

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Q=Jenah Thornborrow

Q1=Brett Labrie

Q2=Derek Hurd

A=Katrina Klum

A1=Hanna Veal

A2=Tom Schappacher

A3=David Bedford

A4=Jennifer Mohr

Q: Yeah. Good afternoon, everyone. I will call the Monday, March 6, 2023, Design Review Committee meeting to order at 3:00 pm. For the record, um, both appointed members are present, um, as is the planning official Jenah Thornborrow and the planners Hanna Veal and Betty Gumm. Are there any changes to the agenda?

Q1: Not I.

Q: Thank you. And there's none by staff? And that will lead us to the consent agenda.

Q2: I don't have any.

Q1: I don't have anything either. I'll - I'll move to approve the consent agenda.

Q: All in favor?

Q2: Aye.

Q1: Aye.

Q: All right. The first, um, action item today is, uh, continuation of Design Review, Fiscal Year 2022, Number 22. Um, and Katrina Klum with Erstad Architects is requesting new construction of a multi-family project located at (233311) East 47th Street. Um, with that, I'll turn it over to you, Ms. Klum.

43

44 A: Yeah. All right. I'm assuming you guys can see my screen online?

45

46 Q2: Yes.

47

48 Q1: Yes.

49

50 A: Excellent. Katrina Klum, Erstad Architects, 310 North 5th Street in Boise,
51 Idaho. Um, we're back in front of you again for the 47th Street Apartments.
52 Um, we have been able to update our site plan, working diligently with the
53 irrigation district and our civil engineer. We were essentially able to mirror
54 the locations of the plantings along the property line and the irrigation line
55 that we are now tiling. Um, as Hanna noted in - in the staff report with the, uh,
56 drainage ditch being tiled on either end, we now meet city code in order to be
57 able to tile the length of it. Um, and again, working as a team I think we've -
58 we've come to a solution that gives us the separation needed between the line
59 and the trees, um, but also allows those plantings along the property edge.
60 Um, I do wanna know, and - and this came up in the last, uh, meeting that that
61 irrigation line can't go in any other location. It's serving properties to the east,
62 um, and you can see those connection points here and here that I've
63 highlighted in red. Um, and so in order to maintain that service, this is really
64 the only location on our property that it can go. Another point that I want to
65 bring up while looking at the site plan, um, is we were able to get two trash
66 enclosures in place, um, essentially splitting, um, the location of those across
67 the property. Um, in addition, I know there was some concern about, um, this
68 area down here, um, nearing the buildings on this end of the property. We
69 were able to get those fire riser rooms along the property edge, opening up
70 this - this node or this plaza space down between the two adjacent buildings.
71 In addition, all of our pedestrian crossings will be, um, concrete so it'd be
72 quite a stark contrast between basically the black asphalt and the white
73 concrete, um, which you will see in some of the renderings that we have
74 coming up. Again, this is that west property edge. Um, we did open up 47th,
75 which you'll see in this next one. Again, removing that front, um, fence along
76 47th, and our main courtyard really allows you to see completely through the -
77 the property. This is that irrigation property line, again, showing those - those
78 trees essentially locating, um, on the property line. In addition, you can't really
79 see the irrigation but it's just along the edge of that sidewalk that you are
80 seeing there. Um, and then we've got some really good shots, again, showing
81 that - that rear, uh, courtyard space which we're - we're very pleased with how
82 that came out. So this is that, um, that property line. Um, again, in this image,
83 you can - you can see that - that pedestrian walkway, um, being a change in
84 material to really identify it, um, as, uh, very pedestrian. Uh, stepping back

85 just a little bit further so you can see that in - in full view. Um, looking back
86 the other way again, we've got the two amenity areas on either side of this,
87 and then kind of again showing that complete sight line all the way through
88 the property by removing that fence along 47th. Um, little closer view there
89 for you. Um, we also worked diligently on the, um, amenity areas, really
90 trying to make sure that they're gonna be easily identifiable. Um, you can also
91 see the trash enclosure edge on - on this one. Um, so we're changing the, um,
92 style of siding in addition to the color of siding, again, working with signage.
93 Um, this is also a good shot for you to see sort of that change in material that
94 will allow that - that pedestrian view. Um, this is that other building that has
95 the similar, um, amenities, uh, with it. And I believe that is the end of this
96 presentation. Um, I will note, we do have an alternate up along 47th if we
97 need. (Unintelligible) view. Um, if there's still concern about, you know, how
98 this is meeting street edge, I do have an alternate that I can show. But, um, we
99 - we like how that landscape is meeting that sidewalk edge and we like the
100 openness that's been created by removing that fence, so we're proposing it as -
101 as we view it. Um, but I'm happy to answer any questions based on the
102 changes we've presented today.

103
104 Q1: So can you...

105
106 Q: Thank you.

107
108 Q1: ...can you, uh, al- elaborate just on that - on that alternate? I mean, is that
109 something that...

110
111 A: We can pull that sort of landscape strip that you see back, um, and provide
112 some additional hardscape. And we've talked about what does that hardscape
113 wanna become, you know? Is it a public facing amenity? Is it, uh, an amenity
114 that works better with the site? I know, um, in some of the comments there,
115 um, were notions of, you know, e-bike parking and e-scooter parking to go
116 with the, um, general parking, uh, guest parking areas that we've talked about,
117 so it's an option. Again, it - it - I don't think it's our favorite just based off
118 design. We - we like what that landscape is doing for that courtyard, um, but
119 did want to let you guys know we had - we had thought about it and processed
120 through it as an option.

121
122 Q1: Thank you.

123
124 Q: All right. Any other questions for the applicant? All right, and seeing none, I'll
125 turn it over to Ms. Veal for a staff report.

126

127 A1: Good afternoon. Um, this is Design Review, fiscal year 2022-0022. Um, the
128 applicant did a very good job at summarizing the changes that they have
129 proposed. Um, some particular ones that I would like to reiterate or include is
130 that the applicant did manage to, um, have additional trash enclosures added
131 to both sides of the property, and it looks like there are two trash enclosure-
132 enclosures on each side. But with adding those trash enclosures, uh, they did
133 have to eliminate one of the vehicle guest parking spaces, so instead of asking
134 for an alternative, um, to parking standards to allow for a deficiency of eight
135 parking spaces, it is now a deficiency of nine parking spaces. Um, the
136 applicant also submitted a letter from the irrigation ditch, uh, Fairview Acres
137 Company, um, saying that the company would rather have the irrigation ditch
138 tiled in along the perimeter of the property boundary lines, and that was
139 included in the submittal packet for the record.

140
141 Man: (Unintelligible).

142
143 A1: And additionally, the, uh, the pedestrian pathway that was discussed at the
144 previous hearing that goes from the common, uh, common lot through the
145 property and all the way to the backside of the property, um, that pedestrian
146 pathway over the common drive has been identified as a different hardscape
147 material and pattern via the site plans. Um, and if there are any other questions
148 regarding the changes, um, I - I can most likely answer those questions, if not
149 the applicant. But I'll move on to the decision document. Um, I have
150 highlighted on - on Page 11 some of the conditions that staff has, um,
151 proposed in the approval. Uh, that includes allowing for the irrigation ditch to
152 be tiled based off of, um, Garden City Code allowing for it to be tiled based
153 off of the two adjacent properties having the irrigation canal be tiled. Um, and
154 that's in accordance with, uh, Garden City Code 84A9. I've also conditioned
155 that there - the deficiency of nine vehicle parking spaces is permitted so long
156 as the ride-share parking spaces, e-bike parking facilities, and scooter parking
157 facilities are provided as proposed in their, uh, submittal documents and their
158 site plans. I have also conditioned that the northern property boundary line
159 that is associated with the gravity irrigation ditch, uh, does not need to have
160 the trees per the land - per the perimeter landscaping requirements, but it does
161 need to have a mix of evergreen and deciduous screening vegetation. Um, and
162 then condition item seven is also highlighted, and that's just in regard to the
163 common open space being adjacent to this, um, the adjacent property which
164 was previously approved at the last Design View Hearing, and its Design
165 Review, fiscal year 2022-0023, and there needs to be an e- easement ensuring,
166 um, that this common open space cannot be constructed upon. That includes
167 fencing so that those two common open spaces between the adjacent

168 properties remain open and, um, like a common open space for both
169 properties. And with that, I'll stand for any questions?
170

171 Q: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Veal?
172

173 Q2: Did you have an intention or maybe an idea of how wide that easement would
174 be? Is that - that maybe something that's defined in the condition as - as wide
175 as the common area itself or something like that just for - so it doesn't end up
176 just being a 4-foot gate or something like that?
177

178 A1: Right. Um, that is not drafted in the decision document, but we can certainly
179 require that it is as wide as what the common open space is proposed as
180 currently.
181

182 A: Okay.
183

184 Q1: I don't have any questions.
185

186 Q: All right. Uh, thank you. Uh, with that, we'll open the public testimony, and
187 the first person that we have signed up today is Tom Schappacher.
188

189 A2: That's (unintelligible).
190

191 Q: Thanks.
192

193 A2: Thanks for letting me testify again, or to talk as public testimonial. Um, I
194 spoke last time for this, uh, about the project. Our main issue was the trash
195 enclosure, and so appreciate that you guys addressed that. Um, of course we
196 cared so much about that, we paid attention the whole time to the meeting and,
197 um, both of the committee members had said, you know, can you analyze
198 putting it centrally? And that's really our biggest thrust is, it's good that you've
199 split it 'cause in a way you look at rather than 60 units dumping their trash
200 right by our property line, it's 30. But I think even if it were just a 30-unit
201 development and the trash enclosure was where it is, I think we'd have an
202 issue with it. Um, I think I mentioned that we own these properties and the -
203 the two properties that are right there are two different parcels. The houses are
204 oriented one facing, uh, west or north, one facing south. Or one - they're
205 basically facing to where you'd be sitting on your front porch and the trash
206 enclosure is to your right or to your left. And they're at the backside of the
207 property so it's about 40-, say 40 feet away, um, so the main concern I had is I
208 think the commission or the - the design committee members had said, can
209 you guys evaluate it centrally? I think the project should absorb the impact of

210 the garbage. Uh, I just - I just think that it's a good - it's a better move, and it's
211 a better move that you have more perimeter landscaping than you did before
212 ben- by the tiling of the - or the - how you moved the - the ditch a little bit.
213 But still, to me, it's - it's kind - it's a really big issue to have the trash enclosure
214 right there. Um, I think that - and - and - and I guess the other - the other
215 comment is about parking, and I know that we've been giving variances out in
216 Garden City for it. I really don't think that giving, uh, nine parking spaces up
217 is a - is a wise move because Adams Street has no parking so parcels on, like,
218 our parcels on Adams don't have any street parking so what you're told is you
219 can have guests park on 46th or 47th. And if this property behind is - is given
220 essentially six - is giving a variance of nines parking spaces that may
221 inevitably be parking on 47th street, um, I think it just - it just absorbs all of
222 that - that street parking when I think Adams Street owners should have some,
223 you know, reasonable probability of getting a parking space on the street if
224 they need to since they don't have any street parking. Um, I don't know if this
225 is, you know, PR is PR but on March Capital's website you guys have this
226 property as having 148 parking spaces? Maybe that's 'cause it's the code and
227 you - you - you had that there and we're gonna ask for the variance? But I just
228 don't think, I don't know if it's financially feasible already at 148. It's just - it's
229 just the - the highest and best thing to lobby for; not lobby for, but to apply for
230 is to get it down to 141. But I think it should be 148. My biggest issue is - is
231 the trash enclosure, and I just think - we went around again and looked at
232 more big apartment complex, uh, projects around town and many of them,
233 most of them, hardly any of them have it all in - central to the thing. And if
234 they're not central, there's someplace else that isn't right at the property line
235 with the neighbors. They have an enclosed structure with a roof. Uh, just a lot
236 of things obviously you guys know that can be done to - to mitigate it. Um, so
237 that's our big issue. Um, two properties that we have right there on the - on the
238 north side of the property and, um, important enough to us that - and I, maybe
239 I should have reached out to the applicant to talk about this before, but some
240 of it's important enough to us and I think I'd have to like try to appeal
241 decisions. I just really gotta ask for a condition to - to - I haven't heard an
242 analysis about putting it centrally so, um, just can't emphasize enough how
243 important it is to us 'cause I think it's a long-term impact on the properties that
244 we have, and quite enjoyment of the - of the just sitting in your backyard. I
245 think anybody here, if they had this kind of proposal and had the garbage that
246 close to their house and where they sit in their backyard, they would take issue
247 to it. That's a big property. And - and I'll just say, we love what Garden City's
248 got going on. Um, like I mentioned, we bought these properties for employees
249 for our business, which is also in Garden City, to be able to like ride their
250 bikes to work, to enjoy everything that's going on in Garden City, so this

251 project in a lot of ways it's great. It's gonna enhance this area, so I'm not
252 against everything and anything. It's just the specific impact to us. So, thanks.

253

254 Q: All right. Thank you. Uh, any questions? All right. Thank you. Seeing none,
255 we'll move to David Bedford.

256

257 A3: Hello. My name is David. I spoke at the last hearing, uh, about the garbage
258 enclosures. I'm - I'm here again for the same reason. Two enclosures, one on
259 each side, it - it still leaves my neighbor and I living next to the dumpster and
260 recycling. Uh, not only that but now someone on the other side of the property
261 who will also be living next to one of these enclosures. Like many people, I've
262 lived in a couple of apartments in my life. I've also had some cleaning and
263 landscaping project- or contracts with locations similar to this and, in my
264 experience, a dumps- or an enclosure for 30 units; more or less, is sometimes
265 overflowing and has trash stacked up on the side. This enclosure is gonna be
266 about 25 to 20 yards away from my front door, and it'll be even closer to my
267 neighbor just across from me. Uh, I can't think of - or I don't think of anybody
268 that would want to live right next to that. If it was centrally located it would
269 be fair to ask why a potential tenant would want to take one of these units near
270 the enclosure. I - I think that's a reasonable concern that they might have, but
271 they'll get to choose whether or not they wanna live there. My only choice as a
272 current resident is to request that it being relocated, uh, before it's been built. I
273 - I can't quote anybody on this but I - I believe it was said at the last hearing
274 that while they do fall short of the requirement for the guest parking, they've
275 provided more parking compared to other developments that have been
276 approved and with potential changes to the parking code that might be coming
277 our way, as far as being more lenient. If it was possible to move some of these
278 spaces or even eliminate a couple spaces, it would just be really nice to have
279 this in a central location rather than up on the property line with the other
280 people. That's all. Thank you.

281

282 Q: Thank you. Is there anybody online who wishes to testify? Um, if so, please,
283 uh, utilize the raise your hand feature? All right, we're not seeing any, so if
284 we're missing you just speak up please. All right, hearing none, I'll turn it back
285 over to the applicant for rebuttal.

286

287 A: Um, okay, so I wanna make it clear on the trash enclosure that, um, we're 15
288 feet off the property line. Um, in addition, you'll have the property line fence
289 that occurs, um, along with the actual trash enclosure, um, itself. Um, i- in
290 addition to all of the, you know, landscaping that we've really worked hard to,
291 um, obtain, um, on either side. Um, as to the centralized location, we've really
292 prioritized this central courtyard space for the development and the amenity

293 that that provides for all of, um, the potential tenants. Um, so we did look at
294 centralizing it in addition to the requirements that, um, the tr- trash service
295 has, um, for backup, you know, you need the full fi- clear 50, 60 feet in front
296 of that enclosure to - to accommodate that trash truck. So, uh, we were kind of
297 limited with where it went, but, um, I think the biggest point here is we -
298 we've pulled it off the property line as far as we can. We're - we're
299 landscaping around it. Um, it's kind of a double fence scenario, so, uh, so we
300 don't feel it's gonna be, um, hopefully too big of a nuisance for the adjacent,
301 um, neighbors. Um, I - I think parking has been addressed. We - we've done
302 the best we can, um, again, knowing - knowing things are - are changing at -
303 at the city level, um, but also providing, you know, garages for each of the
304 units, um, that meet - meet city code, so, all we're really talking about here is
305 guests. Um, and we did wanna note that, uh, condition 4 is no longer required
306 in our decision document.

307
308 Q1: Um, a quick clarification we're, uh, you're proposing 10 feet off the property
309 line, correct, not 15?

310
311 Man: (Unintelligible).

312
313 A1: Is it 10?

314
315 A3: (Unintelligible).

316
317 Q1: Is it...

318
319 A: So, we're still working with the, um, trash company to try to size that
320 enclosure because we've added two. And so, we're really hoping that we can
321 reduce it. They've - they've been, um, unresponsive, but it'll be somewhere
322 between 10 and 15 feet off that property line.

323
324 Q1: Okay, I think I was - I'm just looking at one of your - the architectural site
325 plan here that indi- indicates that it's 10 feet off is kind of what it's showing,
326 so somewhere in between there, but at least 10 feet?

327
328 A: Correct.

329
330 Q1: Great, thank you.

331
332 Q: And I - I do have a question if you know, as to how, uh, parking will be
333 managed, um, will every tenant automatically be assigned a parking space,
334 um, or is there an unbundling of parking?

335

336 A3: So the - all the parking for tenants will be two-car garages.

337

338 Q: Okay.

339

340 A3: Um, so their parking will be in the garages. And then the intent is for the guest
341 parking to be guest parking.

342

343 Q: Thank you, and - and they'll automatically be assigned those garages with
344 their unit?

345

346 A3: Yep, they're accessed directly into their unit with, so, um, you don't want
347 anyone else in there.

348

349 Q: Thank you.

350

351 A3: And I also wanted to note that, um, the goal is to have the trash enclosures
352 half the size, but like Katrina said, the trash company has been slow to
353 respond. So, what we've proposed to them is half the size of what it originally
354 was and that's why it may be up to 15 feet from the, uh, property line.

355

356 Q: Thank you. Are there any other questions of the applicant?

357

358 Q2: Just a quick thing that looked - looked different and it may not be, but the - the
359 courtyard space between the buildings down at the end of this site, did that get
360 smaller when the risers flipped to the perimeter? It looked like it got a little
361 narrower?

362

363 A1: It's a little narrower, but it's actually bigger square footage 'cause, again, those
364 risers (unintelligible).

365

366 Q2: Oh, 'cause the risers were in it, okay.

367

368 A: Yeah, the risers were in it. Yep.

369

370 Q2: Okay, I follow you.

371

372 Q1: I don't have any questions.

373

374 Q2: No more questions.

375

- 376 Q: All right, thank you, then we'll close the hearing and turn it over to the
377 committee members.
378
- 379 Q2: Um, I just had a couple of comments to start off. One was back to street facing
380 view, the entries that we've talked about on - on 47th street. My final
381 comment on that would be, um, and I don't know if Katrina's still at the mouse
382 and can scroll to those, but there's kind of like a - a fence barrier that hides
383 those entryways and I would just suggest that that gets removed so that they
384 look like entries. It's kind of like trying to conceal it as an entry and that's the
385 opposite effect, I think, that the code is looking for. We want it to look like an
386 entry and have that street front presence. So just to - to eliminate those little
387 fence, like, wing walls would be a comment that I have. And then, um, the
388 other, if you scroll to the end of the common area where it meets the parking
389 and the drive, I have a couple of comments on that. One is a suggestion that
390 between the end of this large common area in the parking, maybe there's
391 something you can do to soften that edge. So, and - and not to impede the
392 pathway connection to the smaller courtyard in the back, but maybe there's
393 something to soften between the, you know, the - what will be the face of the
394 guest parking and that - and that edge. And that's a recommendation. Um, and
395 then a suggestion that I would put into a condition is that that pathway across
396 the asphalt be - it - it can be concrete, but we want it to be a textured concrete
397 or something that is more than just, you know, a broom finished concrete that
398 looks as much like a driveway as anything else. So, something that indicates
399 that if it is to be concrete, something that indicates that as something special,
400 um, stamped, textured, colored or - or it's pavers of some sort, but something
401 other than just asphalt and - and regular concrete. And - and those are my big
402 comments. I hear the - I hear the trash enclosure concern, um, from the
403 neighbors, but I also see the, you know, the reality and impact of Republic
404 Services requiring the backup space that they have and the turnarounds that
405 they need. And - and, you know, maybe more so because it will be a - a
406 frequent service, uh, depending - depending on the use. Um, so I think that,
407 you know, the landscape barriers and the distance and it being in a masonry,
408 um, masonry trash enclosure in addition to fence at the property line, um, I
409 think that's gonna - it's gonna meet the intents of the code for that - for that
410 perimeter.
411
- 412 Q1: Yeah, um, I would, uh, I guess I would concur with those comments. I - I too
413 feel that, uh, the trash and enclosure in its - in its distance, um, from the
414 property line and the buffer and the double fencing, I mean, oftentimes it, uh,
415 in a lot of developments such as this, or even i- in other more commercial
416 related developments, I mean, the - the trash enclosure is - and is allowed to
417 get a little bit closer to the property line and a lot of times ends up there. So, I

418 think it's - I think it's just important to - to note that, uh, that the effort with the
419 landscaping and the fact that we've got a little bit more distance than you
420 would even typically see...

421
422 Man: Okay.

423
424 Q1: ...um, it really helps to mitigate that. And - and I - I think that, uh, splitting
425 those into the two trash enclosures is going to - is gonna alleviate the - the
426 intensity on, uh, either side, if there was just one. So I - I - I appreciate the -
427 the, uh, the move to being able to incorporate that and - and, uh, split that up
428 into one on each side for the convenience of the users and just for the
429 intensity. Um, the - the one that I just am is still a little bit focused on here is
430 just really what that, um, the end of that plaza space and how it meets 47th
431 street. It's definitely moving in the right direction, elimination of the fence.
432 Um, I - I just feel that maybe a, uh, something that gives it more of a defined
433 sense of place or feeling of arrival or - or something like that, I would suggest
434 looking into, you know, continuing to - to investigate just on - on how that
435 presents itself at the street. Um, but, uh, other than that, I - I really think that
436 the - the modifications that are made since the last time we saw it have really
437 addressed the - the items that I - I felt that were, um, big concerns. So, yeah, I
438 think, I - I think it's really, um, um, it's, it's greatly improved the - the
439 improvements that have been made, and if there's a possibility too, on the, on
440 that, uh, courtyard in the back, um, depending on what happens with the trash
441 enclosure, if there's a possibility to - to open those buildings, those - those two
442 buildings up a little bit, um, getting those, the, um, uh, fire riser rooms even a
443 little bit closer to the sidewalk over there. I know they're kind of pulled back
444 or, uh, they - they, we may be at the distance of, uh, uh, setback distance there
445 with those. I - I'm not sure what it, what it is, but if there was an opportunity
446 to, to get a little more width in that, in that back, uh, courtyard space, that
447 would be great just because that's the main connection to all those residents on
448 that backside. I mean, that's their front door, so whatever that can be done
449 there that I think would only enhance that space, but, but definitely moving
450 the - the riser rooms out of there and opening that up is - has done a lot.

451
452 Q: Thank you. What I believe I'm hearing for should the - the committee move
453 forward for, uh, potential conditions, um, is to address the existing draft
454 condition number 7, to require that the easement be as wide as the common
455 open space, uh, amend the existing draft condition number 4, uh, to no longer
456 re- um, exclude the land perimeter landscaping, but, uh, to still require a mix
457 of evergreen and deciduous, um, to the - remove the fence at the entryways,
458 um, to soften the edge between the parking and the pedestrian zone. That the
459 pathway, uh, the texture beyond a broom finish across the parking area, um,

460 that the plaza at 47th street, uh, better address the street and allowance, um,
461 that the courtyard that the building's open onto the courtyard at the - at the rear
462 of the property, if possible?
463
464 Q2: Yeah, I think - I think you got 'em all and I - I'm comfortable making a motion
465 to approve with those conditions.
466
467 Q1: I will second that.
468
469 Q: All in favor?
470
471 Man: Aye
472
473 Man: Aye
474
475 Q: Thank you everybody for your time.
476
477 A: Thank you.
478
479 Man: Thank you
480
481 ((Crosstalk))
482
483 Q: All right, uh, the second item on the agenda and the last item on the - the
484 formal committee agenda today is a discussion for a subdivision fiscal year
485 22, Number 8 Chandler's place. Um, and the discussion is specific to, um,
486 condition number 18, prior to approval of construction plans, whether or not,
487 uh, the elevations are meeting the intent of that condition. And with that, I'll
488 turn it over to the applicant.
489
490 ((Crosstalk))
491
492 A4: Hi, there, um, my name is Jennifer Mohr, a partner of GHM ARCHITECTS,
493 uh, 1606 West Hays Street, Boise. Um, and I have a couple of quick
494 presentations if I can share my screen, and it looks like it can. So, just let me
495 know if you can't see any of these. All right, are we good?
496
497 Man: Yep, that came up.
498
499 Q: (Unintelligible).
500

501 A4: Perfect, so, (unintelligible) okay, so just a really quick refresher, um, of the
502 project itself, obviously, we're - we're just talking about the - the color
503 elevations, but I feel like adding a little bit of context might help since there's
504 a lot going on in Garden City. So, um, we've been through DRC back in
505 December. This is Chandler's place, I think I (unintelligible) to get rid of our,
506 there we go. Um, Chandler's Place Town Homes. Um, our project team is
507 SRG Holdings Property Development is our developer, owner, uh, Kimley-
508 Horn and then GHM ARCHITECTS as well. Uh, we met with DRC back in
509 December and had a great discussion (unintelligible). Just, uh, a couple of
510 conditions placed, um, there was additional glazing requested on both the
511 garage doors and (unintelligible), um, lower elevations of the garage areas,
512 um, both of which we do - we did add, um, mostly backing up to the site. So,
513 we're looking at the corner of 57th and Alworth, um, not terribly far from the
514 expo. Um, we're on a main street corridor in the mixed-use residential future
515 land use map, zoned R3. Um, here's just a really cl- uh, closer view of the site
516 with your single family and the little bit of commercial around it. Um, you
517 know, we've provided and planning (unintelligible) DRC planning and zoning
518 and city council all agreed the, uh, variety of housing types and - and offerings
519 have been met. Parking, uh, was one discussion item, we resolved those as
520 well, open space. Um, we've updated our landscape plan since you have last
521 seen it as well. Um, and then this is just, you know, the variety of housing
522 types, all that good stuff, um, floor plan variation, building height and number
523 of floors. And then now I'm actually going to move into our (unintelligible)
524 presentation. So, for this discussion item itself, you know, we received the
525 comment - the structures shall have a variety of siding, materials and colors
526 scheme to better meet the intent of the PED code. And so, since our hear- our
527 DRC hearing back in December, we've really taken that to heart and tried to
528 figure out, you know, what the - the intent of that comment is. Um, you know,
529 obviously, one really big factor in this particular development is to create
530 something kind of architecturally focused. And with that, um, some amount of
531 attention to detail is - is kind of - was kind of the direction that we decided to
532 take it. Um, and so, obviously, backing up to this, how we got here. You
533 know, these are some of the precedents that we looked at. You can see a
534 variety of really just details in these precedents, you know, how the windows
535 are treated and in particular, you know, there's not a lot of, you know, there's
536 somewhat of continuity in those materials, but it - it's - it's the details really
537 that - that are what we're looking at here. And so, the first kind of approach
538 that we took was to use the site (unintelligible) and really encourage a
539 cohesive development. And that was taken from the - the Garden City code
540 just to - to make a development that really feels like its own little micro-
541 neighborhood (unintelligible) have a feel for this neighborhood, and I think
542 that - that will help create something special for the residents. Um, from there,

543 we kind of honed in on the- on the elevations themselves, um, by - so by
544 analyzing these details and by analyzing these elevations, we were able to add
545 (unintelligible) a wide variety of different detailing really around the
546 windows. And we focused a lot on the windows because those are kind, of in
547 our minds, those are really pedestrian elements. Those are the things that, you
548 know, you're looking into, you're looking out of. They're - they're the really
549 kind of pedestrian elements and so, using that as where we're focusing our
550 attention on - on those details, um, we felt really started to meet the intent of
551 the - of the comment because not only are you getting a variety - a variety of -
552 of kind of detailing, you're - you're getting a variety of population. You're
553 getting a variety of kind of that in and out, especially when along that
554 pedestrian environment as well, and that's kind of where I think there's a little
555 bit of a bonus happening because this detailing is where that variety is
556 happening. You know, as you're walking along, for example, 52nd Street, you
557 know, this window goes in and then these are more flat so you kind of get this
558 modulation, you get kind of a flow that you might not necessarily have if just
559 the color was different. And you can kinda see that happening all over, and
560 each color is just a different sort of detail happening. Uh, and so this is our
561 street elevations for these projects. Um, you can kinda see where - where
562 some of those shadow lines are happening in here. Uh, another big thing that
563 we added, um, which wasn't there before but we're - we're trying to kind of
564 graphically show it a little bit better, um, is that kind of primary field
565 material? And so the big - because it's a tall, tall wall, one of the big things
566 that we - we wanted to really prevent was a feeling of something stark or
567 blank or just - just a really big solid wall. Uh, and so adding - selecting a
568 material with variety, with a little bit of randomized kind of pattern to it, we
569 feel really helps to alleviate that. But also, it does add that variety and I think
570 it starts to meet the intent as well. And so this is kind of - here's some images
571 of what that material actually looks like. Um, and so really what it's doing is
572 it's adding movement, it's adding relief, it's adding some maybe even
573 perceived shadow lines to what would be a flat field. And so, I think, because
574 we have variation in that primary field material, um, having a color; that teal
575 color, which would be this (unintelligible) accent color, would be the same
576 (unintelligible) consistent throughout. It does reinforce that kind of consistent
577 development, a cohesive development, and helps to kind of reinforce the
578 micro-neighborhood feel while still providing relief, still kind of reinforcing
579 kind of Garden City's sort of really unique patchwork fabric of development
580 feel that's really started to happen in Garden City. I think is really special. So
581 that's kind of what we're - we're proposing as the intent. We feel that we've
582 kind of exceeded what we interpret as the intent (unintelligible) that, um, and
583 are open to any questions.
584

585 Q: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Mohr?
586
587 Q1: Um, yeah, I - I do have questions. So we're looking at a pallet of two materials
588 there, is that correct?
589
590 A4: That is correct.
591
592 Q1: Are they...
593
594 A4: (Unintelligible).
595
596 Q1: ...oriented differently in some cases or is it just uniformly oriented the way we
597 - you've just presented them there?
598
599 A4: Correct. So it is uniformly oriented the same, um, and that's just to - they can
600 keep that cohesive development and then use the windows and those - those
601 trims and - and details as the variety.
602
603 Q1: Okay. Thank you.
604
605 Q2: Yeah, I don't have any specific questions. Is this - this is just kind of
606 discussion item? No formal staff report on it or anything?
607
608 A4: (Unintelligible)...
609
610 Q: Yeah...
611
612 A4: ...that is correct.
613
614 Q2: Okay.
615
616 A4: There is no formal staff report. It is just to, uh, satisfy the condition in the
617 decision document; that Number 18 under prior to approval of
618 (unintelligible)...
619
620 Q2: And that's the additional fenestrations one?
621
622 Q1: That's - that's what I saw it was but, uh, maybe that's not what we're talking
623 about?
624
625 A4: Yes, it would be the, uh, additional fenestrations...
626

627 Q2: Okay.
628
629 A4: (unintelligible).
630
631 Q2: And - and that I think - I don't think you mentioned it, (Jennifer), but it did
632 look like that there was an additional window on that (Alworth) side in the
633 living area behind what would be kind of behind the garage, is that right?
634 There's the garage and then the bedroom? Yeah.
635
636 A4: Oh, so, um, there is a small - so this would be the living area window right
637 here. Um, we did place a - because the garage is a fair amount of that lower...
638
639 Q2: Yeah.
640
641 A4: ...elevation, we did place a window in the garage on that (Alworth) face for
642 those...
643
644 Q2: Yep.
645
646 A4: ...two units.
647
648 Q2: Yep. Great.
649
650 A4: So that would be these two right here.
651
652 Q2: And then - and then in our discussion last time too it was kind of this question
653 of, is it street facing, is it a side yard, that sort of thing? Because it is set back
654 so far from (Alworth), so I think the additional, um, the additional effort that
655 was made, um, to include more fenestration satisfies any concern that I might
656 have had, and I'll let Brett comment on that as well 'cause I think that's the
657 item in question.
658
659 Q1: Uh, yeah. I think that - that - that is what we talked about, just that lower half
660 of the building being still kind of perceived as having a connection to the - the
661 street even though it's - it is set back and there's that additional, uh, right-of-
662 way space or - or what have you in - in between. I - I think that the added
663 fenestration, uh, it is what we were looking for or what I was looking for in
664 the comment.
665
666 Q2: So there you have it.
667

- 668 A4: And I think one of the other questions that we had, and our understanding for
669 this particular discussion was the, oh, excuse me, make sure, oh, make sure I
670 can get - that is - I just pressed a lot of stuff and I'm sorry about that. Um,
671 there was a actual condition kind of talking about a variety of siding materials
672 and color schemes to better meet the intent of the PUD code. I think that was
673 maybe a subset of, um, a subset of condition number 18, that I'm not...
674
- 675 Q1: Let me see?
676
- 677 A4: ...seeing?
678
- 679 Q2: Yeah, it's 20- it's number 20. And I think that - I think you've described - what
680 you've described has, um, I think satisfied that in - in my mind. And also, you
681 know, the - the architecture you've presented does have that variety and, as
682 you were explaining, it has kind of the solid and void and the different
683 conditions of each different window unit and each different door unit, so I
684 think that that's, you know, I - I'm - I'm content with that because to me the
685 architecture speaks to the variety as much as the materials are. And I think just
686 adding more materials to some of these forms doesn't necessarily make it
687 better.
688
- 689 Q1: Um, I'll just, uh, I'll just add a comment to that, but that's why I had the
690 question on the - on the orientation is I think subtle changes like that can have
691 a - have a pretty big impact on that whether it's changing the material, not
692 necessarily, does it need to do that, could it be as subtle as - as running the -
693 the metal panel horizontally versus vertically and - and kind of playing with -
694 with some of that? Uh, I - I guess I would encourage you to - to - to think
695 about that. I - I wouldn't say that this doesn't meet kind of what we intended
696 with - with providing that as - as you described with the - with the different
697 detail. And, I mean, all of that is important too, and it all, as the overall
698 composition, um, you know, speaks to - to that. It benefits from all of those
699 things. I would just, again, encourage the thought of, you know, does this have
700 a place in there too, you know, to - at the accent, the entryways, or some- I
701 mean, just whatever. Just, that's kind of what I was - what I was - in my
702 thoughts with that initial comment were on those kind of lines. Doesn't have
703 to be drastic.
704
- 705 A4: Absolutely. Yeah, I totally agree with that and appreciate the comment, for
706 sure. Um, something that we'll - we'll keep exploring as we - as we go down
707 the road. If there's opportunities to - to add something like that we'll, um,
708 certainly keep that in mind.
709

710 Q1: So - so Jenah, are - are we looking for some kind of a, uh, any kind of like a
711 motion or is this just if it looks good staff can deal with it from there? What...

712

713 Q: I think...

714

715 Q1: What are you looking for?

716

717 Q: Um, a motion never hurts but, in that it's discussion, I don't know that it has to
718 be formal. Um, if - if we're hearing both committee members saying that it's
719 good enough to move forward?

720

721 Q1: Yep.

722

723 Q: Okay.

724

725 Q2: Yes.

726

727 Q: All right.

728

729 Q2: Thanks, Jenah.

730

731 Q1: Thank you.

732

733 A4: Thank you.

734

735 Q: Thank you. And with that, that concludes the - the regularly scheduled Design
736 Review Committee meeting at 3:50. Um, we do have a consultation, uh,
737 directly following.

738

739

740 This transcript has been reviewed with the audio recording submitted and it is an accurate
741 transcription.

742 Signed _____

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

- Q=Jenah Thornborrow**
- Q1=Brett Labrie**
- Q2=Derek Hurd**
- Q3=Hannah Veal**
- A=Katrina Klum**
- A1=Tom Schappacher**
- A2=David Bedford**
- A3=Jason Jones**
- A4=(Jeff Bauer)**
- A5=(Joy Delgado)**

Woman: (Unintelligible).

A: That's yours.

Woman: It's mine?

A: Yeah.

Woman: Okay, thank you.

Q: Good afternoon, everyone. There's just about a few seconds before I call the meeting to order. Um, but if you intend on testifying today, please, make sure to sign up and place, uh, one of the sign-in sheets in the basket. Thank you. And with that, it is 3 o'clock. So I will call the Monday, February 6, 2023 Design Review Committee Meeting to order. And for the record, I can see that the committee members are present, as is staff Hanna Veal, Betty Gumm and Jenah Thornborrow. Are there any changes to the agenda?

Q1: None for me.

Woman: None by staff.

Q: All right, the next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda consisting of the January 3, 2023 minutes.

45 Q1: I move to approve Consent Agenda.

46

47 Q2: Second.

48

49 Q: All in favor?

50

51 Q2: Aye.

52

53 Q1: Aye.

54

55 Q: All right, um, and then we do have two hearings on the agenda today, um, for
56 the public hearings. Uh, please, if - once we get to the public hearing, uh,
57 portion, if you wish to testify, um, you'll be able to testify after the applicant,
58 uh, provides a presentation and a staff report. Uh, we'll call you up and if you
59 wouldn't mind coming to the dais and saying your full name for the record.
60 Um, if you are on Zoom and wish to testify, if your Zoom name is different
61 than your full name, we will ask that you, uh, spell out your full name. And
62 with that, I'll turn it over to, um, Katrina Klum with Erstad Architects for
63 Design Review Fiscal Year 2022, Number 22.

64

65 A: Just to confirm you guys on screen are seeing the PowerPoint presentation,
66 excellent. Katrina Klum, Erstad Architects. Um, this is 47th Street
67 Apartments. And we are located on 47th and Adams, and this diagram is
68 really to show the complexity of the site context, uh, with- with- within
69 walking distance to the Boise Greenbelt, uh, city parks, schools, et cetera. Um,
70 there's also a couple transit stops adjacent on Chinden. Looking at our
71 landscape plan here, um, you'll see that 47th, uh, Street is the primary access
72 to our site. Um, we also have plenty of perimeter and landscape, meeting all
73 applicable city codes, along with a central courtyard space occurring between
74 the two primary central buildings. Um, in addition, we looked at making a
75 connection to the, uh, 46th Street development that will be happening after,
76 um, our presentation and that connection is at the rear of the property. Um,
77 one thing to note on - on this slide that shows it really well is that, um, we are
78 tiling an existing irrigation ditch. And that is occurring, um, along the
79 property edges and we are unable to plant trees along that irrigation, uh, ditch,
80 but we have anticipated that and we've placed plenty of trees up against the
81 buildings. Anywhere where you can get landscape where there might be
82 concern, uh, by the neighbors, uh, is planted up against those buildings. This
83 is an aerial view of our site. You're sort of hovering over 47th Street, if you
84 will. The white buildings at the rear of this image are the adjacent property
85 development. And I say that lightly because it's simply amassing and not
86 intended to represent their design. Um, you can see here how the buildings
87 step in and out. They sort of modulate along their facades, breaking up those -
88 those long building edges. Uh, the roofs also underlay in a very similar

89 fashion, again, creating sort of this very dynamic, uh, roof layout. Um, the
90 rear buildings, um, also s- step and create some of that similar profile. They
91 are a little bit shorter there along that back property line. You're standing on
92 the, um, back corner of the property and I think this is probably the best image
93 that shows that irrigation line. That will be tiled and you can see we're
94 planting shrubs and - and grasses where we can over that line, and then all of
95 the trees adjacent to the buildings to try to meet those requirements where we
96 can. This is a view on 47th and one of the feedback pieces we got from the
97 design review pre-op was they wanted a little bit more, um, dynamic
98 architecture along 47th, which we agreed with. And so, we've flipped the front
99 door of that - those front units to the 47th Street, um, as well as opened up the
100 patio areas, um, which we'll be able to o- look on 47th. Um, added a bunch
101 more windows, so we feel this elevation is a lot more dynamic than the last
102 time we presented. Again, along 47th, you can see a better view of that - that
103 patio cutout, um, creating that connection to 47th, oh, as well as a little peek
104 to the courtyard beyond. This is that courtyard I mentioned. The amenities
105 will be turf grass, play space, as well as a, um, sport court towards the back.
106 This is the opposite side of that courtyard. We're also planning on barbecue
107 amenities, general hangout space for all of the tenants. You're starting to see a
108 view of some of that guest parking here, um, which we feel, um, is - is
109 adequate given all of the research that we've done, as well as, um, the recent
110 changes that Garden City is looking at to their own code. Um, so you'll see
111 that in the packet. This is the opposite property line from the irrigation ditch
112 again, showing all of the landscaping as well as the sort of individual, um,
113 main entries for each of those units, um, providing a little bit of privacy, but,
114 uh, still being open to the public. Uh, this is sort of your pedestrian view of
115 what you might see as you start to approach that - that adjacent development.
116 And our interior site, um, we also responded to that development. And so this
117 is just a little gathering area we'll have a strong, uh, pedestrian connection all
118 the way from 47th through the development. Uh, you can also start to see
119 again some of that modulation that's occurring where the buildings are
120 stepping in and out creating, um, those facades that are broken up. One thing
121 we wanted to mention is looking at sort of our office space, as well as our bike
122 storage. We strategically pulled those to the interior of the site to p- place
123 them adjacent to the guest parking, um, as - as well as being a little bit more
124 convenient for all the buildings on the development. Um, and so we feel like
125 the placement of these is strategic and appropriate for the development. Also a
126 development of this size that should hopefully be pretty easy to find those
127 locations. Um, we're still exploring what the signage options could be but, uh,
128 we can play signage on the canopies, we can explore, uh, color wayfinding if
129 we need to. But again based on the size of the development and the placement
130 adjacent to parking we feel like it's appropriate. Um, we can get - we're still
131 looking at the options on bike parking but we're - we're looking at roughly 15
132 bike parks which is meeting city code. Uh, we're also looking at the e-bike

133 charging facilities within that bike storage as options. And then this is looking
134 at that - that management office again strategically placed against that, uh,
135 guest parking there. And that was the end of our presentation. And I'm happy
136 to answer any questions.
137
138 Q: Thank you. Any questions for the applicant?
139
140 Q2: Can you - can you go to a site plan and draw - maybe draw with your mouse,
141 just hovering over where the Thurman Mill is currently? Okay, so it's that,
142 well, it's that dashed line then maybe or no, that's a parcel line.
143
144 A: Uh, I mean, that's a parcel line, but it...
145
146 Q2: But it goes internal...
147
148 A: (Unintelligible).
149
150 Q2: ...to the site?
151
152 A: It's - it's very internal to the site, yes.
153
154 Q2: Okay.
155
156 A: And we're proposing to push it along the property edge and then wrap it 'cause
157 we have to carry it through to the adjacent properties.
158
159 Q2: And then it exits at the same spot where your mouse is now? Yeah.
160
161 A: Yeah, it's gonna exit right there.
162
163 Q2: Okay.
164
165 A: Uh-huh.
166
167 Q2: Okay. Thanks.
168
169 Q: Any further questions of the applicant? All right, seeing none. I'll turn it over
170 to staff for a staff report.
171
172 Q3: All right, good afternoon everybody. Um, this is the Design Review Fiscal
173 Year 2022-0022. Um, it is located at 233 and 311 East 47th street. There were
174 re-submittals or rather late exhibit submittals on January 31, 2023, which have
175 since been uploaded online as well as sent to the committee members. Um,
176 and they need to be formally accepted into the record, as they were a late

177 exhibit. And I am showing, uh, the landscape plan that was part of that
178 submittal packet as one of those documents for reference. And that packet
179 essentially added a landscape plan, uh, to address the arborist report, as well
180 as a sustainability checklist. But it is not, uh, reflected in the staff report that is
181 in the record. And we have received, uh, agency comments from the
182 Department of Environmental Quality, the Garden City Engineer, North Ada
183 County Fire Rescue, uh, Republic Services, and ACHD, which have all been
184 included online, uh, for the record as well as this brief summary in the staff
185 report. Um, but as far as getting into, um, all the comments in the staff report,
186 I can stand by, um, and answer any of the questions that the committee or the
187 public might have. Um, especially those comments that have been highlighted
188 in yellow. Um, but for ease of things, I'm just going to go through, um, some
189 of the more important items that need to be discussed. Um, just going through
190 the packet here. So on Page 10, um, there is discussion regarding the
191 multifamily, um, aspects to this development. And while they are providing
192 amenities and the required number of amenities, there is discussion that the
193 committee and applicant and staff should have regarding, um, the mailbox
194 office room, um, the enclosed bike parking spaces. Um, and the property
195 management office and a dir- uh, a directory map of the development. Um,
196 since some of those things, so for example the office and management, um, or
197 the management office and post office area are, uh, identified and I can zoom
198 in here on the site plan. Um, they have been identified, the floor plans, uh, are
199 preliminary in nature. Essentially it doesn't identify, um, a lot of the details
200 regarding where those post office boxes are going to go. Um, and it's not
201 extremely clear as to if there is going to be someone on site at all times, um,
202 for that property management office. So there's just some questions left
203 unanswered there. Um, and then, regarding the design of these locations, um,
204 as Katrina, the applicant was able to show earlier in her presentation, um, it -
205 it doesn't necessarily not meet code and it's not facing the public street so
206 maybe the design review committee doesn't necessarily care what the
207 architectural features are on these end locations, but they're not super
208 prominent. Um, at least as far as indicating what function those rooms are
209 providing. So, maybe some discussion there, um, like I mentioned in the staff
210 report. Additionally, there - there is shown to be, or there is fencing shown on
211 the renderings, but it's not identified in the site plans. Um, fencing is not
212 required, um, however, there could be privacy concerns, especially regarding
213 the density and the adjacent residential properties. There are, um, existing
214 fences on some of the adjacent properties, and there is a - a, uh, generalized
215 condition in the decision document to require that any, if - if fencing is to be,
216 um, placed on site, it needs to be compliant with code. So that doesn't
217 necessarily need discussion unless it's in regards to the privacy.

218
219
220

Man:

So, are you - are you adding (unintelligible).

221 Q3: For the common open space...

222

223 Man: So, I under- (unintelligible)...

224

225 Q3: Um, I have drafted, um, well, first of all, they are compliant with the common
226 open space and the amenities. However, it could change due to the
227 stormwater, um, facilities on site. It appears that the stormwater facilities are
228 underneath or at least surrounding um, some of the amenity areas. So, for
229 example, in the - in the middle of the property, uh, where the sports court or
230 the bocce ball court is, I - I believe that's where one of the stormwater
231 mitigation areas is to be located. Um, development services staff is not in
232 charge of reviewing those facilities. It just might be a point of discussion that
233 if the site can't handle on-site stormwater, um, mitigation appropriately, some
234 of that common space might be changed. Then there's the discussion
235 regarding the Fairview Acres open irrigation ditch. Um, right now it is - it's
236 currently an open ditch and they propose to tile it over. Um, you - you can
237 defer to the staff report as to how the design review committee can approve of
238 the tiling of that irrigation ditch, but we will need explicit approval from the
239 committee here today, uh, for the permission to tile it over. Um, one of the -
240 one of the main reasons staff believes that there - there could be permission
241 granted is due to the fact that, um, on the - I'll call it the northwest side, which
242 is 47th Street, it is tiled there. Um, the canal runs under the road and then to
243 the southeast side, um, or right-hand side of the plan, um, the adjacent
244 property associated with design review fiscal year 2022-0023, which we will
245 be hearing next is also proposing to tile it over. Um, there are comments in
246 regard to the design, the architectural design and fenestrations glazing of those
247 end units that face 47th Street. Um, there were comments from the pre-
248 application discussion meeting, uh, where the end units needed to address the
249 street, have their front door facing 47th, uh, appear as a front facade, et cetera,
250 and, um, new renderings and schematics have been submitted. And so the
251 committee needs to determine if what was submitted is satisfactory and
252 satisfying those comments. Uh, the site is deficient 8 guest parking spaces.
253 They are, um, they are parking for all of the residential units themselves.
254 However, there is the deficiency of 8 parking spaces still. Um, there was a
255 standards or an alternative to code standards, um, submitted, so they - they're
256 providing bike parking, scooter parking, e-bike parking and rideshare parking.
257 Um, uh, or at least that was mentioned in the packet, but it's not necessarily
258 identified specifically within the site plans. Um, s- and with the rideshare
259 program or shared parking, there needs to be formalized agreements drafted,
260 um, at least prior to construction. Um, and then just for wrapping up the
261 comments, um, I suppose th- there were comments regarding the sustainability
262 checklist. I believe those two have been, um, null and void at this point,
263 because they resubmitted the sustainability checklist and it does, um, meet the
264 standards of the six points required. Uh, it is conditioned in the decision

265 document um, so, the committee can either choose to keep it in there or
266 remove it, depending on if they accept that new sustainability checklist.
267 They're meeting their street trees. Um, and there is an arborist report requiring
268 that 170 n- s- 179.75 calipers be mitigated for based off of the removal of
269 existing trees on site. The old landscape plans show that 140 caliper inches
270 were being mitigated which was a deficiency of 39.75. Um, since then on
271 January 31, like I mentioned, there was a new landscape plan submitted but
272 staff has not been able to thoroughly analyze it. So, any condition drafted in
273 the decision document regarding, uh, mitigation for those trees should remain.
274 Um, and then for my last comment. Um, there - there is a lack of perimeter
275 landscaping. However, that is only due to the, uh, gravity irrigation line that
276 they are proposing to install. Um, with the canal as it is right now, it's running
277 through essentially the middle of the property and the applicant is proposing
278 to tile it and relocate it along the northern property boundary line. Um, and so,
279 with that being tiled there, uh, the perimeter trees that are required are, um,
280 not permitted due to those irrigation facilities. So, with that, I'll stand for
281 questions.

282
283 Q: Um, thank you. Any questions for Ms. Veal? I just have a point of
284 clarification and that's on the tiling. And so, what I'm understanding you to
285 say is that should the adjacent property also be allowed to tile, then th- it
286 would meet a portion of code saying that tiling is allowed should one side of
287 the property or both sides of the property already be tiled; is that...

288
289 Q3: Yeah. And I - I can quote code directly. Um, so, Code says that the Design
290 Review Committee can permit the tiling of the canal if the irrigation ditch
291 lateral canal or drain is enclosed on both ends adjacent to the property and the
292 adjacent properties are fully developed in a manner that future opening of the
293 enclosed irrigation ditch lateral canal or drain isn't feasible.

294
295 Q: Thank you. All right. Seeing no further questions, I'll open up the public
296 hearing portion. Um, we have two people in person who have signed up to
297 speak on this matter. Uh, the first of which is Tom, um, Schappacher.

298
299 A1: Schappacher.

300
301 Q: All right. Sorry about.

302
303 A1: That's okay. Fine. Here?

304
305 Q: Yes, please. And if you wouldn't mind, um, for them to be able to hear you,
306 um, in Zoom, you'll have to speak right into that microphone. Thank you.

307

308 A1: Okay. Can you guys hear me all right? Okay. So, my name's Tom
309 Schappacher. I own, um, two parcels that are next - directly adjacent to - on
310 the - they're on the, uh, the east side, kind of the northeast side of the property.
311 Um, 4651 Adams and 4639 1/2 Adams. And we're the lucky recipients of the
312 trash enclosure right next to - to the property. So, um, when I first pulled it up
313 and looked at the map, uh, our properties - I have two, you know, two that are
314 right next to each other and the trash enclosures right exactly across the fence
315 line and I think it's where you're saying that they would tile - move and tile
316 over the irrigation ditch. So, there's no trees there. Um, so, it's kind of a big
317 surprise and a - and a concern of mine that, um, for such a dense project with
318 60 units and so, I'm guessing potentially 100 plus people that all the garbage
319 for this site goes to this back corner and it's kind of all affecting one - one
320 neighbor, which is us. Um, so, I kinda - we kinda went around town and
321 looked at different projects: apartment buildings, uh, some are condos but
322 some are apartments and tradit- it looks like typically those are placed - some
323 place central to the - to the development. So I would - I guess that's my main
324 concern with the project at this point is - is, uh, just that they would look at
325 where the location of that enclosure is and if - and that it not be affecting just
326 one group - one neighbor, essentially, um, by both it's adjacency to how close
327 it is to the fence line, just the fact that's where the - everybody in the units are
328 coming back to this back corner and throwing their garbage and the dumpster
329 closing and the garbage man coming and things. So, that's, uh, um, that's
330 something I would hope that - that staff and the committee would con- be
331 concerned with and look at for us. Um, the second issue is parking. I saw - I
332 read through all the material submitted and I saw the argument for having
333 fewer parking stalls for guests. And, um, because there's no parking on Adams
334 already, 47th's gonna become really a hot commodity to park there on the
335 street and a lot of people live on Adams have to, you know, when they have
336 guests and things, they park on 47th. So, I feel like if you were to give them,
337 uh, you know, uh, an exemption from that rule, you're providing kinda eight
338 more spots on the street for - for the project, which is already gonna be taking
339 a ton, even though it's got some parking on site to meet code. So, um, I read
340 through what their reasons were for asking for it and I get the transit, you
341 know, that you push for transit that is kind of hard to prove that that's gonna
342 do anything. I mean, I think it's a - I've seen a lot of projects and - and that's
343 often said, but I don't know that it's really ever has an effect. Um, it also said
344 there was a survey included but I didn't see that exhibit attached. So, uh,
345 maybe that's somethin' people can look at it. It cited a survey that the public
346 didn't feel like parking was an issue and I think anything in Garden City is
347 gonna be dated immediately because of how many, um, projects are going on.
348 So, people need - are gonna adjust their opinions pretty quickly based on how
349 much is being built. And then als - I also don't think that the financial
350 feasibility of the project is - is in the - is something that the Design Committee
351 or the City is gonna - should change the parking requirements to meet, um, the

352 fiscal feasibility of the project. Um, you mentioned the fencing and I guess I
353 couldn't tell from the drawings if it was - there was fencing but that would be
354 a good thing to have considering, again, density. Um, if there's less
355 landscaping on the perimeter due to the tiling of the - of the ditch. And then
356 just that they're 30 feet high - the building's 30 feet high and so, where our
357 properties sit, both houses are on the back part of the parcel. So, they're really
358 close to the property line. And, uh, so, to have these buildings towering over
359 'em, uh, is gonna be, you know, it's dense - it's building dense and - and I
360 know that some of that comes with it but just that you guys could think
361 through all those ramifications to these properties, I didn't buy these properties
362 to develop 'em. I brought - bought 'em for, uh, rentals and for, uh, employees
363 at my business which is also in Garden City and employs 40 people down on -
364 at Artist Metals down - further down towards, uh, towards the Riverside, uh,
365 Hotel. And so, I'm not looking to develop these as more livability for the
366 people that live there at those properties. So, um, thanks for letting me speak
367 and I hope you consider all these things in your next steps. Thanks.
368

369 Q: Thank you. Um, any questions? All right. Um, thank you. The next person we
370 have signed up is David Bedford.
371

372 A2: I don't have a whole lot to say. Um, I live on 4651 Adam Street, and, uh, the
373 location of the garbage is - is my main concern. Uh, trash for not just 60
374 people but possibly 60 households that close to the property line, I - I don't
375 feel - I would rather not live next to a dumpster for 60 units. Um, that's about
376 all I have to say, really.
377

378 Q: Thank you.
379

380 A2: Yeah.
381

382 Q: Um, that concludes the individuals we have signed up, um, here at City Hall.
383 Is there anybody else that would like to testify? Um, all right. Is there anyone
384 online who wishes to testify? And it looks like Jason Jones.
385

386 A3: Um, Jason Jones, 208 East 33rd Street. Um, I guess just one of my maybe
387 comments that I'll point out, you know, I know they're already short on, uh,
388 guest parking but I know when I've looked at some previous projects that have
389 come through, um, that guest parking ratio for a lot of PUD applications has
390 been reduced as low as, like, one guest parking space for every eight units.
391 And I wonder if there's a possibility of maybe removing a guest parking space
392 that's centrally located and moving the trash enclosure there so that it wasn't
393 affecting neighbors quite as much. And maybe that's something that can be
394 discussed, um, 'cause - because again, they really - while they're maybe not
395 meeting the code of one guest parking space for every two units for most of

396 these PUD applications, they're far exceeding the parking that's been required
397 for other - other developments of this size. So, maybe the possibility of
398 removing a guest parking space to move that trash enclosure so that it doesn't
399 affect the neighbors might be something smart to look at for Design Review.
400 That's my only comment. Thank you.
401

402 Q: Thank you. Is there anybody else online who wishes to provide testimony? All
403 right. Seeing none, we'll turn it back over to the applicant.
404

405 A: Um, your comments on the trash have been heard and the enclosure itself will
406 be a CMU typical commercial, uh, development, uh, enclosure with gates.
407 Um, and so, I think, you know, it should be well-contained. Um, we also can
408 set the frequency of that trash pickup with Republic Services. So, uh, we can
409 get that picked up, uh, daily, uh, to cause those concerns to hopefully be less.
410 Um, certainly if we have any flexibility on our parking we're - we're all ears.
411 Um, but in order to do our best to meet Garden City Code as it currently
412 stands, um, we have put as many guest parking spots on site as possible. Um,
413 but if there's - if there's flexibility there, we can look at some type of
414 rearrangement, uh, to pull it off that property line or get it more central. We're
415 all ears. So, thank you.
416

417 Q: Uh, thank you. And don't go away just yet. Thanks. Are there any, uh,
418 questions for Ms. Klum?
419

420 Q1: I do have a question.
421

422 Q: Yup.
423

424 Q1: Could you go over where perimeter fencing is going to be provided or
425 proposed...
426

427 A: Absolutely.
428

429 Q1: ...and where it's not?
430

431 A: So, we are basically proposing, uh, perimeter fencing on all of the property
432 lines surrounding the development. Um, there will be a break in the fencing
433 here, again, as it relates and ties to that adjacent development. But, um, what
434 we were showing in our renderings was a typical six-foot wood slat fence. We
435 haven't fully designed that but we know it needs to meet all applicable Garden
436 City Code. Um, and then some of the additional, uh, fencing that you saw was
437 - was some privacy fencing for the courtyard, uh, space up front along 47th
438 and then we've got privacy screens happening at each of the front doors.
439

- 440 Q1: Okay. Um, thank you for that. Uh, also another question, was it - was it ever
441 considered to look at, um, integrating the, um, portions of, um, uh, open
442 irrigation ditch in that central kind of plaza space that runs through the center
443 of the - the development?
444
- 445 A: We looked at several options but as Hanna mentioned, um, storm water that
446 became our biggest concern and so, uh, trying to centralize all the storm water
447 into a reasonable area to collect it's happening under drive aisles. It's
448 happening under the sport court. Uh, we had to push that irrigation to that
449 property edge in order to make the development work.
450
- 451 Q1: Okay. And then, um, I guess another question that I have. In regards to the
452 trash enclosure, um, it - would it be possible or did the - did you go through
453 the process of maybe really considering the, um, amount of waste for that size
454 of an enclosure for this size of the development and maybe, uh, multiple
455 enclosures. Maybe if there was enclosure on - on each side on the opposite
456 side there for - I - I'm just trying to think that there's gonna be a lot of activity
457 at that - in the trash enclosure. And then it's on the side of the, uh,
458 development that doesn't - doesn't have, whereas, minimal, um, planting
459 materials due to the location of that irrigation ditch.
460
- 461 A: Yeah. Absolutely. I mean, we discussed individual bins that could alley load. I
462 mean, we looked at it happening in the central area but from a sight line
463 perspective that didn't make sense. Um, 'cause you'd basically be looking
464 through your courtyard at - at your trash. Um, we did have it adjacent to this
465 sort of backup piece on the, uh, car parks at one point in time. Uh, logistically
466 based off of what Republic Service needs that big, long, you know, 60 feet in
467 front of that enclosure, um, in the adjacent garage, it just ultimately didn't
468 work out. Um, but we could re-evaluate if - if that's the desire of that
469 committee.
470
- 471 Q1: Well, it - it - it seems to me that on the op- opposite side there it's the same, is
472 it not, pretty much the same configuration as where it's sitting now? Yeah. I
473 mean, if it was to go on that side or if there was to be an enclosure on both
474 sides to, um, to better serve that size of the facility and the distances between
475 units and that trash enclosure, single location.
476
- 477 A: Yeah. It - it's definitely close and it - it - it's workable. It just comes down to,
478 uh, the - these end parking stalls here.
479
- 480 Q1: Sure.
481
- 482 A: There, and - and there, um, and again, just trying to sneak in as many of those
483 spaces as we could possibly fit on site to meet that code. Um, but yes, in a

484 short answer to - if we really needed to split this into two, we could place it on
485 either side. We would probably lose a parking space doing that.
486
487 Q1: Okay. Thank you.
488
489 Q2: And - and Republic won't roll the dumpster out into a drive aisle. They have
490 to be able to get...
491
492 A: Make this turn.
493
494 Q2: ...without getting out of the truck?
495
496 A: That's what they've told us, yes, u- upon reviewing this. I mean - and they
497 even were concerned about access and we had to reassure them that it was all
498 per their codes.
499
500 Q2: Okay. And then I - I have a kind of follow-up question or I need to hear it
501 maybe stated a different way but the irrigation, once that's tiled in the pipe,
502 you're saying that because of the drive aisles being permeable pavers or
503 whatever, that that pipe can't be in the drive aisle and that pipe can't be in the
504 central, kind of, sports court area?
505
506 A: Talking to the drainage district, they really want it along a property edge and
507 they really wanna maintain their clearance and all of their appropriate
508 easements over the top of it. So, it - it doesn't work as well to try to put it
509 anywhere else because of their need for continuous access and their legal right
510 to have the easement over the top of it.
511
512 Q2: Which they could have down the drive aisle and then in between the - in
513 between building - the end buildings, I guess. It was - it what - you're - you're
514 saying it's a easement thing not a civil engineering?
515
516 A: I- it's both. Yeah. Our civil engineer has been working closely with them to
517 try to ensure that we're meeting all of their standards. Um, the other
518 complexity as it relates to the site is those drive aisles are picking up all of the
519 site drainage. And so, again, from a - when you step back and you look at all
520 of the pieces of the site and not just cherry-pick this one issue, we feel like
521 this is the best compromise to meet all applicable agencies.
522
523 Q2: And then are you using the what, surface water for irrigation on site?
524
525 A: We're not. We're collecting it in an infiltration system.
526

527 Q2: No. I mean the - the irrigation water that comes through the site that you're
528 tiling, are you using that water to...
529
530 A: Got it.
531
532 Q2: ...water - water the street trees and perimeter landscaping and internal
533 landscaping?
534
535 A: We are not based off the recommendation from our landscape, um, architect.
536 Um, there's apparently some complexities involved in - in using that irrigation
537 water. So, from the development standpoint, um, it makes more sense to
538 connect to city water.
539
540 Q2: Thank you.
541
542 Q1: I - I have one more question before we let you go there.
543
544 A: You're good.
545
546 Q1: Um, just on that, um, we'll call it, uh, kind of the south, um - um, plaza space
547 in between buildings. Are they both C down there?
548
549 A: Yeah, this space right here?
550
551 Q1: Yeah. What are those little bumpouts there?
552
553 A: Um, that...
554
555 Q1: Those little bumpouts in the structure.
556
557 A: Oh, in the structure. Got it. Those are the...
558
559 Q1: Yeah.
560
561 A: ...fire riser rooms.
562
563 Q1: Uh, okay. All right. I think that's all, uh, that's all that I have right now.
564
565 Q: All right. Well, thank you, then I'll go ahead and close the -the pub- the public
566 hearing, and turn it over to discussion with the committee members.
567
568 Q1: Well, I guess I can go ahead and start. Some of the concerns that I still - that I
569 still have, and a few of 'em were on the - the staff report. Um, I think that, uh,
570 just in looking at those, the amenities, um, I - I think that they're just the - the

571 lack of, um, of identity for those. And - and just from a visual wayfinding of
572 those elements, I'm speaking more of the - the bike storage component and the
573 office, um, office and - and mail room and - and such that I think that
574 something more needs to be done with - whether it's, uh - uh, articulation of
575 the - of the exterior facade, fenestrations, materials, something to - to enhance
576 that - that visual wayfinding of - of those elements rather than they look like
577 they're just another unit and we're, you know, gonna indicate with some
578 signage. I think something more needs to happen with those. Um, the, um, uh,
579 the other one, I think we probably need to discuss is whether these side
580 facades as they - as they are with the - with the door moved around and w-
581 some added, uh, fenestrations are still meeting the intent of really addressing
582 the, uh, street on the 47th Street, um, elevations for - for those end units. I
583 think some discussion there is warranted. The - the bigger one in my mind
584 here and I - and I mentioned it in the, uh, pre-app was to feel how - how these
585 - the - the rear Building C and Building C how they really become connected
586 and be part of this overall development. And I - I think it - it's kind of headed
587 in the right direction with that little plaza area, but even that, to me feels like,
588 um, we've - we've got this small plaza and - and we've got these - these bump
589 out utilitarian components and nothing about that space reads, oh, you know,
590 continue moving this way and come around the corner. And we're accessing
591 all the rest of these - these units. I - I just feel that there's a - there's a - a big
592 disconnection between the end buildings and just from a, um, access
593 standpoint from visitors, um, just to - to, uh, to have them feel like that's their,
594 um, that integral part to this whole development. And in that same token, it
595 would be - I guess, in my mind with, um, with a development this size, and
596 we've got multiple points of access, spines that are - that are coming down
597 perpendicular to 47th Street, that, that central spine is where the activity court
598 and the - the open lawn area - it seems in my mind to be the, um, the large
599 identifier - group identifier, as far as the entire location or the entire
600 development. And so maybe, uh, I feel that something more, um, some mo-
601 something more of a node, whether it be a hardscape plaza S type of, uh, a
602 node at the intersection of 47th and where that - that central spine, um,
603 activities area is something more is warranted there to, um, or create a
604 stronger - even stronger connection. I mean, it looked at the - in the, um - um,
605 the presentation with the imagery there, that there was some fencing and I
606 mean, it - it seemed still kind of, um, closed off from the street frontage. I
607 think there's an opportunity there to make it more like a, um, a pedestrian
608 node that brings people in and invites 'em into the internal of this space, which
609 then creates in my mind if the procession is gonna be down that central - that
610 central space to get across the parking to a plaza, to further gain access to the
611 back end of the development, it - it seems to, uh, strengthen that quite a bit to
612 do something in- in - on those - on those lines. And - and I would - I would
613 even go as far as to say, you know, I'd like to see those fire riser rooms go
614 somewhere else and really kind of open that throat up as you wrap around that

615 corner. So it really wants to draw you into access those - those, uh, last two
616 buildings. But I - I would even think maybe even a raised section there at the
617 crosswalk, um, access point between the plaza and the - the sport court,
618 something to - to really accentuate that this is a, uh, first of all, pedestrian
619 access, second of all, vehicular access. Um, the irrigation ditch tiling. I - I - I
620 think we both kind of came at that from two different, uh, points. I just, I - I
621 wish I would've liked to see it incorporated even partially if possible in that
622 kind of open lawn space, central access. But, um, anyways, those were my -
623 those were my b- and then the trash enclosure, I think that consideration for
624 you know, maybe, uh, we allow reduction in another - another one of the
625 parking stalls, get another trash enclosure on the other side, um, split the
626 amount of, um, usage and activity that's gonna be at one of those locations.
627 Um, or if it's just a single enclosure, maybe it needs to flop to the other side,
628 to where it - it has a little bit more landscaping opportunity, um, around that.
629 Just some thoughts on - on that.

630

631 Q2:

632 Yeah. I'll - I'll kind of touch on that and maybe some of these in reverse order
633 while they're on our minds. Um, yeah, my impression, another impression, I
634 guess, too, on trash enclosure is if I'm on 47th Street unit on the far corner, I
635 mean, it's easier for me to take my trash to work and throw it away than it is to
636 walk, you know, all the way to the far corner of the development. So I just
637 think as far as usability is concerned it should be, you know, there should be
638 an attempt made to get it central. Um, if not - if not one on each side, I hate
639 adding trash enclosures, but this is a big development and it's a long ways
640 away for some of the front units. Um, the - the amount of times it's used
641 would be cut in half too if th- if there is a - is a second one. So the doors
642 opening and closing and the lids banging and, uh, you know, banging open
643 and closed is gonna be less impactful to the neighbors if there's one on each
644 side. Um, so I think cen- central is ideal if that can be - if that can be looked
645 at, one central unit. Um, as far as, uh, I'm not yet convinced that the irrigation
646 ditch on that property, which then eliminates all that perimeter landscaping is
647 the - is the best solution. If - if there's a way to have that come down the
648 central corridor and I mean, there - there is a way. It just has to be explored
649 and engineered to come down that central corridor, then we can have
650 perimeter landscaping back, and then that helps mitigate the trash enclosure as
651 well on that north side. So I think that needs to be, you know, it was - it was
652 said in the - in the presentation that, you know, kind of, so- something has to
653 give, but, you know, it's a - it's a sacrifice to the neighbors and the - and the
654 landscaping elements that are required by codes. So I think the sacrifice needs
655 to be - be made internal to the development rather than to the neighbors and at
656 the expense of - of city code. So I think that needs to be looked at. Uh, as far
657 as 47th Street elevations you know, I think that there is - there is some solid
658 void going on there now. And, you know, looking - looking at the street when
we're kind of at an angle to the - the notch out of that second floor patio, you

659 know, that does give us kind of this element that we're - that we're looking for
660 as far as kind of material changes and - and some articulation in that - in that
661 building facade, there - there seems to be enough glazing now on that facade
662 to meet code. And it does have the kind of porch stoop element. Could it be -
663 could it be more articulated and have some more kind of depth to those 47th
664 Street walls? It - it - it certainly could. Um, but I think it's a - it's an
665 improvement from where - where it was. And I - I agree with you Brett, on
666 that actual courtyard on 47th Street, I was - I don't know if I missed it the first
667 time, as far as the fencing, basically blocking off that entire spine, or if that
668 fencing is now shown. Um, but certainly that element is something that we
669 want to have part of the identity of the street front of this - of this
670 development. Not have it be just a fence that we're looking at. Um, so I think
671 that does two things, you know, as you mentioned, it gives identity to the -
672 that street facade, but it does also in a way open up those rear - those rear
673 buildings and - and kind of draw those rear buildings into part of the project
674 whole. Um, so I think that's - I think that's really - really important that that be
675 opened up and kind of part of the community presentation to the, um, to that
676 street front. I think that's - I think that went through some of the points that I
677 had from the presentation. So that's what I have for now, want to bounce any
678 of that around, I don't disagree with your fire roo-...

679
680 Q1: No...

681
682 Q2: ...I don't disagree with your fire room, uh, fire riser room comment, and that
683 moving also opens up the, you know, what might be a push back from the
684 irrigation district, as far as their accessibility for the - for the, um, the tiled
685 pipe that would and could go through there. 'Cause my experience - what I've
686 h- what I've heard is that, you know, they need enough room to dig a pipe out,
687 which isn't, you know, isn't much more than a mini excavator at the end of the
688 day. In - in reality.

689
690 Q1: I'm thinking if they've - from the - the current location on the perimeter over
691 there, if that's gonna be an acceptable amount of space to get in there and do
692 what they need to do then...

693
694 Q2: And it is the (unintelligible)...

695
696 Q1: ...by all means, yeah, I mean, I - I think it - it needs to be explored and...

697
698 Q2: Yeah, and also bears mentioning that to have river water, which the state
699 defines as surface water available - readily available on site going through the
700 site and not using it is, uh, is a missed opportunity and dis- disservice to the
701 arid west that we live in.

702

703 Q1: Um, thoughts on the, uh, my comment on the amenities, those two amenity
704 buildings and just
705

706 Q2: Yeah, I s- I - I see the point, you know, someone could live in a - in a front
707 unit and kind of not know they existed, but if you - if they are more of a
708 feature and look like something unique, you know, and it's not to the degree of
709 looking like a clubhouse, but it's to the degree of looking like something other
710 than, uh, another.
711

712 Q1: Uh, and I - I think just for clarity of - of - of my comment, I mean, it - it could
713 be something as simple as, you know, utilizing some of the faux wood type
714 finish material, kind of peeling back that lower level and - and just adding
715 kind of a - a - a little bit of more, um, articulation with just the material usage.
716

717 Q2: Yeah.
718

719 Q1: And fenestrations. I mean it - it - I'm not necessarily saying that it needs to
720 have a - a full on different design overhaul or look or any - I - I just feel that
721 there's some more attention that can be given to where the signage can be
722 more of, uh, not the - the way that - that individuals find out it's there. I mean,
723 it's almost, it's - it's visually identifiable that there's something...
724

725 Q2: Yeah.
726

727 Q1: ...different at those - at those locations.
728

729 Q2: Yeah, 'cause you have this repetitive unit - unit - unit - unit - unit, and then
730 there's an exception. There's something different. It would bring a level of
731 curiosity of why is that different? Oh, that's because that's the office or that's
732 the bike - bike storage. I agree with you.
733

734 Q: All right. It is sounding like, um, you're looking for some items to be
735 addressed. The next date that would be available would be March 6, the same
736 time, same place, um, should it be available.
737

738 Man: (Unintelligible) on most of these things. I'm not sure when you get through it.
739

740 Q: Um, uh, uh, is - and the applicant is asking that it not be continued, uh, as you
741 get ready for your decision, but should you continue it the next date would be
742 March 6, uh, provided that the applicant can provide the revised materials 14
743 days in advance.
744

745 Q1: Well, I - I don't think that I feel comfortable with all of these items that we've
746 been talking about being conditions that are not going to be reviewed and
747 looked at.
748

749 Q2: Yeah. Or...

750

751 Man: (Unintelligible).
752

753 Q2: ...or potentially so heavily conditioned that the applicant wants to make and
754 propose different changes anyway.
755

756 Q: (Unintelligible).
757

758 Man: I didn't quite hear that.
759

760 Q: Um, the applicant is asking that you might to repeat that, Mr. Hurd.
761

762 Q2: Well, Brett was saying that these were items that we're gonna wanna see
763 again, because there's a number of them and they're design related. So we
764 should continue it. And what I was saying was if we condition this so heavily
765 that, I mean, we'd be basically designing it through our conditions, which then
766 the applicant would want to go back and redesign it their way anyway. So I'm
767 saying...
768

769 Man: (Unintelligible).
770

771 Q2: ...it should be pushed.
772

773 Man: (Unintelligible) explore after (unintelligible) we were asked questions about
774 those and then about (unintelligible).
775

776 Q2: We - we can't hear the applicant.
777

778 Q: It's somewhat out of order. Um, is - so the applicant has, uh, it has address- or
779 has approached the podium, um, wishing to address, uh, the members. Um,
780 with that, um, please do note that it's somewhat out of order, and so w- you've
781 already had the opportunity to present tonight. If you have points of
782 clarification, uh, we should allow it, but if it's, um, to state the case, I - I think
783 it - it is, uh, wholly out of order.
784

785 Q1: Is it points of clarification?
786

787 A4: Hi committee members, (Jeff Bauer), 601 West Bannock in Boise. I - I think
788 what we just want to reiterate here is, um, we've been th- going through the

789 design reprocess, I think, for five months now. Um, the comments sound the
790 same as they were at the initial meeting and I think what we'd like to offer
791 now are, you know, responses to those comments. I - I - I'm not sure we got
792 direct questions on those issues, uh, in advance of our rebuttal or - or a chance
793 to, uh, weigh in on those design recommendations. And I think there are quite
794 a few that we're in agreement with, um, that we could step through and maybe
795 take them off the list and narrow this down at - at least so that, um, when we
796 come back, we're only looking at a couple items instead of, you know, eight or
797 ten that - that were articulated. For instance, we're not really sure what you
798 want us to do with the trash enclosures. We're - we're happy to add another
799 one at the loss of a parking stall. Um, you know, the - the piping of the
800 irrigation lateral I think is a no-go based on their jurisdictional overlay. Um,
801 that's just something they're requiring. Um, at best, we'll have to do two 90-
802 degree bends to get it in one of those drive aisles. And even then they don't
803 want it to be paved over. So, I - I think that - that that's another issue we can -
804 we can take off the list. Uh, we like your note idea on 47th, uh, Mr. Labrie.
805 Uh, we're - we're happy to remove the fencing there and put some hardscape
806 in and - and activate that. Um, happy to add more signing - signage to our -
807 our bike room and maintenance room. Again, those are private facilities.
808 We're not really looking to invite the public in there. Um, this is a very small
809 site, 2 acres. I'm - I'm sure all the residents will know where their amenities
810 are. Um, so I - I think that's most of what we looked at. Um, in terms of the
811 pass through to the building, uh, being developed to our east, um, we can try
812 our best to open that up some more. Um, again, uh, we - we don't think that
813 needs a- another hearing. I think you could direct staff to require that to be
814 opened up and - and landscaped for, uh, additional open space.

815
816 Q1: The, uh, the irrigation pipe is paved under every street that it runs under and
817 many driveways throughout the district. So - and it's - and it's functioning
818 where it is now, so you're proposing to move it. And the irrigation district,
819 once you move it and tile it, it's 100% your responsibility to maintain it. So it
820 can go anywhere on the site except under buildings.

821
822 A4: Commissioner Hurd, I - I'm not sure if that was a question or a statement, but
823 they - they do want it located on the property line. They do not want it to be
824 paved over. And it's th- their expectation that when those properties, uh, to the
825 north develop, they're going to take some easement there as well, um, to allow
826 additional access and maintenance of that. And - and we can't use that water
827 really in a practical sense. We have very little irrigable area and - and to use it,
828 uh, and still meet the city's, uh, goals for, uh, conservation, we'd need a pump
829 house and to pressurize it. And so again, for the amount of space we have,
830 that's really not practical. So I know I'm out of order, but I think, again, we -
831 we would take conditions on the note at 47th, uh, the pedestrian connection to
832 the east, um, additional signage and, um, entrance, uh, material changes. We

833 would again split the trash enclosure on the north and south sides. Uh, those
834 are all conditions we would be acceptable with. And I think that addresses,
835 you know, 90% of the comments I've heard. So thank you.
836

837 Q1: What are your thoughts, Derek?
838

839 Q2: Design it for them through conditions, is that w...
840

841 Q1: I don't - I - I don't.
842

843 Q2: ...(unintelligible) ask to do?
844

845 Q1: I guess I'm - I'm a little concerned with not seeing how they're going to
846 address the conditions.
847

848 Q2: Right.
849

850 Q1: No, I, uh, I guess we could - we could - we could approve it based on those
851 conditions with staff's review. If the staff doesn't feel comfortable once those -
852 once the review documents come in, then it needs to come back to us, so I
853 don't.
854

855 Q2: Right. And, yeah. And I'm - and I'm - I'm hung up on the irrigation too. I think
856 that some of the - as the applicant mentioned, some of the items are easy to
857 condition and they can be taken off the table perhaps, um, but I'm - I'm hung
858 up on losing, you know, hundreds of feet of perimeter landscaping at the
859 expense of, um, you know, the - the interpretation of the applicant with what
860 the irrigation district has said, um, and...
861

862 Q1: (Unintelligible).
863

864 Q2: ...and not - and not forcing that issue with the irrigation district because I
865 know there's a lot of leeway with what irrigation districts can do and can
866 approve and can work with developers that are willing to work with them to,
867 um, to make it work and the...
868

869 Q1: I, uh, I - I guess I would think that if we need to look at that as the ultimate
870 solution, that it has to be placed there, I feel that there's - there's a lack of, um,
871 support documentation that - that really justifies the - the need for tiling it
872 completely and for locating it there. So maybe that's just, again, just some
873 additional documentation from the, uh, irrigation district, uh, uh, civil
874 engineer, both on - on...
875

876 Man: (Unintelligible).

877
878 Q1: ...what the, um, the s- specifics concerning the - the fact that these - these
879 other potential locations were, um, not viable and this is the only viable
880 solution, as we're eliminating, um, landscaping and...
881
882 Man: (Unintelligible).
883
884 Q2: Right.
885
886 Man: Yeah. Everybody, yeah. (Unintelligible).
887
888 Q1: So just I - I - I - I just - I - I guess I'm not just comfortable hearing that, well,
889 that's - that's what we're...
890
891 Q2: And - and...
892
893 Q1: ...that's the only thing we can do.
894
895 Q2: I'm not - yeah.
896
897 Man: (Unintelligible).
898
899 Q2: And I'm not comfortable hearing that, well, this is the, you know...
900
901 Man: (Unintelligible).
902
903 Q2: ...this is the answer 'cause it's the easiest answer, which was kind of..
904
905 Man: (Unintelligible).
906
907 Q2: ...the - maybe the impression that I got.
908
909 Q1: So this is, uh, and - and I - I believe this is the - the first that we've seen this
910 on a formal hearing basis. It was just a pre-app prior to this.
911
912 Man: No, I can do that. No, uh, (unintelligible).
913
914 Q2: I don't recall.
915
916 Q: That is correct.
917
918 Q2: Okay.
919
920 Man: Yeah.

921
922 Q1: So, I - I mean, I think my position is still the same that I...
923
924 Q2: To continue it?
925
926 Q1: ...I would like to continue it and I would like to see - see the items addressed.
927
928 Q: Is that a - a motion, Mr. Labrie?
929
930 Q1: Uh, that is a motion.
931
932 Q2: And I'll second the motion.
933
934 Q1: Continue to (unintelligible) certain, um...
935
936 Q: And that would be of March 6.
937
938 Q1: ...March 6.
939
940 Q2: Second.
941
942 Q: All in favor?
943
944 Q1: Aye.
945
946 Q2: Aye.
947
948 Q: Thank you. Okay. Then, uh, thank you to the applicant and the members of
949 the public on this item. And with that, we'll move on, uh, to Design Review
950 fiscal year 2023. And I'll turn it over to Ms. (Delgado).
951
952 A5: Hi everyone, are you able to see my screen?
953
954 Q2: Yes.
955
956 Woman: Yes.
957
958 A5: Uh, my name is (Joy Delgado). I'm here to present the Silver Bucket Project
959 located at 306 East 46th Street in Garden City. Um, as you guys all know, you
960 have seen this project a few times on a formal hearing, um, and for the sake of
961 this meeting and time, I will jump to kinda what we ended on last time and
962 what you guys were really wanting to see to get this pushed through and have
963 an approval, and that was the f- front facades facing 46th Street on these front
964 two buildings. And, um, with the new design that we have, we've actually

965 rotated the building, like I had mentioned that I wasn't sure if it was gonna be
966 possible...

967
968 Man: (Unintelligible).

969
970 A5: ...but it - it actually was possible for us to kind of rotate the building and put
971 the stairs at the back of it. So we were able to actually move those balconies,
972 which are the people's living room, kitchen area, more of their common area,
973 to the front so that those balconies, those doors can open up to 46th Street.

974
975 Man: (Unintelligible).

976
977 A5: People can stand out on those balconies and so it's - it's really facing 46th
978 Street now and it's really interacting with that side of the street. The other
979 duplex on the other side, we did not flip that one, although we did add some
980 different, um, elements to the front, some more windows, and some awnings.
981 The reasoning for not flipping this one was we kinda just mixed it up, did a
982 couple of different elevations on those front. This is still that stairwell. And if
983 we were to flip this building, it would kind of cut into some of the parking
984 spaces that are located directly behind it. So it is possible to flip this building,
985 just it would end up cutting into a parking space. So if that is something that
986 could be conditioned in there, then we're more than happy to flip it that way.
987 But if not, we feel that these two front facades have really changed the look of
988 the whole subdivision and kind of more face 46th Street and interact with the
989 street better.

990
991 Q1: Now a question for you, did...

992
993 A5: Yes.

994
995 Q1: ...did you, um, it looks like the - did the bike parking move out from in front
996 of the, yeah, okay.

997
998 Man: (Unintelligible).

999
1000 A5: So we have bike parking kind of randomly throughout the subdivision. So this
1001 bike parking is currently right there because we didn't flip this one, so it's not
1002 somebody's front yard and their s- or front door. And so there still is a
1003 walkway right there 'cause this does enter into their carport. So this is, like, we
1004 felt an acceptable area for people to put their bikes since it wasn't somebody's
1005 actual front door. Uh, but we do have other bike racks located throughout the
1006 subdivision as well.

1007
1008 Q1: Okay. Sorry to interrupt. Go ahead.

1009

1010 A5: Nope. I'm good. I'm open for comments and questions.

1011

1012 Q1: Well, I thought there was a few more comments than that. Um, pedestrian
1013 access i- I think it - you - I kind of would like you to walk through the changes
1014 that you've made, or are you saying that the only change you made was the
1015 front facades?

1016

1017 A5: So a majority of the common - or a majority of the changes that we did make
1018 were those front facades. Um, we felt that flipping those really helped interact
1019 with the street. And then we did...

1020

1021 Man: (Unintelligible).

1022

1023 A5: ...we do still have our pedestrian pathway that goes down the side of it as well
1024 as internally.

1025

1026 Man: (Unintelligible).

1027

1028 A5: Each one has their own - their own walkway up to their front doors still. And
1029 then we do have pathways by all of the parking spaces still. So I don't think
1030 that any of the internal items have changed much from the last time you guys
1031 saw this. We were really focusing on getting that interaction with 46th Street
1032 and those front facades of those buildings. And then this back, uh, kind of
1033 open area that we had presented last time, uh, we kind of kept the same. Um,
1034 as you know, the project that just went before us, they presented their little
1035 area right there too, so I do think that there is some things that as there's is
1036 coming more to a design, we could probably work together a little bit more
1037 here. We do have the same landscape architect so I think that that'd be
1038 something that would be easily conditioned - that you guys could condition
1039 for us, uh, is to make that more of a connection for everybody and make it
1040 more of a pedestrian open area. Um, but other than that, I think that a majority
1041 of what we were trying to do was make sure that we got these front facades to
1042 really interact with 46th Street.

1043

1044 Man: (Unintelligible).

1045

1046 Man: (Unintelligible).

1047

1048 A5: And I guess one of our - one of our main reasoning for not having that main
1049 walkway down the other side of the property is, there is already a subdivision
1050 there that's built and there already is an existing fence there. So we're at our
1051 setback right there to where we just wanted to put it all on one side and try to
1052 pull off of those people's backyards as much as possible.

1053
1054 Man: (Unintelligible).
1055
1056 Q1: Okay. I don't have any further questions right now or comments.
1057
1058 Q2: Me neither.
1059
1060 Q: All right. Then I'll turn it over to Ms. Veal for a staff report.
1061
1062 Q3: Good afternoon. Uh, this is Design Review fiscal year 2022 dash 0023 for
1063 Silver Bucket, um, located at 306 East 46th Street. Um, in this staff report on
1064 Page 3, there is a quick summary of all of the public hearings...
1065
1066 Man: (Unintelligible).
1067
1068 Q3: ...and the discussions had during those hearings, um, including the most recent
1069 one, which is January 3.
1070
1071 Man: (Unintelligible).
1072
1073 Q3: Um, during that hearing, it - the primary discussions revolved around the
1074 streetscape lacking presence there on 46th Street with the structures, um,
1075 being set back too far. Um, and the terminus view was discussed.
1076
1077 Man: (Unintelligible).
1078
1079 Q3: However, in regards to the pedestrian pathway systems, not necessarily the
1080 public pathway, but the ones internal to the common drive, that was addressed
1081 at the January 3 hearing, um, with - with some of the sidewalk being provided
1082 along the common drive. I just wanted to clarify that conversation that you
1083 just had. But as far as for this hearing on February 6, um, there was new
1084 material submitted on the 23rd, which included an updated site plan, the
1085 schematics and floor plans, as well as renderings. So, um, there was a new
1086 sidewalk connection from the front door entrance of Duplex A and B to the
1087 proposed public sidewalk along 46th Street. There was additional front facade
1088 designs. Um, the - there was the removal of garden boxes as an amenity. The
1089 relocation of three bike racks, which that number stayed the same, it was just
1090 relocation of it. And then there is a terminal view rendering from 46th Street.
1091 However, um, there are still items that are up for discussion, um, that have
1092 been conditioned in the decision document to either require compliance, um,
1093 or that they are permitted. For example, the common open space still remains
1094 to be deficient. Um, there was a common open space map or diagram, um,
1095 exhibit that, uh, is part of the record that identifies where the common open
1096 space is, but it isn't in compliance with the dimensional standards set forth in

1097 code. Um, so further discussion is needed on that, um, or further
1098 identification. At least there is a particularly difficult provision, um, in code
1099 that applicant struggled to meet. And it's the dimensional standards of the
1100 open space being 20 X 20. And so that's - that's where staff's main concern
1101 lies. Um, the parking remains deficient by eight vehicular spaces. Uh, it's
1102 conditioned that - that is permitted based off of, um, the alternatives to onsite
1103 parking through the pedestrian pathway, uh, they are providing, which is to
1104 the public and the bike parking spaces. Um, and new site plans were
1105 submitted. Landscape plans were not updated. So conditions regarding
1106 landscaping stayed the same. Um, it has also been conditioned to allow for the
1107 tiling of the drains on site. The site has two, it has the Thurman Mill Drain,
1108 um, which we were just discussing at the previous application. It's that same
1109 drain, um, same line. And then they also have the Davis Drain, Um, which we
1110 have previously discussed in other hearings. Um, and then regarding perimeter
1111 landscape along the northern property boundary line, that remains to be non-
1112 existent due to the public pedestrian and bicycle pathway easement that the
1113 city is wanting. Um, but that does require perimeter landscaping there along
1114 the northern boundary line. Um, but there is a fence proposed. Um, and that -
1115 that about sums up the changes that are for this hearing then. So with that'll
1116 stand for any questions.

1117
1118 Q: Um, Ms. Veal, um, in the draft potential conditions of approval, there's a
1119 number of items that have been highlighted.

1120
1121 Q3: Uh-huh.

1122
1123 Q: Um, and just for clarification, are those items that have been added, um, or
1124 that are requesting to have some clarification.

1125
1126 Q3: Oh, right. Sorry, um, so the conditions highlighted in the decision document
1127 are essentially items that need to be noted or, um, specifically stated. For
1128 example, number two, under site specific requirements is in regard to the
1129 deficiency of parking spaces. So number two is saying that, um, the site has
1130 provided enough alternatives to vehicular transportation per code, and is
1131 permitted to be deficient by eight parking spaces. And that's if the committee
1132 does find that the deficiency is made up for, by those alternatives to onsite
1133 parking. Um, and then number one, under, prior to construction, it does say
1134 that a minimum of 5150 square feet of common open space is required. So
1135 that - that's a typo there. So it needs to be required. And that's just based off of
1136 generalized code, uh, requirements. But the highlighted portion beneath it is
1137 common open space calculations may incorporate the common open space of
1138 the adjacent parcel being developed to the west, which is the application that
1139 we just discussed, design review fiscal year, 2000, uh, 220022, because they
1140 are butting each other. And they are proposing common open space adjacent

- 1141 to each other, which includes landscaping pathway connections, um, et cetera.
1142 Um, the, it has been drafted to include that common open space. If the
1143 committee believes that this - this current site does not have to provide its own
1144 common open space that meets code. So discussion could be had there. And I
1145 can answer any questions. I don't know if I explained that well enough, um,
1146 but yes.
1147
- 1148 Q: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Veal?
1149
- 1150 Q2: So, that - I guess that common open space then you've drafted in a way that
1151 the continuation of the other development is kind of - is meeting the code or...
1152
- 1153 Q3: Yeah.
1154
- 1155 Q2: ...square footage of common area?
1156
- 1157 Q3: So the square footage of this development, I believe is deficient by at least
1158 100 square feet, if not more, based off of the s-, uh, plans that were submitted.
1159 However, it is abutting the adjacent property's common open space
1160 landscaping. So it's drafted in what I believe in - in such a way that where it
1161 immediately connects with the adjacent property that can be counted. So call
1162 it an extra 100 square feet. It's not intended to be the entire property or the
1163 entire common open space of that adjacent property.
1164
- 1165 Q2: And is there in the packet or a condition to be written that kind of keeps that
1166 connection open and keeps that shared one to the other?
1167
- 1168 Q3: Um, so we have - there is not a condition drafted in either decision document
1169 to require that it remain open, just that the connection be there and remains
1170 indefinitely, the, um, pathways specifically need to connect with one another.
1171 But if they were to put up a fence, there is not something prohibiting that as of
1172 right now in the conditions. So a condition would need to be drafted to, um,
1173 essentially prohibit any kind of privacy fencing or disassociation and of that
1174 entire area.
1175
- 1176 Q2: Okay. Yeah, that seems - it seems like the intention both ways. So if there's a
1177 condition that it's written to clarify that intention, that would be helpful.
1178
- 1179 Q: All right. Uh, thank you. If there is no f-, if there are no further, uh, questions,
1180 I'll open it up to the, um, public testimony. Is there anybody online who
1181 wishes to provide testimony? All right. I'm not seeing anybody. Um, is there
1182 anybody in the audience who wishes to provide testimony on this?
1183
- 1184 Woman: Mr. (Bauer)?

- 1185
1186 Q: Okay. Thank you. And with that, I'll, uh, close the public testimony and turn it
1187 back over to Ms. (Delgado).
1188
- 1189 A5: Um, regarding the common open space towards the back of the property. Uh, I
1190 have been in communication with the other architect that did the presentation
1191 earlier. And like I mentioned, we do have the same landscape architect
1192 working on both of those. Um, so I can make sure that as we continue on and
1193 they continue on with the development of these, that we have something to
1194 show you that shows that that common open space stays open and that there's
1195 no fences being put up.
1196
- 1197 Q: Thank you. Any further questions for Ms. (Delgado)? All right.
1198
- 1199 Q2: And if - if one, well, one clarification, I guess, is if the other developments
1200 irrigation ditch moves to what would be, I think, center of your site, then you
1201 could run the irrigation ditch down center of road, in essence, I would
1202 imagine.
1203
- 1204 A5: We would have to have our civil engineer take a look at that, but potentially,
1205 but we also have that Davis Canal running the opposite direction. Um, so we'd
1206 have to look at the engineering on those two crossing paths. But I mean, it's a
1207 potential if they do - if they are required to move theirs. Uh, but again, we're
1208 just trying to align with where they had initially said they were gonna move
1209 theirs. And we had both thought it was a good idea if we were both gonna be
1210 moving them to that location, but if they are gonna run theirs directly down
1211 the middle, then that's a potential that we could do. Um, but obviously not
1212 ideal, but it's definitely not off the table.
1213
- 1214 Q2: Thanks.
1215
- 1216 Q: Thank you any, or, um, now I'll open it up for discussion, close the public, uh,
1217 hearing and open it up for discussion.
1218
- 1219 Q2: I think that - that street front elevation is meeting everything I was looking for
1220 - for it to work with code. And then as far as internal site circulation, it looks
1221 like we can walk from 46th Street up in front of Duplex A and then on a stone
1222 path to get to Unit C and along on what would be, it's calling out a raised four
1223 inched wide stamped, concrete sidewalk with a rolled curb. So we have kind
1224 of that internal site circulation, I guess the - the only missing connection is
1225 from the end of that pathway to the fourplexes on the back.
1226
- 1227 Q1: That's what I still think we're - we're missing. And both - I think we can
1228 condition some connectivity from...

1229
1230 Q2: Yeah.
1231
1232 Q1: ...the end of those walks, whether it's, uh, some colored concrete or whatever,
1233 some way to get over to that plaza, that's kind of an island.
1234
1235 Q2: Yep.
1236
1237 Q1: And then, yeah, I would, I - I'm in agreement with, I think those front
1238 elevations have - have come a long ways to - to really address, uh, kind of that
1239 street presence and engaging with the street. So, and I don't think it's
1240 necessary, I think that it - it doesn't have to be symmetrical, both the same.
1241 One's flipped, one's not, they both still to ad-, uh, feel that they address the
1242 street, in my mind.
1243
1244 Q2: So, with conditions that staff has written in, does it work for us at this point? I
1245 think it - I think it works for me.
1246
1247 Q: So, um, just a point of clarification with the condition, uh, requiring that the -
1248 that back area have an easement, um, to allow for the common open space to
1249 connect?
1250
1251 Q2: Yes, and to connect that Unit A, to the back fourplexes but with the internal
1252 site circulation.
1253
1254 Q: And would that include a materials change, uh, to - to, um, the point of the
1255 connectivity?
1256
1257 Q2: Yeah, I would suggest that the - the stamped concrete, whatever that material
1258 is, and however that's designated that - that continues.
1259
1260 Q1: Is that a motion?
1261
1262 Q2: Yeah, I was waiting if Jenah had any further clarifications?
1263
1264 Q: Um, yes. One that's just pointed out, um, by Hanna is there's a condition that
1265 the - the, um, Davis Drain and Thurman Mill be addressed, um, as proposed
1266 and perhaps that condition could be reworked to provide flexibility as well.
1267 It's, uh, condition number three...
1268
1269 Woman: Under (unintelligible).
1270
1271 Q: Under site specific.
1272

1273 Man: (unintelligible) there.
1274
1275 Q: Perhaps...
1276
1277 Q1: No, wait a minute, which decision...
1278
1279 Woman: ...this is the question...
1280
1281 Q1: which decision doc- document is this that we're looking at? The, uh...
1282
1283 Woman: Twenty three.
1284
1285 Q: Um...
1286
1287 Q1: ...the one that's January 3 or the one that's draft potential decision December
1288 5?
1289
1290 Q: Uh, it's the January 3 one, I believe.
1291
1292 Q3: Um...
1293
1294 Q1: I'm not seeing a condition.
1295
1296 Q3: Let me see...
1297
1298 Q1: Site condition, number 3. So, what am I...
1299
1300 Q3: So - so designer view fiscal year 2022-0023.
1301
1302 Woman: Um...
1303
1304 Q1: There's two decision documents in there, right?
1305
1306 Q: Uh-huh.
1307
1308 Woman: Uh-huh. What we could do is just bring them back to make sure that it's
1309 accurate and it's (unintelligible).
1310
1311 Q: So it looks like that decision document isn't online. Um, what we could do,
1312 uh, should you move forward with an approval is approve the application and
1313 bring back, uh, the decision document for consent agenda, which you could
1314 pull off, uh, if it's not accurate, but to make sure that it accurately reflects your
1315 decision.
1316

1317 Q1: Okay, I'm fine with that.
1318
1319 Q2: Yeah, me too. So I'll move to approve DSRFY22-23 with the conditions as
1320 written and including the updated d- decision or conditions that we just
1321 discussed.
1322
1323 Q1: Second.
1324
1325 Q: All in favor?
1326
1327 Q2: Aye.
1328
1329 Q1: Aye.
1330
1331 Q: Thank you. And this concludes...
1332
1333 A5: Thank you guys.
1334
1335 Man: Thank you.
1336
1337 Q1: Thanks (Joy).
1338
1339 Q: Okay thank you - thank you. Um, this concludes the items that we had on the
1340 design review committee's application. Uh, we do have a consultant meeting,
1341 uh, that directly follows, uh, this. Um, but, uh, with that, thank you for
1342 everybody that attended the design review committee meeting. Um, and we
1343 can adjourn the meeting at 4:37. Um, all right.
1344
1345 Woman: (Unintelligible)?
1346
1347 Q: Yes, please.
1348
1349
1350 This transcript has been reviewed with the audio recording submitted and it is an accurate
1351 transcription.
1352 Signed _____

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

Q=Jenah Thornborrow

Q1=Hanna Veal

Q2=Brett Labrie

Q3=Derek Hurd

A=Jeff Hatch

A1=(Brie Platt)

A2=(Matthew Clark)

A3=Cathy Sewell

A4=(Kate Falkinstein)

A5=Karl Wirkus

A6=Louis Landry

A7=Belinda Isley

A8=Jason Jones

A9=Jeff Bowers

A10=Jorre Delgado

A11=Katrina Klum

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Q: All right. Uh, good afternoon, everyone. Um, I will be calling the design re-
committee - design review committee meeting to order. Uh, it is September 8,
2022. It is a special meeting. Um, a couple of - as we have a full house today,
there's a couple of items I'd like to take care of before, um, we call the
meeting to order um -- or excuse me -- um, go any further in the agenda. Uh,
the first of which is just an explanation of how public hearings are held. For
those items that are public hearings, there are four of them today. Uh, the
order is, the applicant will have the ability to present their application. Then
there will be a staff report. Uh, and then it will be opened up to the public, uh,
for public testimony. Uh, we do ask that the public's, um, stay to three minutes
in their public testimony. Uh, you will also need to state your name and
address. Um, if you're here in person, make sure that you've signed up, please,

43 for the - the corresponding application. And then come up to the podium, and
44 speak directly into the microphone. Uh, in particular, so those that are on
45 Zoom can hear you. Um, and again, state your name and address. For those of
46 you who are on Zoom. If your full first and last name are not, uh, on Zoom,
47 please make sure to have them, or before you testify to let us know the
48 spelling of your name, um, and your full name. Uh, often, uh, members of the
49 public will ask questions. Uh, because of the format of a public hearing, the
50 applicant will be, uh, taking notes, and will be able to, um, respond to your
51 questions in the rebuttal that comes after the public testimony portion. Um,
52 and the commission can also ask staff clarifying questions. Uh, we do ask that
53 you stay within the order, and only provide testimony or comments during
54 your turn at, uh - um, f- when you do provide the testimony within those three
55 minutes. And with that, I can note for the record that, uh, both appointed
56 mem- members are present on Zoom. Planning Official Thornborrow is here,
57 as well as, uh, City Associate Planner, Hanna Veal. Um, and are there any
58 changes to the agenda?
59

60 Q1: None by staff.

61

62 Q: None by staff. Um, it looks like no changes to the agenda. The next item is the
63 consent agenda which consists of the August 16, 2022 minutes.
64

65

66 Q2: I move to approve the consent agenda.

67

68 Q3: Second.

69

70 Q: All in favor?

71

72 Q3: Aye.

73

74 Q2: Aye.

75

76 Q: All right. Thank you. And then we'll move on to our first public hearing which
77 is subdivision fiscal year 2022 Number 2, (Honseck) town home subdivision
78 located at 3900 North Reed Street. And I will turn it over to Mr. (Hatch) for
79 his presentation.

80

81 A: Good afternoon. Jeff Hatch with Hatch Design Architecture. Our address is
82 200 West 36th Street in the wonderful Garden City. Good afternoon, design
83 review commissioners...

84

85 Man: (Unintelligible).

85
86 A: ...city staff. Thank you for consideration of our design review, uh, hearing this
87 afternoon. The - the brief recap of the location, uh, we were just kind of
88 northwest of Heron Park, right along the river. Um, from some of the last
89 feedback we had at our public hearings, we have gone ahead and revised, um,
90 some of the amenity in our common space. We've also defined, uh, additional,
91 uh, distinct thing to the proposed pathway between the structure providing
92 planters and vegetation to soften that walk and approach, as well.
93 (Unintelligible) enlarged location of that - those planters and opportunities to
94 engage general public. So, uh, just highlighting that location, uh, a couple
95 considerations for the purpose and the function of, uh, achieving and
96 addressing, um, if we look at, uh, an aerial of this location in particular where
97 the post, uh, sidewalk currently is, for that to continue and convey towards the
98 - the park, um, we have a fire hydrant, a large transformer (unintelligible) box,
99 um, some - some, uh, I - IT, uh, meterings, a power pole. And so we'd
100 effectively be going through this location to try to connect into that sidewalk.
101 If we look slightly south, we have a location, uh, currently shown where we
102 have our bike storage, and, uh, at this location, as well as over here.
103
104 Q: And Mr. Hatch?
105
106 A: Yes.
107
108 Q: Um, it sounds like you may believe that you're sharing your screen. I just
109 wanted to let you know that you're not.
110
111 A: Fantastic. Well I apologize for that inconvenience. And, uh...
112
113 Q3: I was seeing it all in my head, Jeff. I saw it all.
114
115 A: I - I appreciate that, Derek. So I'll - I'll, uh, briefly recap since you've already
116 heard me kind of describe where I'm at so far. So, uh, the location which is
117 shown on the vicinity map, which, uh, just to confirm you can all see that
118 now?
119
120 Q: We can. Thank you.
121
122 A: Excellent. Thank you. Uh, so we have disorientation next to public park. We
123 have the river frontage. And so I'm looking at our revised landscaping plan.
124 We have, uh, enhanced this walkway, adding, uh, planters and - and buffers
125 along that way to help, uh, encourage pedestrian activity towards that, uh,
126 space as well as enhancing some of the amenities at this location, our common

127 area. So we can see that slightly enlarged here. Um, in that location, what I
128 was just recapping was we actually look at connectivity to the existing
129 sidewalk of the park. Um, that location is interrupted by a range of different
130 utilities from electrical to, uh - uh, emergency services, and other meters, a
131 power pole. So to be able to connect, uh, that sidewalk, there - there's some
132 very valid reasons why the city didn't put in that public sidewalk at that
133 location. So if we look at, okay, well, how are we going to connect this
134 sidewalk into, um, into the park? If we go a little bit further south, where we
135 have our - our public, uh, bike parking here, and we have some bike parking
136 here, we still have some additional, uh, meters over there. So then, uh, we're
137 actually pushed even further into the site, um, which really led us to think, you
138 know, if we're, if we're having to engage the site halfway through the site
139 anyway, in order to engage people with the park, um, the owner felt that it was
140 prudent to, uh, adjust the site layout. And so that we're accentuating that,
141 centralizing it to, uh, the center of the development, and creating a - a focused,
142 intentional access to Greenbelt, and also, uh, for general public to enjoy that
143 parkway. So looking at, um, you know, some of the enhancements that we've
144 done to that to help encourage and engage that, we've added a pedestrian
145 access signage with an entry arbor which calls attention and engages
146 individuals into understanding that, yes, this is a public access. This is
147 intentional. This is the way to go. You don't need to go walk through the
148 sector meter box tree forest with all the utilities to try to get to the sidewalk.
149 We've - we've engaged, and made this much more functional, uh, purposeful
150 access to Greenbelts. And then with that, um, we - we've added, uh, a little bit
151 of our artistic, uh, intention of, uh, directing people to go that way again, to try
152 to engage and make it intentionally inviting for people to clearly be able to get
153 there from that standpoint. So here's a screenshot looking through, seeing that
154 space, walking through to the Greenbelt. And then, um, you know, based on
155 the - the staff report, we just wanted to speak to a couple of different accounts
156 and considerations of the staff report. There was a comment about units
157 greater than 30 feet in height meeting aerial apparatus. And in talking with,
158 uh, the fire department, we did widen our walkway to the 26 feet that's needed
159 for the aerial apparatus. In talking to them, um, we would also be proposing,
160 uh, fire suppression, which also alleviates some of their concerns. Um, there's
161 a consideration of, uh, some of the curve widths needing to be, uh, reducing
162 size and the annotation for the final plat or final (unintelligible) approval. Uh,
163 here is just kind of our follow-up with the fire department, and them
164 acknowledging that they're okay (unintelligible) refreshing, uh - uh, in that. So
165 this is the reiteration from our previous coordination. There is some
166 consideration for the preliminary plat as far as, uh, labeling, and also
167 dimensional tolerances, which you would be fine in any agreement with those
168 conditions of approval. And then indication of the bike parking, which I

169 previously spoke to is the keynote. Some of the vegetation needed to be
170 clarified, which is now in news renderings. Uh, there was a site efficiency in
171 enclosed parking, which has now been revised since, uh, we have no carports
172 on the site at this time. There were some, uh, questions as far as our tabulation
173 for landscaping. And so from our most recent design review plans, the intent
174 would be to have, uh, class of lawn trees. But, uh, the landscape architect does
175 feel that they are comfortable, and can revise that to be three class two trees as
176 requested by staff. And then we just need to clarify with staff, the species that
177 they would want for those locations. We would, you know, request that, that
178 be, uh, a coordination significant approval. We are in agreement that we can
179 achieve that request. And then there was the request for tree remediation for
180 arborist as we had recently done, even on our - our multifamily project off
181 State Street, having arborists do that as a little re- refinement. We can provide
182 staff that letter, so we may request that as a condition of approval, as well.
183 Um, as far as the open space, uh, there was question about how that
184 coordination is taking place, and coordination with the intent of really
185 maintaining the connectivity and development, and activating the pedestrian
186 to the Greenbelt and to (Peregrine) Park as discussed, versus trying to lead
187 them through a whole meter bank of utilities. Uh, fencing to remain in
188 protection. That's mostly to our western property line for adjacent neighbor,
189 uh, from our feedback. Uh, that was something that was maintained. And if
190 staff's okay with the existing fencing in our southern area parking, uh,
191 adjacent to the parking lot, we would keep that, mostly for that separation
192 between, uh, the private use and that public parking lot. So if we need to, uh,
193 have any kind of easement location for the Greenbelt access, or - or an
194 agreement until that we can coordinate that with the city and the square. As
195 far as our 10 percent, uh, space, in talking with our, uh, landscape architect
196 who provided us with this, uh - uh, response, now, ownership, and- and
197 architect coordinate with the surveyor to just distinctly, uh, fund a- and
198 quantify those, uh, percentages. But we feel that we can do that. And we've
199 had to do that in past with staff, um, so we request that as condition of
200 approval. ACHD, uh, had some maximum widths for their access points,
201 which are reflected. And w- we would just clarify that with our final - final
202 (unintelligible). And then, uh, with that, as far as their permanent easement,
203 we would also be able to satisfy that with their surveyor. And with that, I
204 would stand for any questions.

205
206 Q: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Hatch? Okay. Seeing none, I'll turn it over
207 to Ms. Veal for a staff report.

208
209 Q1: Good afternoon. Um, this is subdivision fiscal year 2022-002, (Honseck)
210 subdivision. Um, the discussion, or the most recent discussion with the design

211 review committee was on June 20, 2022. And the most recent re-submittal
212 packet was received on August 8, 2022. The packet addresses some of the
213 design review's committee's concerns and comments from previous hearings
214 dating all the way back to February of 2022. This staff report associated with
215 today's hearing, uh, reflects the most recent changes to plans submitted in
216 August. Highlighted in bold sections in the staff report, um, reflect the most
217 recent analysis and staff's comments, so I will defer to the staff analysis for
218 any questions that the public or the committee might have. Um, any changes
219 to the site and landscape plans as mentioned today by the applicant, um, in
220 order to meet code would need to go through another, uh, thorough code
221 review analysis, and possibly another public hearing. Otherwise, there are a
222 lot of conditions conditioned in that staff report, or the associated decision
223 document to require code compliance. Um, but, uh, they are pretty generalized
224 conditions. Some of the major, um, code compliance issues that staff has
225 concerns with, uh, regard the first being the common open space. Um, there
226 was not enough information provided to staff to thoroughly analyze the
227 common open space, and at least the details of that common open space.
228 Although it was pretty clear as to what was going to be the common open
229 space area. Uh, the square footage was not included in the packet. It has been
230 conditioned to, uh, require code compliant, common open space, including
231 square footage counts. Um, this is a concern, or at least having the condition is
232 a concern of staff's because despite it being conditioned in that decision
233 document, if the current proposed plans are approved and the common open
234 space is not adequate as shown, um, redesigning the whole development
235 might have to happen and occur. And, uh, if it's a significant enough change,
236 then the entire application would have to go back through the public hearing
237 process. Um, so really narrowing down what that square footage count is, and
238 if it is code compliant is, um, very important. Staff also has concerns
239 regarding the structural design and the standards that it's meeting. Um, the
240 new site plans show pedestrian pathways from the public sidewalk to the
241 primary entrances of the residential dwelling units. Um, they are shown on
242 site plans or the pedestrian pathway as shown on the site plans as stamped
243 concrete that resembled pavers, um, through the drive aisle. The most recent
244 re-submittal packet also lacked updated schematic drawings of the guest
245 parking and dwelling unit, that shared unit there along Reed Street. Um, so
246 staff wasn't able to review for further compliance and, um, based off of
247 previous comments and discussions, that whole guest unit and parking unit
248 was, um, not code compliant. Additionally, uh, staff does not believe that the
249 dwelling units of the entire development adequately address North Reed
250 Street. Um, nor do they create a dynamic relationship between the front facing
251 facades and the public realm of Reed Street. Um, for- for reference, Garden
252 City Code 84C, speaks to pedestrian level design, and how to adequately

253 address the public ground by having a frontage zone. And this frontage zone is
254 measured from the property line, and is between the minimum setback per the
255 base zoning district standards and the maximum setback of 20 feet. So by
256 proposing such a large setback between the road, the sidewalk, the common
257 drive, and the front door of these buildings, um, there is essentially too much
258 space in order to have that active and dynamic frontage space. Landscaping is
259 also another concern. Um, in March the submittal packet included a mitigation
260 plan, but it didn't include an arborist letter. The site does propose to remove
261 all existing trees, including those that are closest to the Greenbelt, but still
262 remain on site as, um, removal of trees offsite is not permitted. Um, this goes
263 against subdivision findings or at least the removal of all existing trees goes
264 against subdivision, findings and goals of the comprehensive plan, um,
265 because both speak to preserving the natural scenic and historic resources of a
266 development site when at all possible. Um, especially when considering the
267 property's proximity to the green belt area. The rest of the development
268 specifically in the area between the green belt and the proposed homes have
269 two different tree types, both of which are columnar in character. Um, staff
270 might suggest having larger trees, perhaps even class two or three trees could
271 be planted in this location. Um, and include the retention of the existing
272 healthy Elm trees so that the green belt is protected. Um, and we help create
273 that green landscape that everyone likes to have along the green belt. Um, so,
274 uh, there is a issue regarding the lots in the common drive. Um, the proposed
275 subdivision does not dedicate a common lot for the common drive or the
276 common area located at the front of the property. Um, while this is not
277 completely unheard of to have, um, individual lots contained subdivision,
278 common areas. Uh, we would just require there to be an easement across those
279 lots where the common open spaces are. Um, but staff does prefer, at least for
280 the common drive area to be on its own lot for maintenance standards and
281 reasons. Um, the - there's a - at least a need for discussion regarding the
282 parking. Um, there - there's that guest - guest dwelling unit slash parking
283 structure, um, located to the, I'll call it the west side of the property. Um, and
284 staff has questions regarding how the legalities, uh, of that structure is to
285 function. Um, the structure shows that there's going to be three guest parking
286 spaces within the structure, um, with garage doors. And as these spaces are
287 supposed to be guest parking spaces, uh, staff has questions as to how guests
288 will know that those are for them to utilize, um, as well as it being on - I'll call
289 it Dwelling Ones Lot or Lot One. Um, is it going to be maintained by the
290 HOA. uh, because it's on Lot One. Is that owner of Lot One going to be the
291 one responsible for the guest parking and that guest unit that is above the
292 guest parking spaces. Um, that - that needs to be hashed out and discussed as
293 far as legal - as far as legal concerns go. Um, and with that, I stand for
294 questions.

295

296 Q: Uh, thank you, Ms. Veal. Any questions, staff?

297

298 Man: Not right now.

299

300 Q: Uh, thank you. Uh, we do not have anybody signed up for this application in
301 person. Is there anybody that wishes to testify on this matter? Is there anybody
302 on Zoom that wishes to testify on this matter? If you do not know how to use
303 the raise your hand feature, you can go ahead and speak up. All right. Um,
304 then we will close the pu- public testimony and turn it back over to Mr. Hatch
305 for rebuttal.

306

307 A: Thanks. I will touch on a, uh, couple comments from Hanna. Hanna, thank
308 you for that recap. As far as the, uh, request for easement for the roadway, um,
309 I - I think since we're in a preliminary plat, uh, right now that ownership will
310 be fine with that via a condition of approval with that, uh, the, the guest unit
311 would be, um, uh, owned and maintained by the HOA. But to clarify that if
312 we're having to, uh, make a common lot for the roadway itself, um, uh, I
313 would say as part of that condition of approval, we could make that, uh, guess
314 unit also part of that same, uh, easement so that we could just clean up that
315 common area request. As far as the, uh, use of the guest parking, uh, for, for
316 the units, each of the units would have, um, associated control through the
317 HOA and talking with the ownership team. Um, everyone would have access
318 to those guest parking, um, based on the limited availability of parking in that
319 area, um, that access would - would be secured. Um, but everyone in, uh, the
320 townhomes would have access to that. So similar to, uh, the reservation, uh,
321 that will be used for the actual guest dwelling, uh, the guest parking would
322 also be associated with that. So if you have reservation for the guest dwelling,
323 you would be able to also have reservation for parking associated with that. So
324 that is something that, uh, ownership feels comfortable with, uh, managing,
325 especially 'cause, um, the developer is also gonna live on site. So he's aware
326 of, uh, that complexity and feels that the CCNRs and HOA can - can manage
327 that. Um, as far as some of the, uh, interpretations and - and that aren't - aren't,
328 uh, entirely following code, we also do have a - a planned unit development
329 application associated with this subdivision, which, um, kinda indicates, uh,
330 some of the waivers and alternative, uh, compliance methods that - that we've,
331 uh, presented, discussed and - and, you know, hope to accomplish. And with
332 that, I will stand for any additional questions from, uh, commission.

333

334 Q: Um, thank you. Any questions for Mr. Hatch?

335

- 336 Q: I guess, um, I might have a couple to make sure that we've addressed, uh,
337 what came up in Ms. Field's staff report. Um, might you be able to share the
338 screen and show the - the differences of where, um, the, the public, uh,
339 easement is intended and where the private easement is intended.
340
- 341 A: Uh, as far as when you - when you say private, are you talking about the - the
342 townhomes themselves? Or are you talking about that roadway easement? I'm
343 not totally following question, Jenah.
344
- 345 Q: In - in looking at the response, the - the re-submittal response, it looked to me
346 that there's an intended private easement, green easement, uh, for the
347 residents. However, it's also noted that that connection piece between the units
348 is intended for public, uh, access. And so I'm just curious about, uh, the
349 difference in locations?
350
- 351 A: Yeah. Okay. Thank you for that. So, each of the individual townhomes will be
352 subdivided. Uh, and as a townhome, they're gonna have their own property
353 boundaries. In order to access that public easement, we will need an access
354 easement, um, uh - uh, between those private residences in order to be able to
355 access that - that public right way. And so how that works from their
356 individual locations to that would have to be clarified.
357
- 358 Q: Okay, thank you. And - and have you spoken with the adjacent, uh, property,
359 um, to - to verify that that connection to the green belt, uh, could be granted?
360
- 361 A: As far as this location?
362
- 363 Q: Yes.
364
- 365 A: Uh, at least our initial discussions with that entity were, you know, after you
366 have something, uh, finalized for approval, uh, we can determine exactly how
367 that looks for that access point. So it was, uh, favorable, but as far as a - a
368 formal agreement, um, we wanted to make sure that, uh, we - we all had
369 general approved buy-in for, uh, this proposed solution. And then as a
370 condition of approval, we would request that we formalize that. That's a great
371 comment.
372
- 373 Q: Um, thank you. And, and then, um, it's been brought up the purposes of the
374 plan unit development, um, and I was hoping that you might be ar- be able to
375 articulate how this applications meeting the - the purpose of the plan unit, uh,
376 development for the - the waivers that are being requested.
377

- 378 A: Uh...
- 379
- 380 Q: I can help out if you need the, uh, code section or I can generalize it.
- 381
- 382 A: Okay.
- 383
- 384 Q: Um, the purpose, and very generally states that, um, the plan unit development
- 385 is utilized to increase, uh, living choices, uh, to preserve open space, to
- 386 preserve items of notes, such as trees, vistas, et cetera. And to be in harmony
- 387 with the comprehensive plan.
- 388
- 389 A: Thank you, Jenah. So as far as the PUD application goes, we feel that this
- 390 project accomplishes, uh, the ideals of that. We feel that one of the - one of
- 391 the main things that this application does with these townhomes that is, uh, a
- 392 little unique, but also we found has been favorable, from a city council
- 393 standpoint, in the past with some of our other approvals for - for planning and
- 394 developments is a mix of - of types of units. So we have some that are, you
- 395 know, range of different sizes. But with that, we also have some that are more
- 396 of kind of a - a two-bedroom smaller footprint versus your three with an
- 397 office. And it seems like most of the feedback we were getting from city
- 398 council was having these opportunities for larger units, uh, was something
- 399 they hadn't seen with a lot of the other plan unit developments, uh, coming
- 400 through as of late. And so that has been really well received. And that was
- 401 something that we wanted to continue, uh, gaining that feedback and - and
- 402 being active about. Um, as far as, uh, open space. I mean, we're literally
- 403 opening the middle of our development in order to - to celebrate, uh, the open
- 404 space and - and natural connectivity with that green belt. And so I think the -
- 405 the limitation of our - our roadway towards the Reed Street versus having kind
- 406 of a - a larger centralized access that would really put asphalt in the roadway,
- 407 uh, center to the river funage. Um, in this particular case activates and
- 408 celebrates that with the pedestrian connectivity versus, uh, celebrating the
- 409 vehicle. And so I think, uh, based on - on those, and then also the - that - the
- 410 consideration of having that guest unit for that - that flexible housing for
- 411 people who have visitors that come into the area, they want to be able to, you
- 412 know, maybe they have a full house already with that townhome. They wanna
- 413 be able to have their family close, to be able to celebrate and enjoy the river.
- 414 And they can really achieve all of that with this dynamic. So we feel that, um,
- 415 that kinda recaps what that planning development is about.
- 416
- 417 Q: Thank you. Um, any other questions for Mr. Hatch? All right. Uh, seeing
- 418 none. Thank you, Mr. Hatch. I'll turn it over to the committee members for
- 419 discussion.

420

421 Woman: (Unintelligible).

422

423 Q3:

424 I - I keep hoping this comes back without a U-shape drive in the front and it -
425 and it hasn't. From the pre-app to the many, many other times we've seen this,
426 it still is, uh, car-centric, car-focused, you know, mul- multi-family housing
427 with, uh - with a or pavement front than almost there is living footprint. And I
428 think that's been the biggest elephant in the room in this project all along. And
429 we've asked for that to be changed and be addressed, and that hasn't been
430 changed or addressed. So I don't, you know, once again, don't see this project
431 moving forward with my recommendation with that - with that major element
432 that hasn't - hasn't changed. There's been - there's been things to - there's been
433 things done to try to address that, but, you know, in - in every rendering,
434 except the one, when you're standing in the pathway, it doesn't look like, oh,
435 there's the green belt. Let me - let me go down this really nice pedestrian path.
436 That's carved out between these buildings. It's - it's six feet wide through a
437 three-story on each side, uh, canyon. And that doesn't to me feel like that
438 we've all of a sudden forgotten that we've crossed a - basically a circular drive
439 to get there. So I'm still struggling with that big - that big picture element.
440 And, you know, can't see it moving forward with that.

440

441 Q2:

442 Um, yeah, I, yes, I - I tend to feel the same way. I think we've - we've...

443

444 Woman:

445 It's more appropriate (unintelligible).

446

447 Q2:

448 I've struggled with this from the start of just, uh, the connectivity and the - and
449 the street front presence, um, that these buildings have being pulled so far
450 back and giving more attention to their proximity, to the green belt than their
451 proximity to the street. Um, and - and the - that narrow connection between
452 those, again, the three story buildings, the narrow connection there to the
453 green belt. I mean, I - I still feel that everything that was done there to try and
454 draw attention to it, if I was in that area, I'd probably go through the park, get
455 to the green belt. I wouldn't feel like that there's - that's a, um, a public
456 connection, even though we're trying, you know, there's - there's a lot done
457 there with the signage and- and colored walkway and the rest of that. Uh, it - it
458 just - it still comes back to how far those are that you're traversing, basically,
459 across to drive - drive aisle to get to the front doors of those - those homes.
460 And I - I - I really can't get past that either. I - I don't think it meets the intent
461 of the code.

462

463 Q3:

464 Yeah, that's the - that's the big, very obvious one. And then there was a - there
465 was so many, you know, other - other small things that Hanna very well

466

462 summarized in her staff report, you know, that this is wrong. It needs to be
463 addressed. This is wrong. It needs to be addressed. This doesn't meet code. It
464 needs to be addressed. And - and, you know, often we'll see things like that
465 and it's - and it can be conditioned and it works. But there was a lot of these
466 things that I think that, you know, were, if it had to change in a certain way, it
467 needs to completely redesign something. And, um, so I just - I just, it - it's a -
468 it's a tricky one now, too. 'Cause there's, I'm - I'm, I'm struggling with, if we
469 just deny it, and then this goes to city council. All of those other little things
470 that aren't right may just, you know, go along with, uh, you know, an appeal
471 or if our - if our denial gets overturned, there's all those little things that are
472 just gonna kind of go along with a potentially future approval.

473
474 Woman: (Unintelligible).

475
476 Q3: So I struggle with that. But I also struggle with, you know, Hey, come back to
477 us again, 'cause we've already said that five times and it hasn't changed. So I
478 guess, I don't know where - I...

479
480 Woman: (Unintelligible).

481
482 Q3: ...don't know where to go with this because I wanna see it redesigned and I
483 wanna see the things that we've been looking for since the pre-app actually
484 getting included in the plans. But we've been asking for that and it hasn't
485 happened. So I don't know, this may be a where do we go from here. Staff?
486 Or what are your thoughts, Brett?

487
488 Q: Um, I - I may jump in too. It sounds like there may be, um, a recommendation
489 for denial. But perhaps the - the draft potential decision document does not
490 adequately incorporate, uh, the findings. And so with, uh, there could be a
491 possibility where, uh, the design review committee requests that, uh, the...

492
493 Woman: (Unintelligible).

494
495 Q: ...findings be redrafted to better identify, uh, the items, uh, that are found
496 within - found to be deficient within the staff report and bring it back at the
497 next meeting, uh, to make sure that it's adequately contained within the - the
498 (unintelligible).

499
500 Q3: Brought back for review of those - of how that's crafted.

501

502 Q2: Yeah, because I - I - I guess I would agree with that. The, uh, unless we want
503 to go through the, uh, draft decision item by item and - and make sure that
504 that's the way we want it drafted or crafted...
505
506 Q3: Right.
507
508 Q2: ...at this point and take the time in this meeting to do that.
509
510 Q3: Yeah.
511
512 Q2: Uh, because there - the, uh, decision document is - is more, I guess a little
513 more generic and I think...
514
515 Q3: Yeah.
516
517 Q2: ...the applicant deserves, uh, the specifics...
518
519 Q3: Right. Right.
520
521 Q2: ...on the items that - that we're fine - that this application is deficient in.
522
523 Woman: (Unintelligible).
524
525 Q3: Yeah, I'd - I'd rather let Hanna have that fun at a later date. And, um, and then,
526 too, we can - we can look at what, you know, 'cause in a d- in a denial the
527 applicant's gonna be looking for, well, what could I have done, you know. So
528 we can - we can study that a little bit more, too, and have a more thorough
529 response for that.
530
531 Q2: And - and I think it - it - it's the, uh, it gives the specifics to City Council on
532 an appeal on exactly what the items were that did not get addressed...
533
534 Woman: (Unintelligible).
535
536 Q2: ...that we were focused on during these...
537
538 Woman: (Unintelligible).
539
540 Q2: ...numerous, um, hearings.
541
542 Q3: Yeah.
543

544 Q2: Does - does the staff have enough information based on our - our past
545 comments or do we need to go through any of - any of that, in order to get, I
546 guess, some more specifics drafted?
547

548 Woman: (Unintelligible).
549

550 Q3: And - and I think I'll jump in too...
551

552 Q: I guess.
553

554 Q3: ...to is, you know, sorry.
555

556 Q: Um, I - I was going to ask so that everybody can hear if - if, uh, Ms. Veal
557 feels that we have enough should there be a continuance of this item, uh, to a
558 date certain of the next scheduled meeting in 14 days or not 14 days, excuse
559 me, um...
560

561 Q1: No, it's the 19th.
562

563 Q: On the 18th. Um, and, uh, if she has enough information based on previous
564 discussions to - that she feels that she could adequately address that, um, or if
565 she would, like, prefer the commission detail that at this - at this time. What I
566 might note that, um, if there is any new, um, material that's discussed or
567 introduced, uh, we would need to reopen a hearing, so I would suggest if this
568 is the direction, uh, that the committee is going to leave the public hearing
569 open into the next meeting. Ms. Veal, do you feel that you have enough or
570 would you like...
571

572 Q1: No.
573

574 Q2: No? She does not. She would like some direction.
575

576 Q3: Well, I think, Hanna, when you were going through - when you were going
577 through your staff report, much of that, you know, you went through your
578 staff report and then there was, you know, other further discussion and I kind
579 of wanted right after your staff report, just to say, I recommend denial based
580 on that. Because all of those things were like, yeah, that's missing. That's
581 missing. That's missing. So I think my - my interpretation is what you've
582 written in the staff report crafted in a way or denial is what I'd be looking for,
583 basically. I mean, it's the - it's the - it's all of those things and the thing - the
584 bigge- the biggest one being the street front presence that we've talked about
585 and the, you know, car-centric...

586

587 Q1: Okay.

588

589 Q3: ...facade that we have of the building and guest parking and common areas
590 and.

591

592 Q1: Okay, thanks, Derek. I - I understand that. So, essentially, all of the yellow
593 highlighted portions that would require additional discussion.

594

595 Q3: Right.

596

597 Q1: Because they're not code compliant?

598

599 Q3: Right. Minus the fire stuff and things that are kind of...

600

601 Q1: Right.

602

603 Q3: ...other people's realms.

604

605 Q1: Okay. Thank you.

606

607 Q: All right. Um, do we have a motion?

608

609 Q2: Yes, I would move to continue this and leave the hearing open to the, uh,
610 September, uh, was it 18th?

611

612 Q1: 19th.

613

614 Q2: 19th.

615

616 Q3: And then in that meeting, just so that I'm prepared and Jeff's prepared, do we
617 go through, uh, applicant report, staff report, public hearing, et cetera? It's just
618 a - it just opens up the same way again.

619

620 Q2: Or do we move right into review of the, uh, decision document? How does
621 that need to happen, Jenah?

622

623 Q: Um, I s- I suspect to k- to keep it safe, that I would recommend that we just
624 leave it completely open and request that only new information is addressed.
625 Um, so, if there is any- anything that is found to be new information, uh, that
626 that be addressed and give the applicant the opportunity, um, and then open it

627 up for public hearing and go through the process just to - just to keep it very
628 safe.
629
630 Q3: And then with that, then Jeff has the opportunity to prepare and submit new
631 information as well, or are now we too close to that window of time to
632 submit?
633
634 Q: Well, um, if i- so it - it would be very difficult to submit timely and have it be
635 reviewed by staff in time in a two-week - less than two-week turnaround. Um,
636 and - and so if that - that were to occur, I would suspect that you may see an
637 additional continuance.
638
639 Q3: And I just wanted to be clear and kind of speak it out so the - so that the
640 applicant was prepared more than anything. So I'll second that because I think
641 Brett did make a motion to continue.
642
643 Q: All in favor?
644
645 Q2: Aye.
646
647 Q3: Aye.
648
649 Q: Uh, thank you.
650
651 Q3: Thanks, Jeff.
652
653 Q: Uh, and thank you, Mr. Hatch. Uh, the next item on the agenda is Design
654 Review Fiscal Year 2022, Number 14. Uh, Cathy Sewell is requesting a new
655 mixed-use multi-family project located at 210 East 35th Street. And, with that,
656 I will give the recorder to Ms. (Sewel) or...
657
658 Woman: (Unintelligible).
659
660 Q: And team.
661
662 Woman: (Unintelligible).
663
664 Man: Do you want me to go (unintelligible)?
665
666 Woman: Yeah.
667
668 A1: Um, could I share my screen? Is that possible?

669

670 Woman: From your laptop?

671

672 A1: Yeah.

673

674 Woman: Yeah.

675

676 A1: Okay. Is it - okay. First time with my laptop. Okay. Okay. Well, good
677 afternoon. Uh, my name is (Brie Platt). This is my partner, (Matthew Clark).
678 And we're here with our architecting collaborator, Cathy Sewell. Um, we want
679 to thank you all for the opportunity to present our design for your review
680 today, um, and thank the committee and hello, staff, um, for your time
681 throughout this process. Uh, we believe we have a design that is ready for
682 approval, once we clarify a few important elements of the plan for our
683 property. Um, The Sonder is a mixed-use development within the C2 zone
684 located at 210 East 35th Street between Carr and Clay. Um, it's on a block in
685 the heart of the Surel Mitchell Live-Work-Create District across the street
686 from Wepa, and the new SoUL project now under construction. We're also
687 just two blocks from the future site of Casino Beach. Those projects along
688 with ours are a big step towards realizing the goals and objectives of the
689 comprehensive plan, um, that Garden City has created as well as the Live-
690 Work-Create District or the Old Town planning area. The mixed uses in our
691 projects include a single ground floor commercial retail space, extensive
692 outdoor common areas, and 15 apartment units, 7 of which have
693 accompanying workspaces at the courtyard level. Um, it's also important, uh,
694 for us to say at this point that (Matthew) and I are not outside developers just
695 looking to maximize profits from this property, uh, for investors from afar, but
696 this building will be our home, um, our family of four, plus a - a tiny, crazy,
697 cute little dog, um, will live in one of the 15 apartment units and we plan to
698 use one of the courtyard level workspaces as our home office and art studio.
699 Um, a little over a year ago, we, um, identified and purchased this property for
700 a few primary reasons. Um, we're very aligned with the stated intentions of
701 this neighborhood, including growth, density, diversity of housing, and our
702 (unintelligible) making. Um, we really believe in the creativity and sense of
703 community fostered by the Live-Work-Create District. There's also no limit
704 on building height, no limit on density, and no objective parking standards for
705 the mixed - for mixed-use projects. Um, we saw this last item in particular as
706 a selling point for our investment in the neighborhood and our commitment to
707 making it our home. Um, we know that our community is growing quickly,
708 and included in that growth are some people looking for ways to reduce their
709 reliance on cars and looking to live with neighbors that share that intention.
710 Both (Matthew) and I have lived, uh, without cars in other cities, um, for

711 many years and very happily and we're looking to create that possibility for
712 ourselves and for others here at home. Um, Garden and Boise City are
713 working to revise their development code, including parking standards, uh, to
714 better accommodate healthy growth while also allowing for greater density.
715 Um, we understand that that's a tricky process, but there are a number of new
716 tools and proven ideas available to us to address parking in a modern
717 mixed-use development. So we've designed this mixed-use project to be fully
718 compliant with Garden City code and aligned with the comprehensive plan.
719 Um, we believe this fits beautifully within the larger stated vision of Garden
720 City, um, a thriving, uh, safe, and diverse community nestled by the river in
721 the heart of the Treasure Valley. And we are at heart community-focused
722 neighbors, um, and advocates of vibrant, creative, artistic communities. We
723 really admire Garden City's ability to continually innovate and reinvent itself.
724 And we are excited to become part of this neighborhood.

725
726 A2: Thanks. Um, again, (Matthew Clark). Um, we want to say at this point that
727 it's, uh, become clear to us from the staff report and the resulting public
728 comments that we've not yet fully explained the parking plan, uh, developed
729 for our mixed-use building, so we'd like to do that now. Most importantly, we
730 want to clarify the parking space allotted to our car share program. There will
731 be a shared vehicle on site. The staff report mentions, uh, ride-share services
732 like Lyft and Uber, which are certainly helpful in reducing the need for car
733 ownership, particularly the Lyft program that makes connecting to bus stops
734 much easier and more affordable, but our project will also feature an on- on-
735 site car share service, an electric vehicle exclusively available for use by
736 tenants of the building. This may be a new concept for Garden City, but it's
737 been proven across the country as an innovative way to reduce car ownership.
738 Reduced car ownership in turn results in reduced need for parking, but also
739 results in a number of other additional benefits for the community. It reduces
740 costs incurred directly by the tenants, including car payments, insurance, and
741 maintenance, as well as construction costs for additional parking areas or
742 structures. Those costs are typically passed through to tenants as an additional
743 rent expense. Reduced cost means more income circulating to the local
744 economy. Reduced car ownership and its requisite parking reduces
745 environmental impacts, including through concrete, asphalt, and other
746 contributors to the outsized carbon footprint of constructing parking spaces.
747 And by redirecting trips from tenant-owned, typically gas-powered vehicles to
748 a shared electric vehicle, the emissions reductions are substantial. So this plan
749 also helps to improve community health and safety. Fewer cars mean, uh,
750 means lower risk to pedestrians and cyclists. Less exhaust means cleaner air.
751 Fewer combustion engines means a quieter community. On-site car share
752 programs do work. Um, cities like Denver, Salt Lake City, and Portland have

753 codified parking reductions, even for car-share services that are not exclusive
754 to residents, uh, where you'd have a Zipcar that's parked there, but anyone can
755 use it, unlike this system, where the car is actually dedicated to residents. A
756 project in San Francisco has demonstrated that membership in an on-site car
757 share program reduced car ownership to 0.24 vehicles per household. Our
758 project will still have one off-street covered parking space for each apartment
759 in the building, plus one off-street covered ADA-accessible handicap parking
760 spot, and one off-street covered parking spot dedicated to this car-share
761 vehicle. Uh, the project is compliant with the Garden City Code, including
762 being sufficiently parked. To be clear, there's no objective standard for mixed-
763 use development by which it's possible to determine a precise number of
764 required parking spaces. Um, the staff report applies the residential
765 development standards to this project, but that section of the code clearly
766 distinguishes between residential and mixed uses. The mixed-use section, uh,
767 specifically talks about minimum and maximum number of required off-street
768 parking, uh, for non-residential uses, and mixed-use shall be determined by
769 the planning official based on the following criteria. So we're dealing with
770 specific proposed uses on the property. Uh, for us, that's, uh, 15 residential
771 units, seven of which are live workspaces with courtyard, uh, workspaces, uh,
772 one small pedestrian-oriented commercial retail space. Um, number two is
773 uses in the vicinity of the property. Our mixed-use building is very much in
774 line with the stated intentions for the area, but we're relatively early in the
775 growth process in a neighborhood t- and the growth toward that goal. So the
776 area currently is still predominantly residential. Uh, a traffic study, if
777 prepared, we di- we don't have a traffic study, but addressing number four, we
778 did do a parking survey - street parking survey, that demonstrates plentiful
779 available street parking. Um, 65 to 85% of available street, uh, parking spaces
780 were available as an average over four different times, including during a
781 Saturday market where we actually collected data about street parking. Um,
782 lastly, the availability of public transit, van-pooling, or we think most
783 importantly, other alternative transportation to serve the use. So in addition to
784 the 17 covered parking spaces, The Sonder will be less than a quarter mile
785 from a bus stop, will have at least 34 bike and scooter parking spaces, and will
786 have this dedicated shared vehicle onsite. We understand that actual mixed-
787 use development is relatively new to the area, and that the car share program
788 hasn't been seen here yet, but The Sonder justifies its parking plan under these
789 subjective guidelines, while also addressing the standards for alternatives to
790 on-site parking, including transit stop proximity incentives and shower
791 facilities. It's also worth mentioning that the staff report makes reference to a
792 parking formula for commercial space that doesn't directly apply to mixed-use
793 buildings, uh, including live-work spaces, but more importantly, we'd like to
794 clarify that the workspaces at the courtyard level were designed t- for use by

795 residents of the building, not people driving to the building to, you know,
796 renting it just as their office from elsewhere. Um, the Live-Work-Create
797 overlay clearly states that no off-street parking is required for working spaces
798 less than 500 square feet in interior floor area. So knowing that the parking
799 requirement was subjective, but that there was an established metric, we
800 designed our project to meet the standard of workspaces under 500 feet.

801
802 A1: Um, so, yeah. As - as (Matt) just said, um, we've designed our parking plan to
803 provide sufficient parking for the specific uses of this mixed-use project. Um,
804 at the same time, we know the subject, uh, subjectivity of certain sections of
805 development code have caused a lot of confusion and concern and even
806 litigation and so if this, um, committee, or if staff, um, you know, find it
807 relevant after hearing our presentation, um, we're very open to any comments
808 that you all have about the legal status of the code, about the subjectivity of
809 the parking requirements, about the objectivity of parking requirements
810 required by local land use planning act. Um, we're - we're open to questions
811 and comments and discussion there. Um, there is one other clarification
812 needed in response to the staff report. Um, let's see here, the report refers to
813 design provisions for residential structures, uh, specifically 84B4B2 regarding
814 main entrances. So, main entrances, um, which are the primary points of entry
815 where the majority of building users will enter and leave shall be designed as
816 an obvious entrance and focal point of the building through architectural
817 treatment, lighting, and address identification. Um, so, again, this is, uh, this
818 project is a mixed-use building, not an exclusively residential structure, but
819 for the sake of clarity, according to this definition, the small pedestrian-
820 oriented retail space in our design is the main entrance. So, we expect that
821 even something like a coffee shop will see an average of more building users
822 per day than the 15 apartments. So, that said, in response to the comments we
823 got from our pre-app meeting, um, we have designed the other two entrances,
824 one for residents and one for occasional visitors to the courtyard level
825 workspaces to both be clear and inviting.

826
827 A2: We, uh, would also, uh, like to say that we know that a few letters have been
828 submitted in opposition to approval of our project. Uh, and we know that there
829 are some folks here, uh, today to share some thoughts and we're grateful that
830 our neighbors are engaged and willing to express their opinions about growth
831 in the neighborhood, truly. Um, we also see that every one of those letters
832 submitted focuses on parking, um, but none of them mention this car share
833 program, uh, because it's not referenced in the staff report and we hope that
834 better understanding the way we intend to live in the neighborhood, including
835 use of a shared vehicle, will help to allow different perspectives, uh, to share
836 space in Garden City. We named this building The Sonder for a very specific

837 reason. Sonder is defined as the realization that each random passerby is
838 living a life as vivid and complex as your own. (Brie) and I are deliberately
839 choosing to build our home in a way that allows us to share space and to
840 interact with 14 other households in the building and hundreds more in the
841 neighborhood. We hope that that process - that - that in that process, we all
842 learn to better understand the variety of vivid and complex, uh, lives that exist
843 in a community, many of which are different from our own. Um, lastly, we
844 wanna reaffirm that our project meets the findings required for the Design
845 Review Committee, um, to approve our application, so to do that, I wanna
846 invite Cathy Sewell to join us as well, please.
847

848 A3: Okay. Um, hello, uh, Cathy Sewell with Platform Architecture and Design,
849 uh, 280 North 8th, Suite 118, uh, in Boise. Um, first I just wanna thank, um,
850 uh, Ms. Veal for all her help and assistance throughout the process. Um, and I
851 think, um, in regard to the staff report and the proposed, um, decision
852 document that the findings, in fact for approval, um, are - are right in line with
853 what we had identified in our, um, in our statement of intent compliance letter
854 that was submitted with the package. For - just - so for the sake of time, um, I
855 will, um, just say that we are, uh, um, support the - the findings. We - we
856 agree with the findings. We also agree with the site-specific, um, conditions of
857 approval contained in the decision document. The only, um, comments I
858 would like to make, um, in regard to, um, finding one, uh, for approval, um, in
859 there it states the proposed multi-family development. Um, this is a mixed-use
860 development, um, so it'd be great to get that verbiage changed - changed. And
861 then, um, finding two, which addresses the, um, standards for the protection of
862 health safety in general work welfare, um, this is just a small end, but we hope
863 that our proposal, um, just doesn't, uh, will not unreasonably diminish...
864

865 Man: (Unintelligible).
866

867 A3: ...the health safety or work wel- welfare. Um, we hope that it i- improves, um,
868 rather than, um, unreasonably does not diminish it. Um, but I - I think aside
869 from that, um, you know, we know the public's gonna have some comments.
870 Um, Ms. Veal has the staff report, so we'll just, um, wait to - for the - finish
871 our comments, um, after the discussion (unintelligible) unless there's some
872 questions right now.
873

874 Q: Um, any questions for The Sonder team?
875

876 Q2: Not at this time.
877

878 A3: Thank you.

879

880 Q: Okay. Um, Ms. Veal, I'll turn it over to you for your staff report.

881

882 Q1: Mm-hm. Thank you.

883

884 Q: (Unintelligible).

885

886 Q1: Previous discussions with the design review committee, uh, included, uh, the
887 design of the work and live spaces in relation to the public realm. Um, the
888 applicant has updated site plans to include additional design features and
889 signage, um, to help show that - where the entryways are for, um, both the
890 courtyard and the residences. Um, staff has kept the Garden City code analysis
891 of 84B4, which the applicant have - did mention earlier. Um, I've kept it
892 highlighted to indicate that further discussion should be had, or might be
893 necessary just based off of the pre-application discussions, uh, re- at least in
894 regards to the design and orientation of the structure. Um, I was able to - or I
895 had interpreted the section of code, uh, with the understanding that the
896 residential units are the primary use of the project, um, not that the
897 commercial leasing space on the first floor or even the courtyard spaces would
898 act as the primary uses. Um, and as such, I was able to interpret the 84B4
899 section of code, um, as needing the - the primary entrances needing to, um, at
900 least be for the residences and not through that commercial space. So that's
901 why, um, portions of that staff report analysis are highlighted and bolded in
902 the staff analysis. But moving on to the main topic at hand, um, parking. So I -
903 I wanted to point out - um, or I wanted to note a point of clarification that will
904 contradict the staff reports discussion items, um, at least in regards to parking.
905 So based off of legal counsel of the city's legal department, um, and an
906 ongoing, or at least used to be a, uh, litigation application of a previous Live-
907 Work-Create, uh, application, the judge had determined that parking under the
908 Live-Work-Create overlay has to be true to code and not how staff has
909 historically analyzed it and interpreted it. Um, so instead of requiring one
910 vehicular parking space for every 1,500 square feet of commercial space on
911 site, or rather workspace, 'cause we're working with the overlay, um, no -
912 traditionally staff has taken all live - or all workspaces or commercial spaces
913 and added them all up together for accumulative square footage and then
914 divided that by the 1,500 square feet to come out with a required parking
915 count. Um, but what the judge had determined is to go strictly off of what
916 code says. So if the workspace is less than 500 square feet, then no
917 commercial spar- parking space would be required of that project. So in the
918 case of this application, if they were to use the overlay, which they are not, I
919 just want to clarify, 'cause there was some comparison going on, um, if this
920 application were to have that overlay, they provided, um, 3,505 square feet of

921 commercial or workspace. Um, but because all of those units, except for the
922 commercial space, are under 500, um, square feet, really the application
923 would only have to (unintelligible) for that commercial leasing space. Um, the
924 commercial leasing space on the first floor is 660 square feet. So that unit
925 would only have to provide, um, two parking spaces for all of the commercial
926 or the work going on. Um, hopefully, that makes sense, I know it was long-
927 winded. Um, but at the end of the day, in summary, it doesn't necessarily even
928 apply. So you could ignore what I just said because the overlay, uh, district is
929 not applicable to this application. Um, so with that being said, um, the
930 application has not chosen to use the live or create overlay nor have they
931 chosen to use the neighborhood commercial, um, node overlay. So the parking
932 standards that are applicable are the Garden City code 84D parking standards.
933 84D goes into detail, um, about how residential parking is required and how -
934 how much residential parking is required as well as guests. And then it gets
935 vague and gray when it comes to commercial parking space requirements. In
936 the case of this application, um, because it is straightforward, the residential
937 parking requirements, including the guests, would be 11 residential parking
938 spaces. Um, with the commercial parking spaces, staff has traditionally used
939 a, um, a comparison. So we go to other jurisdictions such as City of Boise,
940 City of Meridian, and look at those parking standards. Um, but what we
941 oftentimes do is divide the commercial - the provided commercial spaces
942 with, um, by 300 square feet and that would require one parking space. So for
943 every 300 square feet of commercial, there is one vehicular parking space
944 required. Staff was able to apply this ratio and the calculation, uh, ended up
945 being 11 commercial parking spaces required. So in total 22 parking spaces
946 are required of this site and there are only 17 parking spaces provided. Um,
947 so, um, hashing it all out, it would be - the site is deficient three residential
948 unit parking spaces, eight guest parking spaces, um, and 11 commercial
949 vehicular parking spaces. So to mitigate for the lack of parking, uh, the
950 applicant has provided ample enclosed and exposed bicycle parking spaces.
951 They've provided 34 total, um, and that's only in communal areas. That's not
952 to mention the possibility of having a - a resident use their dwelling unit as
953 storage. Um, they have also proposed a car share program for residents to use.
954 The applicant has mentioned - mentioned their proximity to the greenbelt and
955 the availability of ride-share services such as Uber and Lyft, um, and
956 discounted ride-share services with Valley Regional Transit. Staff has
957 conditioned to require a board or computer located in a public space that
958 provides information, including carpooling, transit trip planning assistance,
959 transit maps, and maps of preferred bar - bike routes. It has also been
960 conditioned to require information regarding the Valley Regional Transit Lyft
961 discount information for the duration of that service that VRT provides. The
962 number of parking spaces proposed could be considered sufficient to serve the

963 project because one, the mixed-use proposal will capture trips, and the small-
964 scale commercial is focused on serving the developments residents and other
965 nearby walkable residents. Two, there is available street parking on the
966 surrounding streets. Three, the project focuses on alternative modes of
967 transportation through the ride-share program and the surplus of bicycle and
968 scooter parking. The project's proximity to the greenbelt could ensure the
969 success of non-vehicular transportation. Four, uh, the new developments
970 within the neighborhood will create a more walkable neighborhood once
971 constructed. And five, the seven work units proposed are to be utilized by the
972 residents of The Sonder generating less vehicular trips than what was - a
973 standard commercial space would. However, um, the number of parking
974 spaces proposed could not be considered sufficient to serve the project
975 because one, the mixed-use proposal will generate additional vehicular trips to
976 the project located - location, and the project does not supply enough onsite
977 parking for its residents, guests, or customers. Two, there are many large-scale
978 developments in the surrounding neighborhood that will also be utilizing the
979 on-street parking, um, thus on-street parking will become more and more
980 difficult to find. Um, three, there is not a public transit line or stop within
981 close proximity to the project. And four, the existing uses surrounding the
982 project do not promote a walkable neighborhood. And lastly, um, I would like
983 to clarify how staff did analyze the application, um, because the application is
984 not proposing to use the Live-Create-Work overlay, um, staff analyzed it as a
985 mixed-use multi-family development. Um, the seven work units on the
986 courtyard level were analyzed in such a way that they would be considered
987 commercial despite them being utilized as the residents themselves. Um, more
988 so in -in the nature of the Live-Work-Create overlay, having it be small
989 businesses, um, not something large scale in nature, but something more than
990 just a home occupancy would be occupying those spaces. Um, so that - that is
991 why the - the parking was calculated as it was. Um, the findings within the
992 decision document are stated as they were, as well as the rest of the - the staff
993 comments, um, were made the way they were. And with that, I stand for
994 questions.

995
996 Q: Um, thank you. Any questions for Ms. Veal?

997
998 Q3: One - one quick question, Hanna, what was the crux of not using the overlay?
999

1000 Q1: Um, so it - it's my understanding that it was based off of height restrictions,
1001 um, and there...

1002
1003 Q3: Yeah. Okay.

1004

1005 Q1: ...were a few other factors involved, but primarily height.
1006

1007 Q3: Yep. Thanks for the reminder.
1008

1009 Q2: No questions for me.
1010

1011 Q: Um, I - I do just have a question to make sure that we have a complete record.
1012 Um, Ms. Veal, do you recall a, um, meeting with the applicant prior to, um,
1013 the formal application process and discussing code that may be applied and
1014 would that extend to, uh, how the city has addressed parking?
1015

1016 Q1: Uh, yes. I do recall having a due diligence or a pre-app or both with the
1017 applicant prior to the formal hearing process.
1018

1019 Q: Thank you. All right. Any other questions? All right. Um, seeing none, we'll
1020 start the public hearing and I have a number of, um, people that are signed up
1021 to testify if you haven't signed up to testify and wish to testify on this matter,
1022 please do so. Um, and the first person I'll call is (Kate), um, (Falkinstein).
1023

1024 A4: Okay. Are - should I go ahead? Okay, great. Hi, I'm (Kate Falkinstein). Uh, I
1025 own a house on 34th Street where my father-in-law lives. Uh, I'm concerned
1026 about the parking, um, as you might guess. Uh, I think this project won't stop
1027 people from owning cars. It will just take those cars and push them onto the
1028 street, uh, rather than on the development itself. Uh, you know, I think it's
1029 telling they're citing studies out of places like San Francisco, which is so
1030 much denser than this neighborhood. I - I can't imagine people living in this
1031 neighborhood and not needing a car getting by with 1/15 of one shared
1032 vehicle. Um, in order to do things like go to school or buy groceries, you need
1033 a car in this neighborhood. And so I think people will move into this and - and
1034 they will have cars. Um, I think the - it's noteworthy that the parking
1035 requirements are pretty lax in the first place, assuming things like one-
1036 bedroom apartments, only having one car, which in many cases might not be
1037 true. And only two cars, even for apartments as big as three bedrooms. So
1038 these are fairly lax requirements. And even despite that they're missing it by
1039 almost 50%. The main argument that they've raised is that they think there's
1040 enough street parking in the neighborhood based on having gone around and
1041 counted the number of cars on the streets right now within a four-block radius,
1042 which is pretty wide, I would say, to get to your primary residence. But
1043 putting that aside, my main concern about that is that there's so much
1044 development happening in this neighborhood right now, uh, that the number
1045 of cars parked on the street during active construction isn't representative of
1046 what the neighborhood will be like and the parking will be in the future. I

1047 think the point of zoning regulations is to keep the area healthy in the long
1048 term, not just to count the cars that are parked right now. Uh, if we allow
1049 every development to point to an availability of street parking right now, then
1050 in the long run that street parking will be taken up, but it'll be too late to solve
1051 a problem because there'll be no additional parking in these large
1052 developments, um, but no more parking available on the streets. I think the
1053 purpose of the street parking is for the people who don't live in the buildings,
1054 things like people who wanna attend the coffee shop. Um, if you've ever been
1055 to the area like Push and Pour is two blocks away and has tons of people
1056 parking on the streets. So if they're thinking their commercial development
1057 might be something like a coffee shop, that's what the street parking is for. It's
1058 for people going to the farmer's market. It's for people going to the greenbelt.
1059 It's for guests visiting, um, beyond the number of people who live in the
1060 building when they have like a party or - or all the things that happen in
1061 normal life. So I think it's important that the people who live in the building
1062 can park in the building and that leaves the street parking for all those sorts of
1063 like overflow situations. Um, and I think we need to act now to preserve
1064 equitable access to that street parking for future developments, not just allow
1065 one lot to take up all the street parking because they've pointed out that it
1066 happens to be available right now. Um, the only other thing I'd like to add is
1067 this idea that the offices are going to be used by residents. Uh, I read their
1068 application and I thought it was telling in their letter, they specifically say
1069 they're not directly connecting each workspace with a specific unit to quote
1070 create more flexibility. Well, flexibility for what, presumably for people who
1071 don't live in those residences to use those offices. If they're actually certain
1072 that the residents would be the people using the office, if they could commit to
1073 that, but the fact that they won't is telling, and I think means it's likely that at
1074 least some of those offices would drive people into the neighborhood to use
1075 the offices without living there, which in turn requires parking. At the end of
1076 the day, I think we need to preserve access to street parking for everyone and
1077 not allow them to take all of it. I'm in favor of development, but responsibly
1078 with necessary parking. Thanks.

1079
1080 Q: Thank you. Um, any questions for Ms. (Falkinstein)?

1081
1082 A4: Oh. (Unintelligible).

1083
1084 Q: Here - it - It doesn't look like they have any, thank you. Um, (Keri Workus)?

1085
1086 Woman: (Unintelligible).

1087
1088 Q: Okay. Thank you. Um, Karl Wirkus?

1089

1090 A5:

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to, uh, address this issue. My name is Karl Wirkus. I live at 3608 North Prospect Way in the Waterfront District in Garden City. I also, uh, own the property at - myself and my wife own the property at, uh, 30 s- or 206 East 35th, which is the next door property - adjoining property. Um, my wife and I came to, uh, the Waterfront District at the beginning. We've been down here for a while. Um, the Waterfront District is kind of the launch of this concept of the - of the density concept in Garden City. We have, uh, work-live, uh, arrangements. It's - uh, and - frankly, it's a - it's a nice place. It's - it's gone quite well. Um, I, um, very much appreciate the applicants', uh, efforts in this way. Uh, I - uh, it's an interesting situation that they chose this site specifically because they could build a very tall structure here. I bought the place at 206 East 35th so that I can move to one level when I get too feeble to climb the three stories at my house. So my bucolic country home will now be a neighbor of a - um, it's not the sky - uh, not a skyscraper, it's a - a tall building. Um, so it just fundamentally changes the nature of the neighborhood and I understand that's coming. I understand that that's planning. And just to note that when, uh, value is added in one aspect, we lose. Um, we no longer have our - our village home. We're now in a high-density area. I understand that's a - that's a process outside of this, but I don't get involved unless I'm personally - un- unless you push me into it, so here I am. Um, I'm not gonna talk about deck chairs. I don't care about the parking for today. Um, I do want to mention that it just - uh, I've run this by some friends, uh, who are developers. Everybody that I've shown it to has said the same thing. It's just too damn big. It's kinda like pornography. You know it when you see it, you don't know - and I don't know what the right size is. The concept is right. We - we lived in a no-car building. Ooh, I don't want to go over my time. So keep me - uh, we lived in a no- in a no-car place for two years. But I got to tell you, transit that could take you anywhere was less than a hundred steps away from the building. As a senior, a hundred steps is too far. And - and that's a lot farther than any transit is in Garden City. So it's an issue for Garden City. Two - two more issues are issues for Garden City, but need to be considered. One, I'm gonna put just on the record - constructability. I don't see how you could do this on this site. I - I've worked in construction. You can do it. It's expensive. Um, and I guess one point that I really want to make today and is completely outside of what anybody's talking about, but the staff report says floodplain not compliant. Um, this development - my houses are in a floodplain. Garden City hasn't adopted, for whatever reason. But if anybody watches the news and saw what happened to Red Lodge, Montana, this year, um, that flood was not out of the ordinary that much. And even if you don't believe climate change, there's still that chance. Um, getting that density of people out of the way of a flood when

1131 it occurs is going to be - it'll be a mess and somebody's gonna be responsible
1132 for it. Likely, I'll be gone by then. Thanks for your time. Any questions?

1133

1134 Q1: Thank you, um, Mr. Wirkus. Any questions? No? Great. Thank you very
1135 much. Um, next we have Louis Landry.

1136

1137 A6: Uh, thank you. Uh, Louis Landry, 211 East 33rd Street. I live, uh, two streets
1138 over, uh, and, uh, built, uh, down there 13 years ago and, uh, you - you know,
1139 the neighborhood is changing. Some people think it's changed absolutely
1140 going in the better direction. I had no problems when there were a lot of folks
1141 living in, uh, mobile homes, trailers, uh, when there was, uh, (Pods Heating
1142 and Cooling), later to become Treasure Valley Granite down the street. That -
1143 that part of the neighborhood, uh, I found fine. So now it's - it's a different
1144 change, the issue of density. Uh, so I want to just hit at one thing and - you
1145 know, in terms of this dialogue about design review, uh, I was back in the
1146 early days when we'd sit around a table and talk. Those days are long gone.
1147 This is, uh, very much more approaching a legal process. And when it goes
1148 from here, if it's appealed or whatever to City Council for review, we're really
1149 in a legal process. And on some of these, we've been to the Supreme Court
1150 and had rulings as we heard a little bit about today. So the applicant
1151 mentioned that there's no height restrictions, no density requirements, no
1152 objective parking requirements in some of the city code here. So right now,
1153 there's - I think it's a six-story building. How many?

1154

1155 Man: Five.

1156

1157 A6: Five - five, uh, stories. Uh, could they withdraw it and put up eight, ten,
1158 around the river - 18, 16? I mean, there are no restrictions for that lot size.
1159 Could it be accommodated? Karl's pointed - is it even buildable? But at this
1160 point, I look at that lot size and I think the massiveness, this is somewhat
1161 staggering. Now, maybe I have to get my eyes used to it, but I've heard issues
1162 of this design review committee arguing over this kind of facade or that kind
1163 of facade a- and massing here or there, and that seems like picayune compared
1164 to setting up something like this and saying, the - the sky is the limit in
1165 Garden City. Or are there any limits in Garden City? Now, I was here at a
1166 number of meetings around the Strawberry Glen subdivision right next door
1167 (unintelligible), and the issue was for the neighbors what the impact is of
1168 going up next to the neighbors, and there were extensive discussions about
1169 that. Whether or not any of that learning that went on comes to play here, it's
1170 as if we have a drop of memory. We don't remember what we've done before,
1171 and there seems to be no applicability to what goes forward. So I'm very
1172 confused, because when I look at some of the staff review and it talks about

1173 the setbacks, I - I can hardly grasp what you're saying. Uh, I have a couple sp-
1174 so that's a bigger view, and I must say in the 13 years I've been coming to
1175 design review - I can't tell if it's my advancing age or long COVID, but they're
1176 making less sense to me. So that may be my problem, but today the parking
1177 issue is just like, I don't get it. I hope at some point we could take and write up
1178 for some of us, and then we can go get, uh, "Parking for Dummies in Garden
1179 City." I have no idea where we're having parking in Garden City. No idea. So
1180 I've got a copy of a notice to "Dear Property Owner" dated August the 12th,
1181 and one of the things it says here, official notice of intent to approve or deny
1182 the application. And then it goes on, "The boundaries of the applicant's
1183 proposal must be notified of the city's intent to imp- to - intent to approve."
1184 And the wording sounds strange to me. Is an intent to review - or is your
1185 intent to im- approve these? Is that - that was put in bold. So it's just - maybe
1186 that's a wording issue. But when you receive these, it felt like this is a done
1187 deal. But maybe that's just a - a poor interpretation on my part. I just bring that
1188 up for your consideration. In some specifics then, without, uh, going into too
1189 much detail, but when we look at site coverage, uh, they add up to 108%. So
1190 that might be just some rounding errors, but we ought to be a little bit clearer,
1191 uh, about 100% is all - you only say you got - you can't go to 108. But that
1192 could be rounding, or my bad math, a little bit of both. Uh, the other issues
1193 that concern me is that when we get into details, and it talks about, uh, "may
1194 not be compliant, may not be compliant," uh, "may not be compliant." I'm not
1195 gonna go through the specifics. Is this, in the words, "a seasoned application,"
1196 or why don't we know if it's either compliant or not compliant? What's the
1197 research? Is that what's supposed to happen for these meetings? Or is there
1198 some staff and applicant that has to come on? So before you present to the
1199 public, it's either compliant or not compliant, but the maybes are confusing.
1200 Um, one last thing. Um, it mentions waterways, uh, and it says - no water
1201 available from, uh, the Boise River. Uh, the issue - uh, I used to know some
1202 stuff about irrigation. I think irrigation is close by, one property away. I think
1203 it's a (unintelligible) property. So is irrigation a requirement? I know on new
1204 subdivisions under city municipal code, it is required to use surface irrigation.
1205 I'm not sure this qualifies as a subdivision. I have no idea. So, uh, maybe in
1206 wrapping up, we talk about the folks, uh, not being car-centric. Uh, and I want
1207 to applaud the applicant. The idea of having a shared vehicle, electric vehicle,
1208 innovative thinking like that - uh, a thousand percent supportive. Fantastic. I
1209 have no idea what that fully means in terms of parking, but my word, um,
1210 we're in a bind. We're in a bind. Uh, this is the summer of the 100-degree
1211 (unintelligible) for our valley. And I get very concerned about these tree
1212 requirements and how we're gonna have shaded streets so that you can get
1213 from that house to (unintelligible) expectation, and not drop in the process
1214 with the heat. And I'm not sure that I feel comfortable that the city is being

1215 really, really good about these landscaping requirements and making sure that
1216 you have the affordable water to get those trees. I had a 2.5 inch caliper tree
1217 requirement when I applied for my house that's out front. Now I'm very
1218 fortunate that I have had, uh, irrigation water, and I put on five hours of water
1219 on a weekend, on a Saturday, for that tree. That tree is now from a 2.5 to
1220 about a 12-to-13 inch across diameter and it's two stories tall, and when the
1221 cars - they're the final requirement - they park underneath the tree. People stop
1222 underneath the tree. In the rest of the community, we don't have that kind of
1223 stuff and I'm hoping that when we look at an application like this, that we
1224 have the responsibility, 'cause that tree won't - it took 13 years to get - or let's
1225 see - it's getting shady (unintelligible). That's what we have a responsibility to
1226 plan for. I'm not sure that some of our work here - so - that was rambling. I
1227 appreciate your patience. Thank you.
1228

1229 Q1: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Landry? All right, is there anybody else in
1230 person that wishes to testify on this matter? Seeing none, I'll - I'll go to Zoom,
1231 if you wouldn't mind using the raise-your-hand feature if you wish to testify.
1232 Um, Belinda Isley.
1233

1234 A7: Hi, my name's Belinda Isley. Can you hear me okay?
1235

1236 Q1: We can, thank you.
1237

1238 A7: Okay. Um, I own and live in the building directly across the street from this
1239 proposed project. And I believe that, um, Hanna has a graphic, um, that sort of
1240 shows the - um, the size and scale of this building. Um, your design review
1241 application specifically asks how the project will advance in urban form
1242 through its relationship to the street and adjacent buildings. And, um, the
1243 proposed buildings - as you can see, my duplex that is across the street is
1244 shown on the right. The proposed building is shown on the left. This is to
1245 scale. My duplex is 24 feet tall. This building, I believe, is 72 feet tall. Um,
1246 you can clearly see that, um, in comparison to - to, uh, my duplex -- which is
1247 one of the taller buildings actually, within a couple block radius -- that, um, it
1248 doesn't. Um, it doesn't. Uh, it's not congruent at all in relationship with
1249 adjacent buildings. And I understand that urban forms are fluid and - and they
1250 adapt with every new building, but in my opinion, the size, scale and mass of
1251 this project - it just doesn't advance the urban form to say - say very little
1252 about the - the non-existing landscaping in front of this building. It's just a
1253 giant building. UM, I know that people have talked a lot about the off-street
1254 parking and it being not compliant with code. So I don't want to be repetitious,
1255 but I would like to point out that the developer, um, by not providing adequate
1256 parking -- and I believe it is not adequate parking at all -- they're creating a

1257 hardship for the residents in this building and for the entire neighborhood. I
1258 mean, our street parking, uh, regardless of how - how they count it, our street
1259 parking's at maximum level from 32nd to 36th Street. All those streets dead-
1260 end into the river. And, um, so it's not a fluid way you drive in, you have to
1261 turn around and drive back out. Um, it's heavily used for river access, to say
1262 nothing about pushin' poor - that street is - is - is constantly - there's no
1263 parking on that street. And when the - the developer mentioned that maybe
1264 their little, um, commercial space would be a coffee shop, I just kinda freaked
1265 out because that's going to bring so many cars that you can't even believe it.
1266 Um, and I think if the developer thinks that - you know, their argument that
1267 those art spaces, those studio spaces are going to be rented by, um, residents
1268 in their building - you know, no one can foresee the future and they can't
1269 guarantee that. So if those are - are - remain open, they are going to absolutely
1270 offer them and rent them to people that do not live in the building, which will
1271 bring more cars into the area. And if they - if they want us to think that - oh,
1272 artists are gonna ride scooters and bicycles to their art spaces - well, let me tell
1273 you -- um, with 100% confidence -- because I am an artist -- that the supplies
1274 that I haul around and the art pieces that I finish would not fit on a scooter or a
1275 bicycle. I need a car. And I absolutely love the idea of their car share, but
1276 none of us are ready to get rid of our cars right now, especially artists. And,
1277 um, I just don't think that we can base a decision as important as this on
1278 hoping that everyone's gonna trade in their car for a bike or a scooter, um, and
1279 embrace car share. I mean, what are those people gonna do after they don't
1280 rent in that building anymore? If they rent in that building, are they gonna
1281 immediately sell their car? No, I don't think they are. When I constructed my
1282 duplex, I was required by code to be compliant with the off-street parking and
1283 with all the parking requirements. And I recently completed two pre-op
1284 meetings for a - for a home that I want to construct on the back of my lot.
1285 And, uh, the city made it very clear that I was to supply the correct number of
1286 parking spots as per the code. So, um, I feel that if this design was modified to
1287 comply, um, with the parking, that, um, it would follow that the - that the size
1288 and scale and mass would be much more congruent, um, with the
1289 neighborhood - which includes already, as someone else already, um,
1290 mentioned, um, several already approved projects in the neighborhood, none
1291 of which are this size or scale or height. And, um, you know, developers may
1292 not like the code. Um, I sometimes don't like the code, because it limits - it
1293 limits their bottom line. But at the end of the day, the code was created to - to
1294 protect, um, the integrity of our neighborhoods, and to foster responsible
1295 growth. And, um, I do not think that this project in any way, shape or form,
1296 um, does that at all. Um, I would ask that you require this project to be code-
1297 compliant. Thank you.
1298

1299 Q1: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Isley? All right. Is there anybody else who
1300 wishes to provide testimony on Zoom? All right. Uh, seein' none - oh, Jason -
1301 Mr. Jones.
1302

1303 A8: Uh, Hey, I figured I might as well speak since everybody else did. Um, so I
1304 just wanna - I mean, I really just wanna get into the code piece of this, since I
1305 think the parking stuff is still comin' up and I think there's some confusion.
1306 Um, can I share my screen? Let me see here. Can I share content here? Let's
1307 see. So, uh, if I can do this. Can everybody see what I'm sharing'? Can y'all
1308 see that?
1309

1310 Q1: No.
1311

1312 Man: No. Did you hit the screen share down at the bottom?
1313

1314 A8: I did. Yeah, let me try again, share screen, dark broadcast. All right.
1315

1316 Man: (Unintelligible).
1317

1318 A8: Can you see me now? Okay. So I wanna just make sure it's clear that this
1319 project is a mixed-use project and that there are very specific standards for
1320 those mixed-use projects for parking. So there's two sections of code for
1321 parking in - in Garden City's code. There's residential uses only, and then
1322 there's non-residential and mixed uses. And I think if you look at the section
1323 of code, this is obviously a mixed-use project. I don't think anybody in here
1324 has denied that it's a mixed-use project. And so the real reality is, if you - if
1325 you look at it, basically says, hey, the parking is going to be determined by the
1326 planning official based on a whole bunch of things here. And, uh, you know,
1327 like I said, there's a list, but there clearly is no objective standard to that
1328 parking. It doesn't say, hey, you're gonna have one parking space for every
1329 300 square feet or 1500 square feet. It also doesn't say each residential is
1330 gonna have to have one half of a guest parking space or two. And I wanna
1331 make sure that it's also real clear to the design review that this already went to
1332 court. And a judge said that the city can't enforce this after-the-fact
1333 determination. And I - I think it probably - in my mind, since it looks like this
1334 is gonna go to City Council, I think it's probably a good point that maybe the
1335 city would include that document as part of this, um, hearing so that it would
1336 be on the record. So that City Council people could actually see that a judge
1337 basically said they cannot delegate someone else to determine what the
1338 standards are on a development by development basis, and that there has to be
1339 a clear standard if you want to enforce parking code. And right now this as a
1340 mixed-use project - literally the parking code is on a case-by-case basis, and

1341 there is no specific parking code for mixed use. And I think it really is
1342 important to kinda make sure that we're clear that you're not looking at this
1343 residential code because this actually qualifies as part B. And I think, like I
1344 said, having said that, you know, I know there's obviously a lot of tension over
1345 where the parking is gonna be and whether it's going to be on the street. But I
1346 think the - the bigger picture here is that part of the reason the city had this
1347 mixed use separately is to encourage mixed-use projects where parking could
1348 be waived when people can just walk to where they work. And I know there's
1349 some argument about whether people will live and work on that site, but I
1350 think it - it's, um, irrelevant anyway, because if we have more workspaces in
1351 this neighborhood, it benefits everybody in the neighborhood. There's more
1352 possibilities for you to actually live and work in this neighborhood, even if it's
1353 not at the same site. And that's the reason for those reductions in parking. And
1354 that - that's always been the purpose of it. And like I said, I think if - if this
1355 design review thinks they can deny this based on parking, it's gonna get
1356 overturned in court if the City Council agrees with you. And so it makes no
1357 sense to me to, like, keep pushing something that's already been decided. And
1358 like I said, there seems to be some confusion with what should apply, but I
1359 wanna make sure it's clear - none of the parking stuff that's in the staff report
1360 applies here. They - the - the staff - at - by code has a right to determine it. But
1361 I do believe that that right to determine it has now been ruled illegal by a
1362 judge. And so if the staff thinks that they can decide it and enforce it, I think
1363 that's the part that's gonna be, uh, problematic here goin' forward. And so I
1364 just wanna kind of point that out, 'cause like I said, I don't want you guys to
1365 get into a situation where you're basically gettin' sued again for the exact same
1366 thing you got sued again before. And I think that, like I said, it doesn't make
1367 sense to try to - like I said, pretend like this project doesn't meet the parking
1368 code 'cause there is no parking code for mixed-use projects. It's determined on
1369 a case-by-case basis, um, by the planning official based on some criteria here,
1370 but that has been ruled illegal. And so it can't be enforced. So I just wanna put
1371 that on the record, um, just to make sure we're all on the same page, goin'
1372 forward.

1373

1374 Q: Any questions for Mr. Jones? Any other, uh, individuals wishing to provide
1375 testimony? All right. I will...

1376

1377 Q3: Belin- Belinda has her hand up again, but I know she already spoke so it's...

1378

1379 A7: No, I have a question for Jason.

1380

1381 Q: Um, could you please do that off- offline, um, in that, uh, you've - you've
1382 already provided your testimony. So has Mr. Jones. Um, and with that I can
1383 per- I can, uh, turn this over to the applicant for any rebuttal.
1384

1385 A3: Uh, Cathy Sewell, no platform. Um, first just wanna address, um, Ma.
1386 (Falkenstien)'s, um, comments. So to - to be clear, the - the project - um,
1387 Garden City code for residential, um, requires, um, one bedrooms - or one-
1388 bedroom units, one parking stall. Anything over two bedrooms, two parking
1389 stalls. Our project provides, um, 17 parking spaces. 15 of those are - we have
1390 15 residential units. So each unit has one parking stall, so everybody can bring
1391 their car to the site. Um, and we use this criteria - um, and initially planning
1392 the project because we knew parking was an issue. We knew that we were a
1393 small site. You know, part of what the comp plan encourages for the live-
1394 work area is small - maintain the small-lot development side, the existing
1395 small lots, and discourages larger-type development. So with that said, trying
1396 to provide parking, um, for - um, in a zone and in a - for the (unintelligible)
1397 that wants to have urban character and provide density and provide the types
1398 of uses that will, um, build that city vision for the site. You know, our - our
1399 goal was, okay, how can we park the site, maximize the parking on the site.
1400 But with this project, it was very important for Brie and Matthew to have
1401 some kind of pedestrian commercial presence on the ground floor to interact
1402 with the neighborhood, to serve the neighborhood, because as more people
1403 move into the neighborhood, there needs to be more services, um, uh, for
1404 those neighbors and - and the residents. Right now, there's a lot of residential
1405 use around there. So with any kind of mixed-use density project, multi-story,
1406 we have to deal with parking, 20-foot wide, you know, entry into the parking
1407 garage. We have to deal with stairs and, um, setbacks - you know, Garden
1408 City has five-foot setbacks, right? 10 foot, uh, landscape setbacks for, um,
1409 when you're adjacent to different uses. So as we start to see our - you know, a
1410 hundred foot of lineal footage, um, shrink because of things we have to
1411 accommodate, um, it's suddenly being very clear that our priorities were, how
1412 much can we park this? And what else can we provide that's left over? And
1413 we - we knew that we had to provide - and I know this is getting a little bit,
1414 um, involved, but this is really that - I just want to express that we worked
1415 long and hard to solve how to park the site, how to create the density for the
1416 site that - that is fit and is sufficient. Um, solid waste is a big issue. We
1417 worked with public storage 'cause we had to create some kind of internal trash
1418 room so they could access the site, and to do so, push that use to the front. So
1419 what - what was left was everything in the rear of the lot. And what we found
1420 after several re- reiterations is that we could park 17 vehicles on the site and it
1421 was absolutely for sure that one of those had to be an electric vehicle car share
1422 for the facility. And we knew we had to provide an ADA-accessible install,

1423 which left 15 - 15 spaces. We knew, okay, 15 spaces. We can only make this -
1424 this project with 15 residential units, because we wanted to make sure
1425 everybody could bring a car to the site. So that left the car share. We
1426 researched car share throughout the country. And we found that Denver,
1427 which has a whole bunch of different zoning districts, but their car share ratio
1428 is for every car share, they can reduce the parking (unintelligible) by five. So
1429 that helped us, um, I guess at least use a baseline for what we could do for our
1430 project. So we knew that we could do ten - ten cars, uh, one car park each and
1431 that left five additional - which left over five two-bedroom units. So with that
1432 said, we thought, okay, we have this, um, residential parking solved. Now, as
1433 we discussed, um, in our letter and throughout that, the other parts of the
1434 project, the live-work component, which is a mixed-use component, as well as
1435 this, uh, small, um, commercial park, also a - a part of the mixed-use
1436 component that there is no specific criteria for us to use to figure out what the
1437 requirement is. We did review the section and - and understood that the
1438 planning official, um, would determine what that is based on certain criteria.
1439 So we did our homework and try and figure out, okay, what really are we
1440 trying to do? And how can we, um, provide information -- within our
1441 application, within our design -- that will provide, you know, assistance to
1442 come up with that number? And so, as Ms. Veal mentioned, we - we are in the
1443 (unintelligible) overlay, but we're unable to, you know, fully comply with all
1444 the provisions primarily because of building height and, um, um, lot coverage.
1445 But within that code section, it does specifically state - it does mention
1446 parking. There is a parking section within that, that does get into any - um, all
1447 the live spaces need to have one parking stall, but any workspaces under 500
1448 square feet do not require a parking stall. So we thought, well, this is at least
1449 some criteria that we can use to design our - our work units. And so each of
1450 these units is well under 500 square feet and Brie and Matt, you know, their -
1451 their intention was never to, um, create large work units because as you
1452 mentioned - um, and I believe, um, this was - uh, Ms. Falkenstien also
1453 mentioned this in her - her comments about the, the flexibility that we
1454 mentioned with how we or- organized our - our work units, is that we wanted
1455 - big part of our project was to create a courtyard space for the - you know, the
1456 - the studio walks and real collaborative space for the artists. And to do so, we
1457 created this courtyard up above, basically because we had no ground area to
1458 do anything, um, because we're trying to - to provide the - the on-street or off-
1459 street parking. Um, but around that then became the idea of - of organizing all
1460 of these working units around this courtyard, to where during those Friday
1461 strolls, people could walk up and see an artist work out in that courtyard
1462 space, very active space. Each workspace has also an - uh, a exterior deck area
1463 where they can, you know, take something' out, spray it, whatever. Um, but
1464 the intent is that these work units are together with each other and working

1465 together with one another and are separate from the - the live units. I mean, I -
1466 I think the idea of - of incorporating the work unit into a live unit up on the
1467 third floor - for us just meant that's more people comin' goin', or just - it didn't
1468 create the kind of vibe that Brie and I were looking for. Um, so back to
1469 parking real quick -- um, apologize -- um, so the other parts of the project that
1470 we - we had to try and solve were the - the - the guest parking. We understood
1471 that, you know, there are people to come see the - the residents in the, um - uh
1472 - that live in the building. But we did review what, uh, Garden City did have
1473 for the residential guest parking requirement. And basically for every two
1474 units, you have to have one guest parking stall. We thought this seemed
1475 excessive, based on the urban character and where we were. And so we
1476 looked through the neighbor, Boise, um, to see what their parking standards
1477 were. And for multi-family developments, it's one parking stall per ten door
1478 units. So we came up with - two seems appropriate for the 15 that we're
1479 providing. Um, and, you know, went with the work units at under 500 square
1480 feet, no parking required for those based on what we could find in Garden
1481 City code. The commercial part, the 600 square foot on the ground floor - we
1482 thought that is small enough. Um, it's meant to support, you know, either a
1483 worker who might live in the neighborhood - might live upstairs - um, but that
1484 - there's, um, just - we thought there was minimal amount of parking that
1485 would be required for that. With that said, there are two - two, um, uh, street
1486 parking spaces in front of our - our space. We did the parking study and
1487 understand that, um, that the existing developments or lack of in the area -
1488 there is available street parking, though it's not really defined because there's
1489 not a good sidewalk curve - better system yet put in place. Um, our project
1490 will, you know, start that process along this - this block, but there is also the -
1491 the public parking lot around the corner. Um, and in reviewing the - the comp
1492 plan and - and how Garden City's, you know, encouraging people to come to
1493 the area, come down to the green belt, come to the water park, all of which are
1494 not supported by people who actually live there right now, but they're, you
1495 know, up on the Boise bench or wherever. So there's mention of satellite
1496 parking, um, lots that may come online at some point. And so I think our
1497 thought is that is - the deve- the area continues to grow. There's likely going to
1498 be some public parking area in place. Um, but till then, we think that the
1499 parking lot around the corner, uh, the existing street parking can, um, satisfy
1500 the two guest parking stalls that were, um, propo- the two guest units we're
1501 proposing and, you know, the minimal, maybe two for the, um, im- the - the
1502 small commercial space, which, um, you know, Ms, um, (Falkenstien) did
1503 mention in her comments that that's the place for those folks - on the street,
1504 um, in the parking lots, that's where guests and visitors typically park. Um, so
1505 - and then just - quickly, I guess, try to - um, in terms of Mr. Wirkus's, uh,
1506 comments, um, the size of the project in height - correct. There is no height

1507 limit, um, in the C2 district. And yes, this is a tall building, um, with its - in -
1508 you know, when you look at its surrounding existing properties. Anticipate at
1509 some point in time, um, those will get redeveloped, um, but they also might
1510 not. But this situation occurs, um, in other cities - um, you know, for example,
1511 um, you know, Bar Gernika in downtown Boise, small single-story building -
1512 next to it are fairly large structures. Um, so I - I - I don't know what we can
1513 say about that other than it's - um, if the - it's gonna change and, you know,
1514 right next door, um, I think to Ms. Isley's place is the sole subdivision, which I
1515 believe has four-plus stories associated with that and a much larger, um,
1516 development in terms of scale and mass, um, which - that kind of addresses
1517 some of Mr. Landry's comments. Um, so I - I think just to, um, sort of
1518 reiterate the - the parking point, we - we did our best, void of any real specific
1519 criteria that Garden City could provide us in terms of, um, pro- pro- pro-
1520 providing, um, parking for our mixed-use components of the - of the project.
1521 Um, so I think that might be it.
1522

1523 Q: Thank you.

1524

1525 Man: Very nice.

1526

1527 A3: Unless...

1528

1529 A4: Oh, yeah, sorry. Yeah. Um, I actually just wanted to say thanks to the
1530 neighbors, um, for sharing your comments, and it's really inspiring to be part
1531 of, like, an engaged community. So truly, even though there are like clearly
1532 ways that we don't see eye to eye on the way that we proposed this or that
1533 we're planning the projects, like, we get it and we appreciate it. And, um,
1534 we're gonna live here. And so we're not tryin' to be jerks with any of this. So
1535 thank you. Um, I also just, um, wanna - wanna say that, um, you know, for
1536 some of the comments that refer to like, you know, normal life is having
1537 several cars, or I think - I think it was Ms. Isley that said, you know, none of
1538 us are ready to get rid of our cars, and there's this dependence. And we don't
1539 have enough places to walk to. Um, we're - we're not asking or expecting
1540 anybody to give up their cars and we're not asking or expecting anybody who
1541 needs or wants more than one car for each unit to live in the building. And we
1542 do walk around the Garden City by foot now. We walk to Roots, we walk to
1543 the different bars and restaurants. We walk to visit neighbors, we walk to visit
1544 artists, and we did do a lot of conversation and consultation, primarily with
1545 artists to think about this space and to think about what they would want and
1546 what would make their lives better. And one of the things that kept coming
1547 back was that they would love to get rid of their car as long as -- to Ms. Isley's
1548 point -- there was at - a vehicle that could help them when they needed to go

1549 to shows, when they needed to go present at galleries. And so we - we
1550 addressed that issue. Um, and so I just wanna say, we hear you. And, um, also,
1551 uh, I guess, say that there is another perspective and we're not looking to
1552 change other people's minds, but believe that there are 15 people to rent 15
1553 units who have a shared mindset, um, about reducing car use.
1554

1555 Q: Uh, do you have any more?

1556
1557 A8: Uh, yeah, I guess the only other thing I would like to add is that the - you
1558 know, our - this is our first project in Garden City. Um, I did work on a - a
1559 project about a mile away along State Street, but in Boise City limits. Slightly
1560 smaller lot also. It was rezoned to have an unlimit- unlimited height. It's a - it's
1561 105 units with 32 parking spaces. Um, and it's gonna be great. It's gonna be
1562 much needed and it's gonna be buildable and it's gonna fill up with people that
1563 need and want that kind of opportunity in the valley. Um, that would be - that
1564 would feel to us like the wrong scale, even though it would fit within the
1565 Garden City code. We made decisions about this. We understood that there
1566 would be neighbors that could think - would potentially be building taller
1567 buildings than ours because there is no height limit. Casino Beach has a six-
1568 story building two blocks away. We'll see how the neighborhood unfolds, um,
1569 but we worked to scale this to a size that works for the community we're
1570 trying, uh, to be a part of. So.
1571

1572 A4: I - I think just lastly, like, it's a - it's been evolving, right? Like, especially
1573 with working into, you know, uh, comments (unintelligible), but, um, that it's
1574 been an evolving process working with the city, which has been great, um, to
1575 learn and explore and then really the - the - uh, you know, um, application you
1576 presented the project (unintelligible) today is what we did after spending it
1577 (unintelligible) it's kind of, um, the city. So just, yeah, thank you both and for
1578 listening. Um, and thank you (unintelligible).
1579

1580 Q: Uh, thank you. Any questions for the applicant team? Thank you. You're
1581 good, thank you. All righty, all righty, um, I'll open this up, uh, for discussion.
1582 And - and, uh, while the committee members are getting there, I just do want
1583 to point out, uh, how the city has, uh, reviewed mixed-use applications. Um,
1584 there's nothing to preclude, uh, reviewing other, uh, pro- pro- the - the land
1585 uses by mixed-use. And so, um, the number one criteria is to review the
1586 specific uses on property. And so staff has historically, um, reviewed that as
1587 meaning to review the residential component under the residential standards.
1588 And then there is the commercial standard as well. Um, and so there is, uh,
1589 precedent for that being utilized in that manner.
1590

- 1591 Q2: Yeah, I'll - I'll go first and kinda start the discussion on - on that piece of it.
1592 Yeah, I think that the precedents and the - the amount of projects - mixed-use
1593 projects that we've reviewed in the past, and with this same criteria and had -
1594 um, there have been, uh, small deficiencies mitigated with alternative, um, uh,
1595 transportation incentives and, you know, in- increased, uh, bicycle parking
1596 and some other creative ideas to offset, uh, the shortfall in parking. For me,
1597 there's kind of a - I guess, a threshold there that it - it seemed - you know,
1598 seemed reasonable, um, as an offset, when we looked at each of those specific
1599 conditions with - with the, uh, mitigation measures. But, I guess - I guess on
1600 this, it feels to me that it - it is, uh, significantly deficient. And, looking at the
1601 - the fact of the - the number, how much deficient it is - I guess, in - in my
1602 view, I tend to kind- to look at it and say, "Well, okay, is it - is it too much for
1603 this - the size of this piece of property?" Because of the significant deficiency
1604 in parking. Uh, if it didn't have the - uh, the commercial, um, spaces up there
1605 on the second floor, which would reduce it by that amount. And then looking
1606 at maybe, okay, does it - it's suffi- it's deficient just in a - the residential by -
1607 by a smaller amount, even if it's 1 per unit or something. Okay. Well, maybe.
1608 But just looking at how we've reviewed mixed use in the past and - I - I guess
1609 I don't feel comfortable sayin' that this meets the intent of the code and how
1610 these projects have always been looked at. Uh, that - that's just on the parking
1611 thing, and I think, Derek, we can have some discussion on that. Love to get
1612 your point of view on that. I still - beyond that, um. the - uh, it doesn't appear
1613 that really much was done with the residential connection to the street that I,
1614 uh, indicated was an issue that I had on the, uh, pre-app, and I still have that
1615 same issue now. It does not have - the primary use is the residential function. I
1616 - I guess I don't feel that that requirement is met by - by just the statement that
1617 - that folks are gonna be coming in through the coffee shop or the - the
1618 commercial space there and - and that commercial space lends the identity as
1619 an entry point for the residents of the building. I - I just don't feel that it - it - it
1620 meets that, um, um, requirement in the code, which is the 84B-4 section, so
1621 those are - those are the two - I guess the two main issues that - that need
1622 discussion. And so, I - I guess I'll turn it over to you, Derek, if you got some
1623 comments.
1624
- 1625 Q3: Yep. And then - and then the third thing would be height. We can loop back
1626 around on height as well. Um, but - but parking first. Um, there - there's
1627 mixed-use, there's residential, there's commercial. And I would - I'm looking
1628 at this like, what's it most like? If we're talking about precedence, what's its -
1629 what's it most like? And it's most like live, work, create, Park 33 where there
1630 was small commercial, where under 500 square feet equaled zero parking. So
1631 I'm looking that in my mind, like, what's this most like? But then I come back
1632 to - well, it doesn't matter what I feel like or what Brett feels like, or what the

1633 neighbors feel like, it's what's code and how does code interpret it? And so
1634 then we're given this - this - you know, we have precedents of this project and
1635 precedents of that project, and precedents of this project, but ultimately we
1636 have recent precedents that - says, this code doesn't apply and it's up to the
1637 planning director, which is, you know, not really a legal way to make parking.
1638 So we're - we're left with this kind of - who's going to litigate this to determine
1639 how much parking there should be? Right? And so that's a - that's a confusing
1640 proposition to be in when we're - when we're asking about how much parking
1641 this - this project should have. Um, and then so the - when we take pieces and
1642 parts of the code and read, you know, the part about alternatives to parking,
1643 that's what - that's what encourages me, I think, is - alternatives to parking
1644 standards are encouraged in the code. And then here we have a project that is
1645 proposing an that alternative no one has proposed before. And then I look at it
1646 in the big picture of, you know, society and I say, "What if this works? What
1647 if this is a development that has a shared car that's part of the development" -
1648 not just a zip car that you see on the street in Portland and you can walk three
1649 blocks to get one. This is a car that lives in this development. And what if that
1650 works? And what if the intention of this, you know, development is to attract
1651 people that don't want a car and don't want to pay a premium for an apartment
1652 because it has a bunch of excess parking, and, you know, then - then it works?
1653 So if - if I take a part of code that says alternatives are encouraged, and then I
1654 look at this alternative that hasn't been proposed before, I want to use that
1655 alternative to say, yeah, it should have less parking than is required. So to me,
1656 I can take all of those - you know, I can take a piece of the 500 square foot or
1657 less, doesn't require parking, and I can take a piece that says alternative is
1658 encouraged, and I can take a piece that says every residential unit already has
1659 a car, h- already has a parking spot for it, and I can say, "Yes, this is parked
1660 sufficiently." And that's kind of - I'm - I'm leaning more in that direction than
1661 saying, "Oh, this needs 18 more parking spots," or 22 more parking spots or
1662 how many ever that is. So that's - that's kind of where I'm coming from with
1663 parking. And as far as the entries are concerned, um, there was a few things I
1664 think I read in the staff report, and I can see in some of the renderings that
1665 there is, uh, signage on the side of those residential sides now. And it - you
1666 know, it does look like there was elements that were added to open those up
1667 and encourage that. And then we go to, what's the primary use? Is the primary
1668 use residential? Or I think there was a suggestion in the - in the applicant's
1669 presentation that said, by volume of people, the primary use is gonna be the
1670 commercial space on the main level, therefore, the - the commercial entry is
1671 the primary entry. So there's some - I think there's some confusion there. The
1672 primary use by volume of square footage is residential, but the primary use by
1673 foot traffic is the commercial unit on the main. So I'm not - I'm not sure how
1674 to determine that. And maybe - maybe there's more effort made to accentuate

1675 the residential entry and that - and that satisfies it. But, um, I'm kinda - I don't
1676 - I don't know what the best solution from that is, because I had yet to
1677 determine it as, like, primary being traffic versus primary being, you know,
1678 vol- volume of square footage. And - and height considerations - unlimited, to
1679 me, means unlimited. And yes, this building looks taller than the duplex
1680 across the street, but it's, you know, as tall as it needs to be to satisfy this - this
1681 development. Could it be 50 feet taller? It could be, according to current code.
1682 So if - if there's an effort to change code or, you know, have a - have a lower
1683 density in this neighborhood, then that's the effort that needs to be made. It
1684 can't be made on a project-by-project basis. So as far as - as far as height's
1685 concerned, it's a - you know, it's a non- non-starter, non-argument because it's
1686 allowed per code. And, uh, you know, we c- we can't make an arbitrary
1687 determination that 100 feet is okay and 110 is not. So that's - that's my
1688 thoughts on heights. And then maybe we look back to parking and maybe staff
1689 has some additional comments on that.
1690

1691 Q2: Yeah, I'm in agreement on the height. I don't - i- it's - there is no limit. So, um
1692 - uh, the parking - I - I can - I can understand where - where you're going with
1693 that, and, you know, looking at - at the live-work and, uh, that - kinda
1694 comparing it to that, with the under 500 square foot. I - I get that. And I could
1695 probably get on board with that. However, just the - the residential component
1696 and the lack of, uh, vehicles for - for those units, I - I think it's just too much. I
1697 mean...

1698

1699 Q3: It's...

1700

1701 Q2: ...we do ha- we do have a, um, adopted code standard for residential parking
1702 that's - that's specific. If it didn't have that little commercial component there,
1703 this is what it would be.

1704

1705 Q3: Right.

1706

1707 Q2: You know...

1708

1709 Q3: And - and there...

1710

1711 Q2: We've allowed an offset, but what is that? Is it a...

1712

1713 Q3: Right. Right.

1714

1715 Q2: ...50% offset? No. Is it...

1716

1717 Q3: Right.
1718
1719 Q2: I mean, what is that threshold? And I - I - I just feel, what is the - uh, the
1720 difference here from what the code, uh, requires compared to what is
1721 provided? So - required 28, provided 17, deficient by 11.
1722
1723 Q3: Yeah, that's...
1724
1725 Q2: And...
1726
1727 Q3: ...guest and - guest and one...
1728
1729 Q2: That's right.
1730
1731 Q3: ...commercial or something.
1732
1733 Q2: And I - And I...
1734
1735 Q3: Right.
1736
1737 Q2: ...still think even in a - in - in an urban setting, you're still gonna have guest
1738 parking needs.
1739
1740 Q3: Right. So that - so that deficiency in my mind is made up for all of these, uh,
1741 alternatives that have been provided, which is, you know, the on-site car, in
1742 essence - something no one's ever proposed before. So we don't have like,
1743 hey, this guy did it down on Adams Street and it worked and there's actually
1744 empty parking spots. Like, we don't have that. But I think if alternatives are
1745 encouraged in the code, then this is a great one to see what works. And - and
1746 there is no number in the code that says, if you have an electric car that any
1747 guests can use at any time, it equals 10 parking spots. That doesn't - you
1748 know, that's where we get into the - per planning director, which is - you
1749 know, which also doesn't work according to the Supreme Court.
1750
1751 Q2: And - and that - the part about the - the court's decision and the lack of
1752 specificity in - in the code, you know, in - in my mind, almost makes me feel
1753 like, okay, we should just continue this indefinitely until, um, that code
1754 section is - is more specific to deal with this type of a- application rather than -
1755 rather than taking the position that because there was, uh, litigation on another
1756 project, that that means that it's - it's whatever any applicant wants to decide
1757 for their parking if it's a mixed-use, whether they want to have no parking or
1758 they want to have, uh, one stall per 20 units or - I - I - I guess I - I just have a

1759 hard time not - not basing, um, a re- a review or an approval on - on some
1760 methodology that is - it - it has either that we - we utilized because we felt that
1761 that is what the interpretation of the code was...
1762

1763 Q3: Right.

1764

1765 Q2: I - I guess I'm - I'm a little...

1766

1767 Q3: Yeah, and I think I've s- you know, I've stated the methodologies that I would
1768 use to get there. Regardless of, you know, court cases and precedences and
1769 what we should be looking at and what we shouldn't be looking at. But - so I -
1770 I - I'm using those things and I think the biggest one is, they've proposed an
1771 alternative, they've proposed a number of alternatives, and they've proposed a
1772 new alternative, which - we don't have a X equals X number of parking spots.
1773 And to me, it feels - and again, who cares what I feel, what I feel is not code,
1774 but to me, it works. And my recommendation would be that the parking is - is
1775 sufficient given - given the testimony, given the - the documents that we have
1776 in the - in the record, et cetera.
1777

1778 Q2: I guess I'm - I'm not prepared to make a motion because I can't - I can't get
1779 behind the - the reduced number of - of - of parking or what's - what's bein'
1780 proposed here. And, um, I guess I could - I - I would need to see a - a better,
1781 more direct - um, um, entry focal element that - that provides an identity for
1782 that resident- the residential component on the street before I feel that it meets
1783 the code's intent with - with that section.
1784

1785 Q3: And I know - I know where you're comin' from on that and I - I'm not, uh -
1786 you know, I can - I can get behind that request and - and, uh, I think it would
1787 be a stronger project with that. Um, so that may be something that, um, we
1788 continue that, and - and then they come back to us with that - with that
1789 modification. And maybe there's some way to - you know, staff can jump in.
1790 Maybe there's some way to continue that, that - this is, you know - that's what
1791 we're looking for in the - in the next hearing and it's not a - we don't need to
1792 hear the entire presentation from the applicant or from staff again and...
1793

1794 Q: Mm-hm, um, there's a lot going on here. Um, there certainly could be a
1795 request that - uh, for a continuance on a specific, uh, component. In the past,
1796 we've done that, um, based on agreement and the other components by the
1797 committee. Um, we're in an interesting situation where we don't have a
1798 tiebreaker with the committee, uh, at this time having two committing
1799 members and staff as an ex officio, non- non-voting member. And so, uh, it
1800 may be an interesting situation where there's an impasse between the

1801 committee members, from what I'm hearing on discussion. In that case,
1802 because there wouldn't be a tie-breaker or a majority vote, it would go, uh, to
1803 Council.
1804

1805 Q3: So you're not a tiebreaker in this case?
1806

1807 Q: I'm not, no.
1808

1809 Q3: Okay. Were you ever? Well, I guess there would've never been a tie if we had
1810 three.
1811

1812 Q: Uh, I cannot remember a situation where I would've weighed in, but I - I know
1813 that it's definitely - definitely been cleaned up that staff is ex officio.
1814

1815 Q3: Okay. And Brett, your thoughts on - in - in some instances where there's been
1816 an element that got cleaned up by the applicant, staff would review it. Is this
1817 entry element something that you would wanna see, or is that something that
1818 you could articulate some direction to the applicant and then they could, uh -
1819 they could...
1820

1821 Q2: No, I - I feel it's - it's something that needs to be...
1822

1823 Q3: Okay.
1824

1825 Q2: It needs to be seen.
1826

1827 Q3: Okay.
1828

1829 Q2: Uh, by us. I mean the commercial component has got an identity. It's a
1830 storefront on - on the street.
1831

1832 Q3: Yeah.
1833

1834 Q2: And if - depending on what that use is, what that commercial use is - it's a
1835 coffee shop or it's this or that, whatever - uh, it - it's gonna have signage as
1836 such, advertisement as such, and so on and so forth. It's not going to have the
1837 identity of the residential component of the building. Every one of these, uh,
1838 mixed-use projects that we've looked at, I've - I've always looked for that.
1839 Show me h- how that component connects with the street. And this one, I - I
1840 feel that it falls short. I feel that it - it has two secondary accesses that are - are
1841 not - and - and I'm looking at this also as in, ultimately it could develop that
1842 you've got another building that, you know, fronts the street on either side, uh,

1843 with the same type of setbacks and - and really gives you that - the - the street
1844 frontage is that front facade plane. And not that you're skirting down the side
1845 between two buildings to get into this entrance that really doesn't have an - a
1846 significant identifiable element on the street. And I think to hear...
1847
1848 Q3: I see.
1849
1850 Q2: ...to see what that - to see what that is, is - I don't think it's something that I
1851 would feel comfortable having staff review it and not seeing it. 'Cause I think
1852 it's - it's - it's gonna be a, um, integral part of the overall design somehow.
1853
1854 Q3: Yep. So we can leave them with that direction. And I don't know that - I think,
1855 logistically, our next meeting is so close that they may not have time to
1856 prepare for that, so we can...
1857
1858 Q2: But...
1859
1860 Q3: ...continue and (unintelligible)...
1861
1862 Q2: Well, I guess - I mean, are we continuing? I mean, I - I think each of us sees
1863 things a little bit different on the parking.
1864
1865 Q3: If we make a motion and it dies, then it goes to council. Do - then - then it
1866 could possibly go to council without the entry changes. Right? And we
1867 wouldn't want them to remand it back to us for entry changes if they happen to
1868 read what we said and agreed with that on the interchange. If we could do it...
1869
1870 Q2: (Unintelligible) - you know, I...
1871
1872 Q3: Mm-hm.
1873
1874 Q2: I do - I - I do understand what you're saying and whether - um, I don't know,
1875 maybe - maybe, uh, Jenah, you can weigh in. I mean, I think that it - uh, if
1876 we're - we're not able to approve it and, - and basically it just goes - goes to
1877 council with other outstanding elements that we had here, unresolved - I guess
1878 in my mind it would be likely that those elements would still need to be
1879 resolved after council. So does it make sense - and maybe it's more for, does
1880 the applicant want to get as much resolved at this point or get the big item that
1881 is the - on the table, the parking - dealt with prior to worrying about the - the
1882 other - the entry component? I...
1883

1884 Q: Um, I - I guess if we're looking to me to weigh in, I - I think the discussion
1885 has been fairly well vetted that, um, c- well, the options are, uh, council either
1886 a- approves or denies the application. Should they approve it, they may not
1887 remand for the entry. They may find it to - to be approved as is, um, to - to
1888 Derek's point, if - if it's important to have that reviewed. So there- there's no
1889 definite, I guess is what I'm saying.
1890

1891 Q3: Then, then I, I would be, be inclined to move - to continue to...
1892

1893 Q: Um...
1894

1895 Q3: ...certain - in order to - to see the, uh, compliance with that 84B-4.
1896

1897 Q: To the - the point of the proximity of the next meeting, staff might suggest
1898 that a date certain of October 3 would - would be something that may give the
1899 applicant actual time to address that, uh, component and resubmit materials.
1900

1901 Q3: Because the next hearing they would need to have materials submitted by
1902 when? Tomorrow or two days ago?
1903

1904 Q2: Yeah.
1905

1906 Q1: Uh, it would be next Monday, seven days in advance to the September 19.
1907

1908 Q: And that would give no - and that - if the committee's comfortable without
1909 staff review, because that wouldn't give the staff any time to review it.
1910

1911 Q3: Well, if it's just that element, that might - that might be okay on - on the fly.
1912 And I guess, so that puts the question in - in Cathy's court and she can nod her
1913 head say, yeah, that's doable or say no way, push it to the next one.
1914

1915 A3: Am I allowed to ask questions? (Unintelligible).
1916

1917 Q: Technically no, uh, but I think if it's - it may help perhaps the - the committee
1918 make their decision. If that's...
1919

1920 Man: If I could just...
1921

1922 Q: They - they won't be able to hear you unless you're at a microphone.
1923

1924 Man: Hi, sorry. Um, appreciate the grace on the moment. Just for clarification, just
1925 so that we don't unnecessarily add time and, uh, expense there. Uh, Derek was

1926 referring to the choice between the foot traffic versus the square footage as the
1927 - what defines the main entry and the code defines main entry as users. So the
1928 - the commercial space would have more users in a day and in general than
1929 the residential space.
1930

1931 Q1: Yeah. And just to - to - to clarify, um, the staff's report, you know, identified
1932 this as a multifamily, uh, residential project and that that section referred to
1933 entry, um, for that type of structure or use, this is a mixed-use project that has
1934 commercial use. It has residential use. It has access up to a courtyard for the
1935 live workspace. So we - we - we can't, um, apply a multifamily project - and
1936 staff mentioned, um, the Trailwinds in their report for parking situation.
1937 Trailwinds to me over a (unintelligible) is a multifamily project, mass parking
1938 lot, lots of units, lots of building that needs a center, um, primary entry point,
1939 even though there's probably several around there for exiting - that to me is a
1940 multifamily, um, project. This is a mixed-use that has primary entry for the
1941 commercial space. The residents do not go through the commercial space to
1942 get to, um, their lobby and, uh, access their units. That has been mentioned in
1943 staff report. That's incorrect. The residents have their own primary entry -
1944 their own private entry, 'cause this is not a public, um, uh, type use where we
1945 want people coming up, um, you know, anytime during the day. So I - I - I
1946 guess we can go back and revisit it, but we think that there's been some, um,
1947 um, incorrect, um, categorization of this project as a multifamily. It is - it is
1948 mixed-use, you know, 100%. Um...
1949

1950 Q2: It is a mixed-use project. It has a multifamily component, as well as a
1951 commercial component. And I f- I feel that the - that my interpretation of the
1952 code is that those components need to have a connection to the street. And so I
1953 - I - I just feel that it doesn't - uh, it doesn't comply.
1954

1955 Q3: And so then back to the question, do we continue to the 19th or do we
1956 continue to the - what's the next one, the third - October 3? And I'll suggest -
1957 I'll suggest, or I think Brett, you m- may already have made a motion to
1958 continue to, uh...
1959

1960 Q2: Date certain of...
1961

1962 Q3: ...the date certain of - the next one.
1963

1964 Q2: The 19th?
1965

1966 Q3: 19th. So I'll say...
1967

1968 Q2: Then if there's not significant time...
1969
1970 Q3: Yeah.
1971
1972 Q2: They can...
1973
1974 Q3: Then they can just push it out.
1975
1976 Q2: (Unintelligible). Yeah. Continue it again.
1977
1978 Q3: Yeah.
1979
1980 Q: And - uh, I hear that's a motion and - is that a motion and a second?
1981
1982 Q2: Yep.
1983
1984 Q3: Yes.
1985
1986 Q: Okay. All in favor?
1987
1988 Q2: Aye.
1989
1990 Q3: Aye.
1991
1992 Q: All right. Thank you. Um, I did notice that those that testified - uh, several -
1993 many were lacking, uh, email. Uh, what we can do is keep the - this particular
1994 application updated, should there be any changes right on - on the application
1995 link on our website. Um, thank you. And with that, we will move on to design
1996 review fiscal year 2022, number 15. Um, Jorre Delgado is requesting a new
1997 multi-family construction project located - located at 3941 North Reed Street.
1998
1999 Woman: Yeah. I'm just (unintelligible).
2000
2001 Woman: That's fine.
2002
2003 A10: Hello. My name is Jorre Delgado. I'm here to present for the Arabella Lofts.
2004 I'm - I just - for the sake of time, I'm just gonna make this as quick as possible.
2005 Uh, I'm just gonna note a couple of the things that we have changed from the
2006 pre-app. Um, as you can see, we moved that front parking space back to the
2007 backside of the building. Um, we also put some stamped concrete in front of
2008 the garages that goes towards the entrances of each building to make more of
2009 a pathway to each one. Um, we also created larger decks to meet that private

2010 open space for each of the units. And then we've also added some private
2011 garden area for some of the units. Um, also it was noted in there, um, about
2012 the fences. It's hard for us to kind of determine the fences right now, as the
2013 property next to us, Violets Crossing is currently being developed. So we're
2014 not really sure what we're going to do down the middle of that. We think that
2015 landscaping is gonna be the best, but we also need to figure out a way to make
2016 sure that those two landscape plans really mesh well. Um, I believe both
2017 landscape plans right now, show plants in that area. So we might need to look
2018 at those landscape plans and make sure that they actually mesh well together.
2019 Um, waterways and irrigation. There's no irrigation ditches within the
2020 property. Um, Violets Crossing is gonna be connecting to city water. So our
2021 property is also going to be connecting to city water. Um, our mitigation
2022 report was missing in the submittals. Uh, we're in the process of that. The
2023 arborist that we have working on that is pretty backed up right now, but we do
2024 intend to get that in before any other meeting. Um, and then waste and
2025 recycle. That was a topic of discussion during the pre-app. Uh, we plan to
2026 bring all of the recycling and trash out to Reed Street, which after looking at
2027 the Violets, uh, entitlements, it looks like they also got approved to bring them
2028 out to Reed Street. So we failed to keep that block cohesive and easy for
2029 Republic Services. It's just the best way is to pull it all out to Reed Street so
2030 that they don't have to go into the development. And then - just so, um, we can
2031 touch on the windows. I know that it was talked about that they're looking
2032 directly into the back of Violets Crossing as well. Uh, as Violets Crossing is
2033 being developed and moving into the construction phases, they have also
2034 looked at some of their windows as we have too. And it does not look like
2035 their window plan lines up with ours. I'm more than happy to pull up those
2036 windows with that architect as well. I don't have their updated window plan,
2037 but I do know that it was looked at and that the windows do not look into each
2038 other. Some of them probably look a little bit, but none of them are fully
2039 directing each other. And our landscape plan, we updated that as well. We
2040 were deficient two trees, which we have added to the front of the
2041 development. And this just shows our stamped concrete path in front of the
2042 garages to each of the entrances to the buildings, with awnings over the front.
2043 I don't think that our first, uh, elevations showed awnings over it. So we do
2044 have awnings over each of the entrances to show that they're direct entrances
2045 into the units and into the stairs that go up to the one-bedroom units. Um, it
2046 was also noted that our private garden beds may not be sufficient to, um, make
2047 up for the lack of private open space that we have on three of our units. But I
2048 did walk a couple subdivisions and I was able to find that private open
2049 gardens are - or private gardens with unit numbers on them are utilized by
2050 people. So I just figured it was a good way to show this and that we were able
2051 to only need them for three of the units and not all eight of them. Uh, and this

2052 is just our floor plans that were already submitted. Uh, these actually show our
2053 enlarged decks in these front areas to make - uh, to make that 80 square feet of
2054 private open space. Um, it was also noted that the square footages were not
2055 included in the plans. Um, I do believe that they were included on the floor
2056 plan pages, but I have included them in here just as a reference, if you wanted
2057 to look back at them. And then as far as the elevations for material, none of
2058 that has changed from the pre-app. I'm not sure that there was any comments
2059 on things that you guys didn't like, except for the garage doors. You guys had
2060 noted that you wanted to see something that wasn't as flat and plain. So they
2061 feel that a garage door with maybe some windows or some type of texture
2062 would be sufficient in that. And with that, I will let Hanna give us the staff
2063 eport.
2064

2065 Q: Uh, thank you. Uh, before you go away, Ms. Delgado, any questions for the
2066 applicant?
2067

2068 Woman: All right.
2069

2070 Q: Thank you. Ms. Veal?
2071

2072 Q1: Good afternoon. Um, I will just go through the staff report item by item, as
2073 highlighted in the analysis. Um, as far as the fence goes or the fence
2074 conversation goes, uh, it is - it is conditioned in the decision document to
2075 require code compliant fencing, um, upon placement or construction of that
2076 fencing. Um, so the - the lack of fencing at this point is time is not too much
2077 of a concern. Um, it just was noted in the landscape plans that there was
2078 fencing. Um, and then that there wasn't fencing - there's existing fencing so
2079 that - there was a little room for, um, confusion, but it is conditioned in there.
2080 So during the construction plan review, um, and final inspection of the actual
2081 subdivision we will as staff go over the fencing, um, making sure it's
2082 compliant. Um, Garden City Code 84B4, uh, speaks to the facades, um, the
2083 orientation of the structures, the windows, et cetera. Um, staff has noted that -
2084 or - yeah staff has noted that the front facade of that building closest to Reed
2085 Street has changed based off of the pre-application conversations, um, but it
2086 may not appear to address the street and the public realm as much as the
2087 committee, um, would like for it to address that public street just based off of
2088 previous conversations with other applications. Um, so (Steph) has
2089 highlighted that section to indicate that further discussion should be had
2090 regarding that front facade facing Reed Street. Um, additionally 8-4C-4B, um,
2091 speaks to the pedestrian connection of the site, um, especially in relation to the
2092 overall accessibility of the site. It does appear through Jorre's, um, renderings
2093 here that she's shown today that there is some kind of, um, color - contrasting

2094 color, uh, on the common drive but it wasn't clearly indicated on the site plans
2095 and, um, even with what was - is shown today it doesn't look like there is a
2096 clear concise pathway especially across the intersection within the
2097 development itself. Um, so conversation regarding pathway and connectivity
2098 should be had with the committee, um, noting code as far as code or what
2099 code says for connectivity. Um, every primary entrance of each dwelling unit
2100 is required to have a clear, um, a - a clear pathway to the public sidewalk that
2101 is provided on Reed Street. 8-4D-5 speaks to parking code standards. Um, the
2102 development does adequately park for itself. Um, that's including residential
2103 dwelling unit parking requirements as well as guest parking requirements.
2104 However, I have highlighted that section of code because it does, um, the
2105 development does provide carport parking and code is pretty specific about
2106 having enclosed parking so, um, really why it's highlighted is because, um,
2107 staff was unsure if the enclosed parking should be considered the garage or if
2108 a carport can consider, uh, itself as enclosed parking space. So that needs to be
2109 a determination. I believe it is drafted in the decision document that the
2110 carports can act as, um, the enclosed parking. Um, as far as sidewalk
2111 standards go along Reed Street, a five-foot wide detached sidewalk is required
2112 for code standards with the - with the standard six or eight foot wide
2113 landscape buffer. Um, this is in compliance with ACHD's sidewalk code
2114 requirements as well, um, and the difference between six and eight feet is, uh,
2115 the - the street trees and if those, uh, buffers have a root barrier or not. Um, in
2116 the landscape plans it didn't appear that there were any street trees proposed
2117 within that buffer area. Um, the landscape plans seemed a little preliminary in
2118 nature regard- regardless. Um, so it has been conditioned to where the three
2119 required street trees are to be within that buffer landscape area, um, or at least
2120 within the frontage with having two of those street trees in that landscape
2121 buffer. I know, uh, the lot is pretty narrow and we're working with clear vision
2122 triangles and, um, so that can be hashed out today, um, and then a little bit
2123 further into the construction plans review, uh, if this is approved. And then
2124 lastly common open space and private open space. So I - I did note that, um,
2125 the su- the square footage for each unit, um, the - is - is noted on the floor plan
2126 so I was able to calculate that based off of the square footage's provided and
2127 what the multifamily, um, I don't know - tier system works out to be is that the
2128 total common open space requirement is 1,900 square feet, um, and that's
2129 purely just based off of how many units are provided at what square footage.
2130 Um, the staff report goes into further discussion of that. In looking at the site
2131 plans and the landscape plans it isn't extremely apparent that the common
2132 open space is adequate enough. Um, there wasn't a separate site plan showing
2133 compliance with the common open space standards. Um, there are specific
2134 requirements of common open space s- su- such as, like, dimensional
2135 standards. Um, so we definitely want to get, um, the - the measurements of

2136 what the applicant thinks is considered common open space before, um, this
2137 application is approved because again, um, without adequate common open
2138 space and if this application is approved, um, it will be required to come back
2139 for re-review to allow for adequate common open space to meet those
2140 standards. And with that I stand for question.
2141

2142 Q: Any questions for Ms. Veal? All right. I see none. Is there anybody that
2143 wishes to provide testimony on this matter? Um, I'm not seeing anybody with
2144 their hand raised. If I'm missing you, um, please speak up. All right. Um, then
2145 I'll turn it back over to the applicant for rebuttal.
2146

2147 A10: Just to comment on a couple of those points from the staff report, um, on the
2148 front facade of the building facing Reed Street I don't have the new rendering
2149 of it but we did - we do intend to add the name of the subdivision in some type
2150 of artwork on the front of that building so that it's not as plain so that's why
2151 there's only one awning over that staircase because in that blank space above
2152 it we intend to put the subdivision name. We just don't know what type of
2153 material that subdivision name sign is gonna be made out of but we do intend
2154 to put it there. Um, the pathway we do intend to make that out of a different,
2155 um, a different color, a different material, maybe a stamped concrete -
2156 something that will show that it's different from where the cars are driving. It
2157 is going into garages and then there is concrete pads that go directly into the
2158 unit so we feel that kind of just a stamped concrete path or a path of some
2159 other material will be sufficient through that. And we don't feel that a lot of
2160 people are going to actually be walking through the subdivision with the green
2161 belt so close. If they're gonna be going on walks or bike rides or something
2162 they're gonna be going over to the green belt and riding over there rather than
2163 up and down or through the subdivision. Um, the carport spaces we are
2164 willing to put garages on those and make them the one car garages but we just
2165 feel that that carport look changes up the buildings just a little bit and it's a
2166 little bit more aesthetically pleasing to see the two buildings be different
2167 instead of just garages on every single one of them. Um, and then as far as the
2168 frontage for the landscaping I do believe that the frontage that we have
2169 presented on our landscape plan matches the landscape plan that was
2170 approved for Violets Crossing. After looking at that I'll have to double-check
2171 but I'm pretty sure that they line up, um, unless we're looking at an older
2172 version of Violets Crossing but I believe that it does line up with what was
2173 approved for them. And that's what we were basing it on since they are going
2174 to be so close. We just didn't wanna have different widths of items. And then
2175 the street trees, uh, we did add some trees. We'll have to double-check on the
2176 classes and make sure that they still are within code but again it's the vision
2177 triangle so we don't wanna put a tree in there that's too large that's gonna

2178 block that. That's gonna end up growing and blocking that vision triangle so
2179 we would need you guys to permit us to do that or later on in the process let
2180 ACHD, um, weigh in on that and permit us to do that as we build that drive
2181 approach and that's all.
2182

2183 Q: Thank you. Any questions?
2184

2185 Q2: Uh, yeah I - I do have question. Um, does the, uh, doesn't appear that the
2186 current landscape plan, uh, shows that connectivity access to from the street,
2187 the sidewalk, to all of the units. Is that correct or has there been something - is
2188 there something more?
2189

2190 A10: Let me - so the newest landscape plan that I have in this - are you able to see
2191 my screen?
2192

2193 Q: No.
2194

2195 Q2: No but yeah if you could show that.
2196

2197 A10: So it doesn't show it. Um, I can also resubmit a colored landscape plan just so
2198 that it's more apparent but with this landscape plan that front i- that landscape
2199 in the frontage will continue on into that stamped concrete so there will be
2200 more of a rounded curb on that end. So the landscaping will kind of stop there
2201 and then we'll move into that stamped concrete and then the entrance or the
2202 gara- the carport and then the entrance to those units if that's what you're
2203 referring to.
2204

2205 Q2: Yeah I'm just tryin' to understand what, uh, how you see that working with a r-
2206 a raised stoop there into each of the units and - so you're traversing down there
2207 stepping up, stepping down, stepping up, stepping down, stepping up,
2208 stepping down as you make your way down to those units? I mean, is that the
2209 - the concept for, uh, direct connectivity?
2210

2211 A10: Essentially it is just because we are separating those garages. I know that it's
2212 not ideal but we are trying to meet that requirement that every entrance have
2213 their own clear entrance. So we do like to have those steps there and it does
2214 provide pri- or more of a divide between whose garage is whose, uh, so that
2215 was kind of the thought behind that. But I'd be more than happy to take away
2216 that step but I feel like the step kind of breaks it up a little bit and I don't know
2217 that anybody would be walking directly down that but if so I don't think it
2218 would be too much of an issue.
2219

- 2220 Q2: Well yeah I guess it's - it's either you've - you have a very distinct pedestrian
2221 spine that connects all those units or, uh, it's intended that people walk down
2222 the drive aisle - the asphalt to get to those, I mean, I - I - and which is what we
2223 don't want. Um, I'm - I guess I'm just trying to get a feel of whether there's,
2224 uh, uh, it's - it is a, um, identifiable pedestrian linkage that people would -
2225 would use. I mean, I...
- 2226
- 2227 Q3: And - and maybe that, um, you know, textured - that different textured brick -
2228 permeable paper whatever it is that's making that path maybe that's even
2229 proud of the - it's drivable, right? But maybe that's proud of the stairs...
- 2230
- 2231 Q1: Mm-hm.
- 2232
- 2233 Q3: ...so we've constrained vehicle traffic at the expense of pedestrian traffic even
2234 though when fire needs access they can drive on that - they can drive on that
2235 pedestrian path.
- 2236
- 2237 Q2: Yeah ma- I mean, maybe that is. It's - it's all built up there and it's - it's kind of
2238 a, um, uh, you say a drivable curb to get into the garages or - or something of
2239 that nature. Just it...
- 2240
- 2241 Q3: Yep.
- 2242
- 2243 Q2: It seems a little, um, it - it seems a little odd that - okay. It looks like it could,
2244 uh, pedestrian connection but it doesn't feel like one because I'm stepping up
2245 and stepping down and stepping up and - and i- it - it just - to me it feels like,
2246 "Okay. We're doin' it because we need to have it but we know nobody's gonna
2247 use it."
- 2248
- 2249 Q3: Yeah. I like that...
- 2250
- 2251 Q2: And...
- 2252
- 2253 Q3: ...that - I like the stairs that give you the sense of entry. I do like that but then
2254 we need the spine inside of those stairs.
- 2255
- 2256 Q2: And I think you could have a rolled curb there getting into the - to the garages
2257 or s- or something of that nature and just be able to...
- 2258
- 2259 Q3: Right.
- 2260

2261 Q2: ...keep that up and really feels like - and then it transitions at the, um, um, at
2262 that - at center - center access point. Yeah it transitions down to street level
2263 and then there's that, you know, it's - it's, uh, uh, stamp concrete or whatever
2264 across that element and then up back in front of the units it's - it's all raised up.
2265 Something of that nature just to really strengthen that. I think it's - it's
2266 important enough.
2267

2268 A10: So if - if we did a rolled curve across the front of all of them would that be
2269 acceptable? 'Cause we're open to doing that. We just hadn't - we were just
2270 trying to think of some other types of materials but we are open to putting that
2271 rolled curve in here to where you're still able to nicely pull into your driveway
2272 but it's also a divide and has - has more...
2273

2274 Q2: I...

2275

2276 A10: Uh...

2277

2278 Q2: I think that that - I would be looking for something like that to - to strengthen
2279 that - that connectivity.
2280

2281 A10: Okay. We can definitely add that.
2282

2283 Q2: And then I - I...

2284

2285 Q3: Mm-hm.
2286

2287 Q2: I guess I really would like to see. You don't have anything that shows that
2288 street front facade?
2289

2290 A10: Um, I don't. I can see. Can I share my iPad?
2291

2292 Q: Mm-hm.
2293

2294 Q1: Uh, if you connect to Zoom from the iPad.
2295

2296 A10: So I have it on hand and I tried to add it on there (unintelligible).
2297

2298 Q1: Is it just a PDF?
2299

2300 A10: Yeah. I just shared it with you. Did it come up? (Unintelligible). Okay. So
2301 stop sharing on that. And then this is the front facade facing Reed Street and
2302 that's where we intend to somehow put the name up there. We're just not sure

2303 what type of material we wanna put it on but we do wanna display the name
2304 of the subdivision there.

2305

2306 Q2: Yes. See I - I really don't think that that - that really addresses the - the street.
2307 It's, uh, the lack of fenestrations in there, I mean, it just - it...
2308

2309 Q3: I think what I struggle with - I'm - I'm agreeing with you Brett but what I
2310 struggle with is that what does interact with the street is kind of, like,
2311 circulation space. It's not the eyeballs on the street that we talk about that, you
2312 know, code speaks to how it interacts and engages and you're kind of
2313 connected at the street, you're connected to the public and it's almo- you
2314 know, it's, like, this is the fire escape in essence, right? It's just the circulation
2315 from garage to main living. It's a door and then you're immediately goin' down
2316 the stairs. It's not a - it's not a living space in essence.
2317

2318 A10: Would it be...
2319

2320 Q2: Yeah.
2321

2322 A10: ...efficient or helpful if we add in more windows to this portion and make it
2323 more of an open stairwell?
2324

2325 Q2: I think it - it definitely needs - it - it needs some more attention. Um, it still
2326 feels like a side elevation with a entry door.
2327

2328 Q3: Yup I agree. And - and while we're on this slide too just to reiterate this rolled
2329 curb and pathway in - a- are we talking about the pathway being internal into
2330 the drive from this curb that is next to this landscaping? So from the curb next
2331 to the landscaping that's at the very bottom of the screen four feet or five feet
2332 into the drive is the rolled curb...
2333

2334 Q2: No. It...
2335

2336 Q3: ...and that continues up a path?
2337

2338 Q2: No it looks like it would be from that - from where that curb is over to the
2339 building face would be the pa- the pathway and then that would traverse in
2340 front of the drive so that - that basically the rolled curve would be where that
2341 curb is in front of the - the units.
2342

2343 A10: That's correct.
2344

2345 Q3: So the - the two cars are sort of in the pathway at this point a little bit?
2346

2347 Q2: Yeah. I don't think they're pulled all the way in the garage.
2348

2349 Q3: Yeah. Yup. But just as...
2350

2351 A10: Yeah.
2352

2353 Q3: As - as a determination yeah. So that pathway would continue through part of
2354 this landscape bed to the sidewalk in a straight line?
2355

2356 A10: That's correct.
2357

2358 Q3: Thanks. And then maybe this is easier to look at on the landscape plan but we
2359 can also see a hint of it here too about the - the guest parking that's in an
2360 important terminal view. One of the landscaping plans had landscaping shown
2361 and then there was a note about artwork which is basically interrupting our
2362 line of sight in a good way to focus on the landscaping and the art rather than
2363 down this long driveway and rather than into the guest parking that's at the
2364 very end. Um, so that's important - something to address and, you know,
2365 perhaps design and - and show us in a rendering how that will - how the focus
2366 will be on that landscape slash art element rather than a direct line of sight all
2367 the way down this property to the end, which ends in guest parking.
2368

2369 Q2: Um, I - I guess the other comment that - that I - that I have is relative to the
2370 adjacent Violets Crossing. I- if they're 10 feet off as well, do they have decks
2371 out of their units too? I mean, I'm - I'm just looking at these decks and how -
2372 how close they come to the property line, approximately 2 feet or something
2373 like that to the property line and just trying to get my mind around that
2374 relationship between those outdoor decks and the neighboring building and
2375 the neighboring building has decks and I don't know, it just - it.
2376

2377 A10: From - from my knowledge, uh, Violets Crossing, not every one of their units
2378 has decks and the ones that do, they're not full decks that you can walk out on.
2379 They're more of a for-show area, that doors open up to, but you can't ac-
2380 they're not actually hanging far off of the building. They're actually not off the
2381 building at all. They're more for show.
2382

2383 Q2: Okay.
2384

2385 Q3: Like yours - like the ones on this rendering that's showing. It's kind of like a
2386 Juliet balcony.

2387
2388 A10: Yeah. Except on this - on this building, we actually expanded these some
2389 more to meet that private open space. So...
2390
2391 Q3: Okay.
2392
2393 A10: ...we added to the front and back ones on these, knowing that the back of
2394 Violets Crossing didn't have actual decks.
2395
2396 Q3: Okay.
2397
2398 A10: And that not every unit does on Violets Crossing.
2399
2400 Q3: So I think there's some things that we need to see again, this street front
2401 elevation, the pathway, the terminal view, and then some things, um, common
2402 open spaces, things that Hanna mentioned previously. So we can leave this
2403 open and continue it to a date certain.
2404
2405 A10: We can do that. Um, a- again, the - a similar conversation on the availability
2406 of, uh, staff's, um, review depending on time. Um, and so again, I might
2407 suggest the October 3 meeting, uh, to provide time for the applicant to submit
2408 and staff to review.
2409
2410 Q3: I'd move to a date s- I'd move to propose this to a date certain of, uh, October -
2411 what did you say it was 3rd? Yeah.
2412
2413 Q1: 3rd. Mm-hm.
2414
2415 Q2: I'll second.
2416
2417 Q: All in favor?
2418
2419 Q3: Aye...
2420
2421 A10: Is there...
2422
2423 Q2: Aye.
2424
2425 A10: Is there any way we could do the Sept- September 19 one? We could have
2426 these corrections to you in the next day or so.
2427
2428 Woman: There's not enough time.

2429
2430 Q1: Uh, it wouldn't give staff enough time to review the changes.
2431
2432 Q: Thank you.
2433
2434 Q1: Okay.
2435
2436 Q: Thank you.
2437
2438 A1: Thank you, guys.
2439
2440 Q: Um, all right. Is, uh, (Andrew Masood) or a representative here? Um, s- staff
2441 had wondered if that may happen, um, in not hearing from the applicant on
2442 this. Uh, I guess there are a couple of options we could continue it to - to
2443 notify them if they're not here at the next, um, meeting that it would be
2444 denied, uh, deem denied. Um, or I - I guess, um, the committee could review
2445 the materials and make a determination now. Uh, I do wanna note for the
2446 public it's under public hearings, but it's actually an appeal hearing.
2447
2448 Q3: And can we review it and make comments without the applicant here or is that
2449 ill-advised?
2450
2451 Q: Um, I - I would think that it's somewhat ill-advised because the applicant
2452 would not have the ability to rebut.
2453
2454 Q3: Okay. So we don't continue it then. We just say push it what?
2455
2456 Q: Well, this one doesn't need to be noticed. And so, uh, we could...
2457
2458 Q3: Okay.
2459
2460 Q: You could actually just not move on it and we'll, uh, make sure for the next
2461 meeting if it needs to be noticed or not.
2462
2463 Q3: Okay.
2464
2465 Q2: Agreed.
2466
2467 Q: Thank you. Um, and that...
2468
2469 Q3: And then, uh, just a quick reminder too, I have a hard stop at 6:30.
2470

2471 Q: All right. Uh, thank you for that reminder. And so those that are still in
2472 attendance, uh, please note that there's a half hour. Um, and we are done with
2473 the - the hearings for tonight. Uh, thank you. And we'll move into the pre-
2474 application and discussion items. Uh, the first item for discussion is Design
2475 Review Fiscal Year 2022, uh, Number 22. And, uh, Erstad Architects, I
2476 believe, uh, Katrina Klum, uh, specifically is requesting a new construction
2477 and multifamily project located at 2, um, 33 and 311 East 47th street. I'd like
2478 to - to invite you up to the - the microphone.
2479

2480 A11: (Unintelligible).
2481

2482 Q1: Well either way we could pull it up on the website.
2483

2484 A11: Okay.
2485

2486 Q1: It might take us a minute to load.
2487

2488 A11: We can (unintelligible) if that's easier?
2489

2490 Q1: That's probably easier.
2491

2492 A11: Okay. (Unintelligible) go any time.
2493

2494 Woman: And then I think the screen sharing with different PDFs, you might have to
2495 exit out of shared screen and then go back and.
2496

2497 Woman: Okay. (Unintelligible).
2498

2499 A11: All right. Katrina Klum with Erstad Architect, 310 North 5th Street, Boise,
2500 Idaho. We are here to present 47th Street apartments. There will be 60 rental
2501 units on this two-acre site. It's on 47th, just south of Adams Street. Um, we are
2502 hoping to fill a much-needed housing, um, problem in the area, um, with
2503 professional work units. We feel this is a compatible use based on the
2504 residential area that is surrounding it. Um, our site plan - we really focused the
2505 units very residentially. We made the front entrances, um, face courtyard
2506 space and or well landscape space on the perimeter, um, with garages on, um,
2507 uh, drive aisles as needed, um, as well as the parking in the back. We've tried
2508 to focus a lot of the amenities space central to all of the buildings that are on
2509 site. The building masses themselves, take the two units and start to push and
2510 pull that mass to really give those long elevations a lot of articulation. And
2511 these are just the overall unit plans here. Again, there's garages on the first
2512 floor, main entrance on the first floor. You'll go to the second floor, which

2513 will have your kitchen living space and your third floor will be your bedroom
2514 space. Um, as you can see in these specific unit plans, um, we will have units
2515 that meet accessibility, so they're, um, they are still a two-story unit, but they
2516 will have a lift inside to meet those requirements. Um, our elevations are
2517 gonna be a mix of materials, very common to the area and the style of the area
2518 where we'll have a masonry base, um, stucco, some of the masses that step
2519 back we'll have the cement board, and then we're providing some wood
2520 accents, um, on our balconies, as well as some of the headers for some of the
2521 windows. Um, again, you can see in this, um, diagram here, the front entries,
2522 balconies, everything we're trying to focus inward to the amenity space or the
2523 landscape space. Again, different - different building elevations. Um, so I
2524 wanted to call your attention to these couple of images up top here. Um, we've
2525 got barbecue areas, some type of, um, play court, we're still deciding what
2526 that's gonna be. Bocce ball has been mentioned, um, but we'll define that as
2527 we move forward. There will be, uh, children's play area. Again, just making
2528 the entries and the balconies really dynamic to that space. Um, the bottom
2529 image you can see is facing adjacent property, um, and so it'll be - have
2530 enough trees. It will be well landscaped, again, really providing, um, a nice
2531 visual for the entries. Um, as part of our application, um, there's an irrigation
2532 line that exists on this property edge here, um, and that is going to be
2533 landscaped as best as we can. Um, it is an irrigation line. We've worked with
2534 the irrigation district. We have the easement set that they want. They of course
2535 don't want any trees, um, and so we planted up closer to those units to provide
2536 that. Um, but, uh, you will notice that we are deficient of trees in that
2537 landscape edge for that reason. Um, it will also provide a buffer to the
2538 adjacent neighbors. There was a comment in the staff report about, uh,
2539 connectivity to the main entrances. What you're seeing here is the architect's
2540 version of sidewalks, very straight lines, very linear. Um, our landscape
2541 architect is gonna get in here and maybe do some meandering paths and direct
2542 connection to those front doors. What does that look like? I- we don't know
2543 yet, but we'll get there. Um, we'll define that as we move forward. Um, I think
2544 that's everything building related. I'm going to jump to parking, which we
2545 have heard a lot about this evening. Um, I wanna make it clear, we are parking
2546 the units per Garden City's code and we do have guest parking spaces on site.
2547 We are deficient, and we feel that based off of, um, the ULI adjacent, um,
2548 jurisdictions that we are parked guest parking wise enough to meet some of
2549 those other standards that the Garden City's standard is a little high as it
2550 relates to, um, guest parking. We did put together this map, it's also in our
2551 letter, um, where we've got sort of the walking perimeter where it says
2552 walking biking versus where you get out to more of a biking diameter. The
2553 biking is about a mile, walking is a little less than half a mile. And you can
2554 start to see we've got transit stops. We've got all sorts of adjacent

- 2555 development, uh, the greenbelt, obviously, and the river. So we really feel like
2556 there are plenty of amenities, um, within walking distance, as well as
2557 pathways and ways to get to our site for those, uh, guests, um, in order to
2558 counteract the lack of parking as it relates to, um, again, just specifically those
2559 - those guest parking spaces. Um, in the interest of time, I will leave it there,
2560 but I'm happy to answer any questions.
2561
- 2562 Q: Based on your - your comments, it sounds like you've already gone through
2563 the staff report and have asked all the questions you might have related to the
2564 staff report. Um, we'll turn it over to the committee for any specific input.
2565
- 2566 Q3: Can you click through maybe, and we can first talk about the street - street
2567 elevations of the units?
2568
- 2569 A11: So this is 47th Street right here. Um, and so again, and you are seeing the end
2570 of the units, but we did that intentionally to focus on courtyard spaces,
2571 landscape spaces. And we do feel like there's adequate park- uh, landscape
2572 adjacent to the sidewalk to really make that feel, um, not like you're walking
2573 against the end of a building, but it will be a nice - nice sidewalk up against
2574 that edge.
2575
- 2576 Q3: Yeah. That, I mean, the court...
2577
- 2578 Q2: We're gonna need the...
2579
- 2580 Q3: Yeah. The courtyard space is great. I love Bocce ball. It's gonna be super fun.
2581 I'm gonna come poach on the court, but those end units need to address the
2582 street. There's no - it doesn't -there's no, like - but if you have courtyard then
2583 you don't need to address the street. It's just - address the street. So, and I think
2584 - I think what is missed very often, maybe every time with developments like
2585 this, where there's, you know, multiple units and only one faces the street, I
2586 think that there's an opportunity to make that unit really cool and really special
2587 and not just let's stick a door on it and have an awkward way to get up to our
2588 unit and forget about the street. I think it's an opportunity to make that end
2589 unit unique. And so there's your challenge.
2590
- 2591 A11: Well, (unintelligible) good design problem.
2592
- 2593 Q: This is a very minor comment, but the renderings you have there show chain
2594 link. Uh, chain link is not allowed by code so.
2595
- 2596 A11: I noticed that.

2597
2598 Q: Um.
2599
2600 A11: I - I apologize about that. I think it's existing and we just didn't take it out, but
2601 we haven't done...
2602
2603 Q: I.
2604
2605 A11: ...fencing yet so we'll take it code compliant.
2606
2607 Q2: I - I just...
2608
2609 Q3: And then - go ahead, Brett. I'm sorry
2610
2611 Q2: I was just gonna say, I - I just have a little bit of a concern of the - the, I guess,
2612 identity of those - the - the furthest units would be -- we'll just call them the
2613 south -- the far end of the development and - and those two buildings are, of
2614 course, facing again, the adjacent property line, but they don't have the ability
2615 to have some kind of visual connectivity to the street, like the - the side units.
2616 So the - the - the middle units have this courtyard, which - which serves as a
2617 good connection, uh, to that street for those units. And then those - the - the
2618 two flanking ones on either side do have that walking path that can be really
2619 strengthened as this pedestrian spine. But boy, those - those ones in the very
2620 end there, their identity is their garages and - from internal on the site, and it -
2621 it just, I don't know, there's just something about that arrangement gives me -
2622 it just feels a little uncomfortable. It feels like that - that's significantly
2623 removed and - and maybe it would help if instead of, uh, having two guest
2624 parking spaces there, it was an extension of maybe that - that internal plaza
2625 space that crosses over - that connects those other two units so it - it really
2626 feels like it's got a stronger connection to the whole. And I know we're talking
2627 about o- we're already deficient five parking stalls, but it's - it's always
2628 interesting to get a - get a graphic like what's here in our packet that shows,
2629 okay, here's the alternative. If we were to get our parking, we just - we'd have
2630 to remove all the required common space and, you know, there - there's,
2631 there's other alternatives to gain parking besides removing required open
2632 space.
2633
2634 Q3: Yeah.
2635
2636 Q2: I - I mean, I don't - I don't think required open space removal is an option,
2637 quite frankly.
2638

- 2639 Q3: Yeah. I had a note - I had a note about the terminal views of the actual drives
2640 and what those look at, at where they terminate into these end buildings. So I
2641 think that's really important what we see as we're looking down this long, you
2642 know, drive aisle, but so - so address that, part A. And then part B is what
2643 Brett's saying is how do you address it down the - the central common area?
2644 And I really - I really like that. I think there's a great opportunity, um, as
2645 Brett's suggesting, to kind of highlight that - that kind of center there. And
2646 maybe something we've - we've touched on in previous applications is, you
2647 know, is there an opportunity that drive aisle and parking becomes multi-use?
2648 And so can that common area spine not only continue and accentuate the
2649 buildings on the end, but is there then, you know, a multi-use sports court that
2650 is part of the parking, which then, you know, engages people with - with, um,
2651 you know, slowing down cars, in essence, whatever sport that may be. I could
2652 list four, but maybe - maybe play with that.
2653
- 2654 Q2: So, yeah, I - I think those are the - those are the big ones that I - that I see.
2655
- 2656 Q3: And then I had another - I had another, sort of, big one was, um, lines. I see - I
2657 see that, you know, there's the - there's the gables that are - that are there to,
2658 kind of, break up the - the roofline. But I - I don't think they go far enough.
2659 Um, it just seems like it's a token hip that connects to the, you know, that
2660 connects to the main roofline. But, you know, give - given some distance, we
2661 still have this long, you know, entire building-long spine. Um, so I'd say
2662 accentuate those hips, drop the, you know, have a different facial line.
2663 Something to - something to give that more depth of character.
2664
- 2665 A11: We did initially play with gables on those ends and it just, kind of - it was too
2666 disjointed. But we'll go back to the drawing board on that reply.
2667
- 2668 Q3: And then, um, just to touch again on the - on the parking, which you heard a
2669 lot of dialogue about. Um, if there is a parking reduction, why is there a
2670 parking reduction, you know? What - what are you doing in this project that
2671 warrants less guest parking? Not what code are you pointing to that requires
2672 less guest parking. What are you doing specifically that requires less guest
2673 parking? I guess that's how I'd - just to reiterate that.
2674
- 2675 Q: And one point, sorry, um, Derek, I didn't mean to run over you there. Uh, one
2676 point I did notice that you're - you'd looked at transit. That line has been
2677 removed, so it's no longer there.
2678
- 2679 Q3: And on that note, Jenna, what is, like, I know this development is X units and
2680 throughout the night we've talked about many, many more units. And there's

2681 hundreds of units on 43rd and Adams. And, you know, what - what does it
2682 take to get that line back? 'Cause we're referencing it often, but is it just a
2683 trigger number of people? Is it a, you know - any insight on that?
2684

2685 Q: Um, I - I would suspect it's a number of things. I think, uh, having ridership
2686 certainly helps. Um, I think funding - as my understanding, BRT also needs
2687 the funding, uh, for the line.
2688

2689 A11: And as a known, we've got lots of bike parking, both external to the site, as
2690 well as covered bike parking, you know, all things that have been mentioned;
2691 ride-shares, scooters, um, things of that nature. The interesting comment came
2692 up earlier about, yeah, providing a dedi- dedicated car space. So all things that
2693 we can look to, um, to help really define what we're specifically doing to
2694 address parking.
2695

2696 Q3: And it wasn't just a designated car space. It was a designated car.
2697

2698 A11: Correct.
2699

2700 Q3: And that's what I - well, that's what I think made it exceptional in my mind.
2701 'Cause, yeah, we can paint zip car only on the pavement for \$30 with some
2702 yellow paint, but this was - this was, kind of, a- above and beyond.
2703

2704 Q1: And uh, piggybacking off of the parking, um, requirements and - and
2705 substituting parking spaces for bicycle and public transit buses, et ce tera. Um,
2706 there is the - the next application actually, um, is right next to this property to
2707 the west. And so the Staff Report, uh, mentions the ability for these two
2708 developments to work together to create maybe more of a larger, common,
2709 open space on - on the adjacent, like, the sharing property line. Or creating a
2710 pedestrian bicycle pathway that could extend through the entire lengths of
2711 both of these properties. Um...
2712

2713 A11: I was - so I did reach out to the property owner. But it was so close to the
2714 meeting (unintelligible) it off the desk. But I did reach out, but I just
2715 (unintelligible) forgotten, but - you know what I'm saying?
2716

2717 Woman: Oh, okay.
2718

2719 A11: So we are willing to do whatever to make certain these properties will
2720 (unintelligible). Then we will know (unintelligible) to.
2721

2722 Woman: Mm-hm.

2723
2724 Q: That's great. Um...
2725
2726 Man: We just need to do more exploration...
2727
2728 A11: Yeah.
2729
2730 Man: ...into the diagram that was sent to us. One and them didn't show we have two
2731 parcels. So it didn't accurately reflect the (unintelligible) images.
2732
2733 Q: Um, just for the benefit of the committee members. I don't know if you can
2734 hear this since a lot of the discussion is going on, um, outside of a
2735 microphone. Uh, but uh, the - this application and the next application, they're
2736 having sidebars that they are potentially willing to work together to create
2737 that, uh, connectivity. And I just wanted to note, um, that it - it is in - in align
2738 with the recent ULI, uh, recommendations too.
2739
2740 Man: Okay.
2741
2742 Q: Although I do have an attorney looking at me. It's not adopted anywhere.
2743
2744 Woman: It - it just wouldn't be a straight alignment as long as that's clear. Like, because
2745 ours is coming down to the end of the property and then over to meet...
2746
2747 Woman: Yeah (unintelligible).
2748
2749 Woman: ...the other (unintelligible).
2750
2751 Woman: (Unintelligible) the property (unintelligible).
2752
2753 Man: Okay.
2754
2755 Woman: So, I probably got myself into trouble. Sorry.
2756
2757 A9: Jeff Bower, 601 West Bannock in Boise, uh, here with the applicant team. I
2758 guess what we would say is that, um, when we come before this body, uh, for
2759 our public hearing, we will have coordinated with the, uh, applicant next door
2760 and have proposed a plan to provide pedestrian connectivity through the
2761 block. Um, we do not foresee it being a straight line, but we will have a plan.
2762
2763 Q: Thank you. All right. Any other, uh, comments?
2764

2765 Q2: I don't.
2766
2767 Q3: Nope.
2768
2769 Q2: And I guess we're probably out of time.
2770
2771 Q: We do have four minutes left. Um...
2772
2773 Q3: Yep. And I'll just say the Glass Doctor one - and I guess discussions and pre-
2774 apps, um, you know, can continue without - out me if that's the will of the
2775 other committee member. But that the Glass Doctor one, that looked fine and,
2776 you know, I don't know what deeper discussion we need on that. But if Jeff
2777 needs to get going on that one, um, you g- you guys may be able to touch on it
2778 and address any high points, and you can push that one forward. Sorry to -
2779 sorry to interject. I just wanted to get one more check - box checked before I
2780 run.
2781
2782 Q2: No, I - I'm also okay with that - with that one.
2783
2784 Q: Okay. Uh, along those lines, just very quickly on the - the number 15 as well.
2785 Uh, do the committee members feel that that needs more discussion, or would
2786 that one be okay as well?
2787
2788 Q2: Um, that was...
2789
2790 Q: It's the State Street, uh, reduction and glazing on I think three units.
2791
2792 Q3: And that was the biggest...
2793
2794 Q1: (Unintelligible).
2795
2796 Q3: The biggest thing about it, right? Was the reduction and glazing?
2797
2798 Q: Thank you. Um, Hanna just reminded me that there's also you - you - why
2799 don't you explain.
2800
2801 Q1: Yeah. So the - with the, um, the State Street town homes, they are doing
2802 facade changes that they're wishing, uh, to - to change. And then the
2803 pedestrian pathway along State Street - Jeff has provided two alternatives, um,
2804 for the committee to decide which would be the best one to move forward
2805 with. Um...
2806

2807 Q3: Okay. And that one - that one you may need to get deeper into, but, um, I
2808 knew the Glass Doctor one would be quick, and I knew Jeff didn't wanna take
2809 too much more time on the Glass Doctor.
2810
2811 Q: All right.
2812
2813 Q3: Go ahead, Jeff and I'll just disappear when I have to.
2814
2815 A: Um, com- Commissioner Hurd, I - I sincerely appreciate you - the opportunity
2816 to have a discussion. I would propose in the consideration of time and
2817 expediency, I have a range of permits that are on hold until the - just the
2818 sidewalk portion of McCarthy could be discussed. I'm fine not talking about
2819 anything else and leaving it all exactly the same. But if we can get through
2820 that tonight, uh - uh, Glass Doctor is, uh, probably a lower priority versus
2821 having to get that - at least your feedback on that.
2822
2823 Q: Can you do it in one minute?
2824
2825 A: Yeah.
2826
2827 Q3: Yeah. Can you show me the two options right now?
2828
2829 A: Okay.
2830
2831 Q3: Explain.
2832
2833 A: All right, here we go. Boom. So, um, we have this letter from (John Patton)
2834 that says we can't - absolutely cannot, uh, which was in the thing put - put any
2835 trees or shrubs or anything, uh, where...
2836
2837 Q3: Okay.
2838
2839 A: ...we want the...
2840
2841 Q3: Next slide..
2842
2843 Man: That's right.
2844
2845 Man: Yep.
2846
2847 A: So the two - the two options we have is keeping the 10 foot multimodal,
2848 shifting the trees back up against the buildings. Or we could reduce the

2849 multimodal to 6 foot, add some nice shrubs, and keep the trees in the same
2850 location. Quantity of trees didn't change. Species, we're working with Hanna.
2851 It's just - does - do either of these solutions work?
2852
2853 Q1: Yeah. How many people...
2854
2855 Q3: Is multimodal, like, a set standard at - at 10 Beach?
2856
2857 A: I think it's gonna stretch. We're tying into a 5 foot and on the other side there's
2858 no sidewalk. So...
2859
2860 Q3: So, you have 5 foot one way and zero the other. And you're proposing six with
2861 landscaping buffer, which feels to me more...
2862
2863 A: I...
2864
2865 Q3: Um...
2866
2867 A: The intent, uh...
2868
2869 Q3: Yeah.
2870
2871 A: ...to soften. Yes.
2872
2873 Q2: I would concur with that.
2874
2875 A: You got Main Street. You got 55 miles an hour, so.
2876
2877 Q: 6 foot?
2878
2879 A: I would - yep, 6 foot.
2880
2881 Q3: Yep.
2882
2883 Man: Okay, thank you.
2884
2885 Woman: Is that rural?
2886
2887 Q3: Let's do all applications like that.
2888
2889 Q: All right.
2890

2891 Q2: Speed review.

2892

2893 Q: All right. Thank...

2894

2895 A: I appreciate your time.

2896

2897 Q: ...you very much. And we'll adjourn at 6:30.

2898

2899 A: Okay. Thank you.

2900

2901 Q: Thank you.

2902

2903 Q1: 'Night guys.

2904

2905 Q: Goodnight.

2906

2907

2908

2909 This transcript has been reviewed with the audio recording submitted, and it is an accurate
2910 transcription.

2911 Signed _____