were received from individuals providing verbal testimony:
1. Power point presentation from Wendy Carver-Herbert
 2. Written statement from Carrie Witt
 3. Written statement from William and Martha Howell
 4. Written statement from Wendy Carver-Herbert and Dale Herbert
 5. Written statement from Gail and Craig Lysne
- ix.** Public testimony was closed by the Committee
- x.** The applicant requested a 10 minute recess to discuss rebuttal testimony.
- xi.** The Committee granted a 10 minute recess at 5:06 pm.
- xii.** The Committee brought the hearing back into session at 5:17 pm.
- xiii.** Applicant Jason Densmere provided rebuttal testimony.
1. Public comments may have been in response to old plans shown at the neighborhood meeting.
 2. Buildings were reduced in number in response to community feedback from the neighborhood meeting.
 3. The proposed density is below the minimum density of the R-3 zone.
 4. Buildings are located away from residential homes.
 5. The parking is "right-sized" to the proposed use.
 6. Unused parking has an environmental and fiscal cost. Parking allotment proposed is correct to the use.
 7. Riverpointe Phase 1 is underparked.
 8. The proposed ditch tiling meets the criteria of the ordinance. The ditch is piped under the fence.
 9. The 404 permit can be submitted with the building permit.
 10. The existing wetland is to be combined with the wetland along the greenbelt to create a more viable wetland.
 11. The wetland should be slightly closed than 50 ft. to building A.
 12. Setbacks exceed the minimums required by code.
 13. Fencing materials originally proposed are technically plastic, but are of better quality than wood.
 14. Gating is provided to be commensurate with the existing Riverpointe development, but can be removed if needed.
- xiv.** Committee member Gresham requested planner Chris Samples address concerns with the proposal's noncompliance with city code.
- xv.** The rebuttal portion was closed by the Committee.
- xvi.** The discussion portion was opened by the Committee. The Committee provided the following discussion points:
1. Landscaping does not meet the standards of Garden City Code. The applicant's plans lack information needed to determine compliance.
 2. More information is needed to determine if perimeter landscaping should be of a species that would be fast growing and a tall species that are adequately spaced to provide adequate screening. This is to provide for the private of adjacent residents as well as a mechanism to reduce the impact of the size of the building from adjacent properties.

3. The proposal is not a mixed use development, but rather only the use “Dwelling Unit, Multiple Family”. The proposed artists’ studio appears intended to be solely for the use of the residents and not open to the public.
 4. Parking does not meet Garden City Code 8-4D-5 for the required number of spaces. The proposal also does not appear to meet the required 108 garage spaces required. The Committee noted that if carport parking is allowed as enclosed parking, they may meet the code requirement for enclosed spaces.
 5. City Attorney Wadams made a point on the record that Idaho Code 18-4308, Idaho Code 42-1207, and the Givens Pursley Urban Land Use Planning document and the Givens Pursley Water Rights In Idaho document dated August 7, 2017 provides for a right of a landowner to tile an irrigation ditch.
 6. The wetlands would be increased near the river due to the applicant removing and relocating wetlands adjacent to the proposed ditch tiling.
 7. The location of the greenbelt on the property may meet the 300’ access and raft put in requirements. The applicant felt the public road could be used for public parking for greenbelt patrons.
 8. Wrought iron fencing along the greenbelt is allowed by city code. The other fencing would need to be revised to meet code and to provide protection against light trespass.
 9. The scope and the scale of the project needs to be revised to take street presence into consideration. The four story structures along N. Strawberry Glenn Road are too close to the street.
 10. There is a lack of consistent setbacks.
 11. The proposal lacks street presence and pedestrian orientation, such as lacking windows, doors, and pedestrian oriented design features.
 12. The garages lack design features.
 13. The end elevations of each building should have windows paced high enough to protect privacy.
 14. The entrances need to be revised to provide for focal points.
 15. There needs to be egress on the sides of the building.
 16. The pedestrian connections need to tie into the greenbelt and will need to tie into the existing sidewalk.
- xvii.** Committee member Gresham moved to recommend denial of the master plan to the City Council due to the proposal not meeting the required 50% canopy requirement, the wetlands setback requirement, the parking requirements, the prohibition on gating along the public streets, and the fencing requirements as well as not having enough information to determine compliance with building design, perimeter landscaping standards and mitigation.
- xviii.** Committee member Labrie seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- xix.** Committee member Labrie moved to defer the design review application decision until after the City Council had made a decision on the Master Plan application.
- xx.** Committee member Hurd seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- xxi.** Committee member Hurd moved to defer the waterway tiling request until after the City Council had made a decision on the Master Plan application.
- xxii.** Committee member Gresham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. DISCUSSION

- i. The Committee noted that school districts are notified of publicly heard applications before the Committee.
- ii. Dog parks are desired in the City.
- iii. A code definition of covered parking is desired.

- iv. HOA's should be utilized as an additional resource to distribute public information.

VIII. ACTION ITEM - ADJOURNMENT

- a. The Committee adjourned at 7:02 pm.



1/23/2019

This signature verifies that this decision document has been reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee.