

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
45

PUBLIC HEARING
Q=Ms. (Thornborrow)
Q1=Ms. (Gresham)
Q2=Mr. (Labrie)
A=Derek Hurd
A1=Jason Jones
A2=Ms. (Veal)
A3=(Julie)
A4=(Lou Landry)
A5=(Don May)
A6=(Hannah Ball)
A7=Mr. (Wadams)

Q: The agenda moving right into public hearing, uh, DSR fiscal year 2021, number 11, uh, Jason Jones with (Wee Boise), or as we've heard, uh, Derek Hurd, uh, will be presenting, uh, is requesting a combined or requests a combined pre-application conference and formal hearing today for the approval of the live work create development proposed at 208 East 33rd Street. Um...

A: Are we (unintelligible).

Q: I'm sorry?

A: (Are we up?).

Q: Um, you are, uh, up, uhm, and I do want to do a little bit before - before I hand it over to you. Um, Mr. Hurd, um, just for the record, I'd like to note, um, that this application, um, in many ways has been seen by this committee, uh, previously. Um, and the reason that it's before you today, um, is because code does not allow for a submittal for the same use in the same form within a one-year timeframe. Um, the previous application DSR fiscal year 2020, number 25, uh, was approved by this committee and then appeal to city council and city council found that that application was the same form for the same use as DSR fiscal year 2019, number four, and therefore was not right for review at that time. Um, this application now is back in front of the committee because that one-year timeframe has elapsed. Um, I'm sure that the applicant and, uh, the staff can give uh more details. Uh, but in looking

46 through the documents and including the application in the staff report, it re- it
47 appears that there are some very minor changes, uh, including relocation and
48 addition of bike parking. Uh, the container doors have been replaced with
49 wood doors, there's been a removal of bathroom units and additional balcony,
50 an additional units on the third floor. And with that, I'll turn it over to you, Mr.
51 Hurd.

52
53 A: Okay. Thanks (Jenah). My name is Derek Hurd, and my address is 112 East
54 33rd Street. Um, I'm really not gonna say (a lot) whole – whole lot about this
55 (unintelligible) applications and now it's back before you with the
56 (unintelligible) changes that (Jenah) mentioned and then maybe
57 (unintelligible) Um, but I will (unintelligible) potentially (unintelligible) I'll
58 certainly be here to answer those. I'm just gonna turn it over to (unintelligible)
59 Jason - Jason Jones, the, uh, the applicant is gonna add some comments and
60 (unintelligible) can get to your questions.

61
62 A1: I'm Jason Jones (unintelligible) 208 East 33rd Street (Garden City, Idaho). Uh,
63 yeah, so I just wanted – just wanted to cover our legal bases (unintelligible)
64 um, this application, uh, is, um, basically the third applications (submitted for)
65 a project on this property. The first application to city on appeal denied for
66 three reasons (unintelligible) that we corrected, uh, (unintelligible) used as a
67 denial, um, (unintelligible) real quick (unintelligible) record. Um, and I don't
68 know whether the city, um – um, (Jenah), I'm not sure whether you can just
69 pull the original into the record or whether I need to read out the actual
70 decision document can be made part of record.

71
72 Q: Um, Mr. Jones, do all committee members have access to that, uh, decision
73 document readily available for the record today and are all members
74 comfortable?

75
76 A1: Yeah (unintelligible) just be, like, I said the – the parts of it that
77 (unintelligible) so that when it is appealed...

78
79 Man: Have him read it (unintelligible).

80
81 Q: Uh, please do read it that's cleaner. Thank you. Please do read it.

82
83 A1: (Unintelligible). Yeah – yeah, it's (unintelligible). So, um, there were three
84 standards that the city council on field decide that it's not (unintelligible). Um,
85 the first standard was that it was not (compliant) of design (unintelligible)
86 because the city council saying not all (unintelligible) had been meet. Um, the
87 second was the it's not adhering to the standards of protection of health,
88 safety, and general welfare, because there is a lack of parking to
89 (unintelligible) utilize the street, lack in sidewalk. The third is that it's not
90 (unintelligible) improving the accessibility of development (unintelligible)

91 public transportation, because there is no public transit nearby. Some of the
92 traffic will be not motorized (unintelligible). Um, (unintelligible) the cities
93 (unintelligible) um, they obviously have clarified what those things actually
94 mean. So the city in that first, uh - uh, (unintelligible) additional requirements
95 that city plans that is because there is a provision of the code is that the Live,
96 Work, Create should be (unintelligible) split in resident space residents spaces
97 – working spaces. Um, they also reiterated that – that means there should be a
98 ratio of working (unintelligible) spaces. So you'll see this project
99 (unintelligible). Um, and the second denial and basically said (lack of parking)
100 Um, and while we believe we had the (unintelligible) parking required our
101 code now add the living spaces (unintelligible) or parking spaces to the
102 project. But we – we actually believe we still need that code (unintelligible)
103 the additional parking spaces added. Um, in the third denial they said there's
104 no (unintelligible) even if they're (unintelligible) that because there is an extra
105 (unintelligible) street. So it's actually on the end of the corner of 33rd Street
106 and (Chinden). Um, so the city claims (unintelligible) parking and again we've
107 actually got more than the require (unintelligible) parking (unintelligible) to
108 provide that (unintelligible) make sure that's in the record. Um, the city also
109 basically said that (unintelligible) reconfigure, um, so that – that's the
110 definition of (unintelligible). Um, the city also (unintelligible) to
111 (unintelligible). Uh, in the - their legal (unintelligible), if you look at the
112 density of this project, it's significantly less dense then it could be. You'll have
113 a 33% size coverage according to the city. And (unintelligible) 55%. Um, so
114 it's actually much less (unintelligible). Um, so we just wanted to make sure to
115 read that into the record, um, so that it (unintelligible). Uh, so now
116 (unintelligible) just a couple of, um, quick explanations of how we can keep
117 the (unintelligible) um the standards. Um, that design (unintelligible) gonna be
118 looking at here, so, um, the proposed design (unintelligible) of the district,
119 um, so once again, the city's denial is based on the idea that (unintelligible)
120 should have (unintelligible) ratio (unintelligible) we now (unintelligible). We
121 also (unintelligible) much smaller than (unintelligible) then the maximum that
122 would be allowed. Um, so (unintelligible) let 33% (unintelligible) staff report.
123 Uh, and we're allowed 55% (unintelligible). Um, the proposed design
124 (unintelligible) protection of (health,) safety and general welfare. Um, we are
125 proposing to build sidewalks. We're also proposing (unintelligible) flexible
126 parking spaces in the back. So if you take a look at the actual site plan you've
127 got some parking spaces back there that's actually flexible space
128 (unintelligible) parking cars and parking bikes so we actually can provide 35
129 people (unintelligible) on site parking (unintelligible). If the city decides we
130 need more than what's required. We also (unintelligible) provide parking
131 along the street. Uh, city code allows us to count one of the spaces that's
132 provided on the street (unintelligible) spaces along the street. Um, so we
133 believe we need more than the (unintelligible). We also (unintelligible)
134 required. So we wanna make sure that - that's clear. Um, we also wanted to
135 point it out that the code (unintelligible) encourages (unintelligible). Um, we

136 also wanna point out that this design does in fact improve accessibility
137 (unintelligible) transportation. Um, this is an (unintelligible) project
138 (unintelligible) nature. It's bringing more people into our district where there
139 are only 850 (unintelligible) bus stop. There's gonna be 200 – less then 200
140 (unintelligible). So obviously adding more people, renting more
141 (unintelligible) accessibility (unintelligible). Um, so I did wanna point out that
142 this, um, design also supports (unintelligible) pattern enables intensification of
143 development changes over time. Um, we – we - we are currently sure that
144 legally allowed (by) codes so the – the code (unintelligible) most of the
145 project is. Um, so there's room for us to expand (vertically) in the future.
146 We're also (unintelligible) 33% site coverage. We could be out to 55%. So
147 there's actually some horizontal expansion across the site that became
148 necessary, um, because we have more possible parking spaces being required
149 intensification to be made. Um, and the parking would already be there. We
150 also have (shared parking) so we have parking spaces (unintelligible) shared
151 parking (unintelligible) parking. So they have a bunch of potential
152 (unintelligible) flexible spaces (unintelligible). So, um, everything else, I
153 mean (unintelligible) um, I do wanna go ahead and (unintelligible) report. So
154 (unintelligible) so on page six of the staff report, um, I do want to address
155 (unintelligible). uh, we more than (unintelligible) bicycle parking
156 (unintelligible) on site. Those 24 spots (unintelligible) flexible spots and – and
157 can be shared (unintelligible) parking (unintelligible) neighbors
158 (unintelligible) parking. The code (unintelligible) parking spaces is cars. Um,
159 you know, there's some question about how to interpret city code. Um, and
160 whether we count the street space – space on the street is one of our spaces,
161 uh, seems to us the (unintelligible) pretty clear (unintelligible) that there was
162 some questions of maybe one of those spaces (unintelligible) parking space
163 depending on how (unintelligible) code. Um, but either way, we're fine
164 (unintelligible). Um, so I don't think those are the questions (unintelligible)
165 spaces (unintelligible) six. Um I also wanted to address (unintelligible)
166 workspaces believe that's factual so it kinda contradicts the statement
167 (unintelligible). So (unintelligible) make sure that that's addressed in the staff
168 report (unintelligible) that statement (unintelligible). Um, on page 12 of the
169 staff report there are a couple of things that (unintelligible) we had not really
170 heard back about whether - it says the proposed (unintelligible) locations is
171 approaching into the rear of minimum setback, uh, that we might be pushed
172 (unintelligible) off the back property line. Um we haven't heard back whether
173 we need to do that because it was more about what is this (unintelligible).
174 Can't be built to (unintelligible) it in right here, but it has to be pushed
175 (unintelligible) we're okay with that condition. Uh, it just might - it seems like
176 they were making it harder to access the dumpster itself and that the dumpster
177 screen is not visible anyway. So since we can have fences along the property
178 line we're not sure if it make sense to have the fence five feet back from the
179 property line. Uh, like I said we'll - we'll actually go with whatever design you
180 think is best, uh, also (unintelligible) um, we're also (unintelligible) if we had

181 to, our preference is obviously clean air. Um, but then it's cleaner or better,
182 but, um, we've seen some other developments for them lots of trash cans
183 everywhere, don't necessarily prefer that, uh, we could (unintelligible). So
184 we're okay with that I for whatever reason that setback creates a problem. Um,
185 on page 14 of the staff report, um, this is where the parking comes in. So I
186 think there's a couple of things we wanna address here. Um, (unintelligible)
187 you know, in (Garden) City code, it appears to us, one of our parking spaces
188 on the street can be counted, um, by codes (unintelligible) and we can actually
189 use that (unintelligible). So that (unintelligible) kinda clarify, so we
190 (unintelligible) those mistake that are behind our project, uh, one of those
191 would be ADA accessible. Um, and then we have one parking space on the
192 street that - that the (Live, Work, Create). Um, so I'll kind of read that out
193 loud. It says, um, parking requirements (unintelligible) for being combination
194 of the following. So, uh part B in that says one parking, one on the street,
195 parallel parking space in front of the (unintelligible). So we believe that
196 should be pretty obvious that we should be able to count one of those spaces
197 to the parking requirement. If you decide it's not (unintelligible) spaces behind
198 the site, actually had up to nine spaces (behind) site. Um, we prefer
199 (unintelligible) eight. Because with eight, we can actually keep one space
200 ADA accessible. So that is our preference is to have ADA accessible space
201 back there, but we don't need the ADA spaces on our apartment right now.
202 (Unintelligible) obviously these are just (unintelligible) four spaces. So we
203 don't think (unintelligible) 'cause we have the ADA accessible unit built into
204 the project. Um, on page 14 of the staff report, um, there is, uh, a
205 miscalculation that says, if it's interpreted for every 1500 of total square feet
206 workspace then that - you would need three additional spaces. That's not true.
207 We have about 3000 square feet of workspace. So you'd only need two
208 additional workspaces. We had a little less than 3000. So we just want to point
209 out that, uh, it says this would necessitate 10, 12 spaces. The (unintelligible)
210 be nine total spaces. Which we can accommodate either on our site or
211 (unintelligible) on our site (unintelligible) from the site. Um, I think the codes
212 pretty clear that this should be on the capital one space. Um, something
213 literally says it. Um, lets see on page 17 of the staff report, um, it says
214 (unintelligible) three feet and there was (unintelligible) position. Um, on the
215 bottom of page 17 on the parking and off-street coding revisions. Um, there's
216 one question about whether our parking area is too close to our prior
217 (unintelligible) that's gonna be built behind the site. Um, we believe the codes
218 (unintelligible) that (unintelligible) it's only for actual public driveways. Um,
219 and alleys in the city code are (unintelligible). So this is a private drive. So
220 right now you've seen lots of projects (unintelligible) product in this
221 (unintelligible). So it's not (unintelligible) but if we need to (unintelligible) do
222 it. So it not (unintelligible). Um, like is said we're just not (unintelligible) that
223 makes any sense. Those (unintelligible) parking lot and they want us to
224 separate our parking lot (unintelligible). So, um, again, it doesn't make sense

225 and part of it (unintelligible) but the city code, the functionality
226 (unintelligible).
227

228 Q: All right, Mr. Jones, um...

229

230 A1: Yes.
231

232 Q: Don't mean to rush you, but I do in that we're trying to adhere to procedures.
233 Um...

234

235 A1: Sure.
236

237 Q: Thank you.
238

239 A1: Um, so I think – I think that basically (says) everything I needed to say.
240

241 Q: Um, any questions for Mr. Jones? Um, I do - I do have a couple of questions
242 just clarification's. Um, it's - it's your, um, testimony that the dumpster is just
243 the dumpster itself. There's no structure associated with that dumpster.
244

245 A1: Well, I'm assuming we're gonna have (unintelligible) dumpster. But we're just
246 wondering if this screening (unintelligible) or whatever screening
247 (unintelligible) construction. Because we're allowed the fencing along the
248 property lines. So why (unintelligible) be any different.
249

250 Q: Okay, thank you. And then...

251

252 A1: Like I said we don't mind (unintelligible).
253

254 Q: And then I have another question related to (unintelligible). Um, if he were to
255 have, uh, trash inside, are there locations within the individual units, uh, for,
256 uh, trash cans?
257

258 A1: Like are you saying (unintelligible) trash cans?
259

260 Q: Yes, sir.
261

262 A1: I assume (unintelligible) we have some storage areas (unintelligible) site
263 (unintelligible).
264

265 Q: All right, thank you. Um, and then it's your indication that there's no more
266 than 3000 square feet of a workspace available in your project. Um...
267

268 A1: That's correct.
269

270 Q: And if that's the case, would you be comfortable with some sort of condition
271 to limit that to 3000 square feet?
272

273 A1: (Unintelligible). I think we'd like to make sure we can do the (unintelligible)
274 or seven units. Each – each of our workspaces can be about 450 square feet.
275 So, in theory (unintelligible) expand (unintelligible) keep us from expanding
276 (unintelligible). But we're okay (unintelligible).
277

278 Q: All right, thank you. Are there any other...
279

280 A1: (Unintelligible) 3150 if you wanna put that (unintelligible).
281

282 Q: Um, and are there any other questions of the applicant? Seeing none. I'll turn
283 it over to Hanna Veal.
284

285 A2: Good afternoon. Based off of code guidance and - or based off of code
286 guidance staff's analysis of this application is based off of the strictest code
287 provided in Garden city code. Additionally, where the live work create
288 overlay of the district, uh, does not apply the Garden City code subsections
289 supersedes. For example, in the case of the parking, um, it's Garden City code
290 B 3C3G general provisions and parking, may not be compliant because the
291 application proposes 11 parking spaces, um, for the proposed seven units,
292 however of the 11 spaces proposed, there are only six spaces provided on the
293 site with the remainder of the parking proposed on the street. Subsection G
294 requires that there be one off street parking space for each living or onsite
295 park - or pardon me, subsection G requires that there be one on-site parking
296 spot for each living space. Um, subsection G3 has been the subject of appeals
297 for the previous applications for the same form in use this sub section states
298 that working spaces over 500 square feet of interior floor area shall be
299 required to provide one parking space for every 1,500 square feet or a portion
300 thereof, or with the emphasis added the number of parking spaces needed to
301 serve employee and patrons as determined by the planning and zoning
302 commission. The – or and this section of code has been emphasized because if
303 proposed parking meets the standards of code, it does not need to be reviewed
304 by the planning and zoning commission. The application as proposed does not
305 include any workspaces greater than 500 square feet. And the total proposed
306 workspace being 2,700 square feet. If it is interpreted that for every 1,500
307 square feet of workspace and parking spaces needed an additional three
308 parking spaces would be required. That is staff's analysis that the site shall
309 provide for all minimal residential parking spots. While on the street, parking
310 can be provided for the commercial spaces. I'm going to share my screen, try
311 and dissect the portion of code that is applicable to the parking note that under
312 subsection G parking, um, the – sorry. Um please note that code allows for
313 one parking space to be parallel. So the one parking space, one parallel
314 parking space on street can count towards that live parking space requirement.

315 Um, in the site plan though, the applicant has stated that they are flexible. The
316 proposal identifies six parallel parking spaces in front of the project while
317 there is, um, seven onsite parking spots, Garden City code 83C3, speaks to the
318 live work, create zoning setback standards. And this dumpster located towards
319 the rear of the property is encroaching into that proposed parking area. Um, as
320 well as within the required minimum setbacks. Staffs analysis of this dumpster
321 encroachment was based off of the property line, the dotted line on the site
322 plans provided, um, and that it is within the 5-foot setback and almost upon
323 the property line with the alleyway being an easement on the adjacent
324 property owners property. This section of code asks that, um, or allows for the
325 side setback to be 5 feet or zero feet, but it staffs interpretation, that the zero
326 foot is only permissible (via) the adjacent property is also applying the live
327 work great overlay, which it is to our knowledge that the adjacent property is
328 not there for this encroachment is not permitted and it has to be at the 5-foot
329 setback. Garden City code 84C4 special provisions for specific nonresidential
330 development also speaks to the sidewalk setback. Um, and the site plans, it
331 looks like the - the doors from the commercial structures are encroaching into
332 the sidewalk. It is staff's - it's come to staff's attention that the applicant is
333 okay with a provision or a requirement in the decision document that they be
334 recess by 3 feet, which would make it code compliant. And Garden City code
335 843, parking design and improvement standards. This application may or may
336 not be compliant then not the parking areas shall not be located closer than the
337 4 feet to any established street or alley right away. And the alley per
338 dimensions were not disclosed and that staff could not provide a complete
339 review. However, um, it does look like the easement is going to be off the
340 property and the provided parking spots in the rear would be encroaching into
341 that 5-foot setback. And the parking spaces need to be 10 by 20 feet in order
342 to meet code. So shifting the parking spaces, more interior to the development
343 would meet code requirements and there has been a condition of approval to
344 do so as such. Also if the alleyway were to be constructed and utilized for
345 vehicles, it shall be constructed in a way that the vehicles using this alleyway
346 cannot back out into the public right away. There's a draft condition of
347 approval requiring that the alley be constructed accordingly. And with that
348 stand for questions.

349
350 Q: Um, thank you. Any questions of - for Ms. (Veal)?

351
352 A3: Yeah I have a question.

353
354 Q: All right.

355
356 A3: Um (Unintelligible) my name is (Julie) (unintelligible).

357
358 Q: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were, um, I couldn't quite see, uh, that I thought
359 you were a committee member. Um, with that, you're welcome to give public

360 testimony when the public testimony portion is opened up, uh, the questions,
361 uh, I - at this time, I'm going to reserve for the committee members, and I can
362 see both of them now. And I do see that Ms. (Gresham) has a question.
363
364 Q1: Um, (unintelligible) speakers (unintelligible).
365
366 Q: (Unintelligible).
367
368 Q1: Um, question for (unintelligible) the, uh, you're talking about dumpster
369 encroaching in setback. Um, I thought this (unintelligible) maybe I'm just not
370 (unintelligible) the right way. Um, but normally the setbacks are for structure's
371 not, um, equipment's necessarily. So can you tell me what exactly the
372 dumpster is and how's approaching (unintelligible)?
373
374 A2: Right. So during the initial review, and I understood that the trash enclosure
375 was to be completely enclosed, however, during today's hearing it - it is
376 apparent that it is only going to be fencing. Um...
377
378 Q1: (Unintelligible).
379
380 Q: Um, it looks like Mr. (Labrie) might also have had a question.
381
382 Q2: No, I (unintelligible).
383
384 Q: All right. And then Hannah or Ms. Veal...
385
386 Q1: (Unintelligible) one other question.
387
388 Q: Okay.
389
390 Q1: This is about the alleyway, um, you know, from the (unintelligible) is not an
391 alleyway. The city is calling it an alleyway. But (unintelligible) how are we
392 (unintelligible).
393
394 Q: Uh, Ms. (Gresham), would you be willing to say that again? I didn't quite hear
395 you, and I'm not sure that Ms. (Veal) did either.
396
397 Q1: Um, there's been discussion about the, uh, area on parking in the back of the
398 lot. Um, the applicant is not (unintelligible) it's not an alleyway
399 (unintelligible) staff report and staff is as, um, common then it is now in a way
400 I'm just curious about (unintelligible).
401
402 A2: So if it were to be a common drive, it would need to be proposed on the
403 property of the application, and then therefore it would be handled as such,

404 but because it appears that the drive or the alleyway is on the adjacent parcel,
405 it - we have been acting as if it were an alleyway.
406

407 Q: (Unintelligible) Ms. (Veal) would you be willing to put up a section G of the
408 (unintelligible) create standards is again. Thank you. And I just want to make
409 sure that I'm, um, paraphrasing the, your analysis correctly. And so you've
410 indicated that based on G1, one off street parking space shall be provided for
411 each living space in your analysis. And then because there are seven living
412 spaces, you've indicated that there needs to be seven on - on-site spaces.
413

414 A2: Correct.
415

416 Q: Okay. And then also in your analysis, the question then there of is the
417 additional parking spaces based in 4C and 4B one on street parking space in
418 front of the development site is one way that you can meet the parking
419 requirements or all diagonal or right parking in front of the development site
420 consists with the street scape plan adopted by the city. And so the question
421 you have there is whether the parallel parking, the additional parallel parking,
422 um, meets the intent of code. And then it's the statement in 4B says one on
423 street parallel parking space. Is that correct?
424

425 A2: Correct.
426

427 Q: All right. And then looking at the draft, a decision, uh, it looks like the
428 potential draft decision finding number 21. Uh, does note that the design
429 review committee does, or does not find that multiple on street parking
430 parallel parking spaces are equivalent to the code allowance for angled on
431 street parking. I just wanted to point that out. All right. Um, any other
432 questions for Ms. (Veal) before we open the public hearing? All right, uh,
433 seeing none, um, if you wish to testify on this matter, um, before I do that, um,
434 please do raise your hand if you're on zoom. Uh, if you're in person here
435 today, make sure that you've signed up on the correct sign in sheet. Um, and
436 we did receive a late exhibit just shortly before this meeting started, I
437 forwarded on to the committee members, as well as the applicant, but I'm
438 going to go ahead and read it into the record, uh, while we give those on zoom
439 and opportunity to raise their hand, as well as anybody that wants to sign up.
440 Um, this is a testimony from (Roberta Renee) at 209 East 33rd Street. Um, the
441 applicant is requesting the provisions of this rural material work lift create to
442 apply to the project. I request that this application be denied. Number one,
443 application is not sufficiently different from other applications, DSR 2020,
444 number 25 and DSR 2019, number four submitted by the same applicant. The
445 applicant currently has an active case pending judicial review against the city
446 of Garden City case CV01-20-3481, Wee (Boise) Inc. versus city of Garden
447 City. The case involves the same property is referenced in the application
448 currently submitted. Applicants should not have two applications pending on

449 the same property. Is an applicant allowed to have two separate applications
450 pending on the same piece of property? Shouldn't one of the applications be
451 withdrawn? which application as ultimately is going to ultimately be
452 considered? While we have two judicial reviews pending at the same time on
453 the same parcel. This application should not be considered while a prior and
454 similar project by the application is being litigated. This is confusing in
455 places, undo an undue burden on the interested public to have two projects
456 involving the same property, moving through the system, simo-
457 simultaneously. Number two, work live compliance. The district is clear, the
458 work units must be utilized by the tenants that their associated living units, the
459 use of a structure and or site the combines and commercial or manufacturing
460 activity allowed in the overlay district with a residential living space. The
461 spaces may be combined with one space attached to another or separated but
462 located on the same property. By prior action, the Garden City council has
463 determined that by definition, there shall be a one-to-one ratio of residential
464 living space to the commercial or manufacturing activity. There should be
465 absolute clarity of exactly how many living units are proposed and how many
466 studios there should be no more studios than living units. This application has
467 seven living units. There should be seven studios identified specifically
468 identified in linked to a specific living unit. There should be no more than
469 seven studios on the property. Site-specific requirements should be clear,
470 specific, and unambiguous where the po- where possible the live and
471 workspaces that are connected by a common wall should share a common
472 tenant should, is not the operative condition. It should state must. Number
473 three, parking, the design review process is not the review body designated in
474 Garden City municipal code to review parking requirements. Applications of
475 this type should be required to submit to planning and the planning and zoning
476 commission for determination of parking requirements. This has not been
477 done. Title eight article C (unintelligible) work live (unintelligible) G3
478 parking. This (unintelligible) work live create overlay requires that there be
479 one on-site parking for each live unit. Objection. There is seven proposed live
480 units and only six onsite parking spaces working spaces of over 500 square
481 feet of interior floor area shall be required to provide one parking space for
482 every 1,500 square feet or portion thereof, or number of parking spaces
483 needed to serve employees and patrons as determined by the planning and
484 zoning commission, emphasis added. Nowhere in the staff review is the
485 calculation for the aggregate parking needs presented and then stipulated in
486 the specific conditions. This is a serious emission. Article C, (unintelligible)
487 work live create 83C1F states ensure workload units, minimize conflicts and
488 protect the health, safety, and welfare of existing development. The former
489 site planning included what appears to be two large public restrooms
490 anticipating heavy retail traffic. The amount of public parking should be clear
491 so that the project will not create conflicts with the health, safety, and welfare
492 of existing development. Although this condition, or although this current
493 application does not have public ADA compliant restrooms in the plan, the

494 anticipated heavy retail track that traffic EG 29 bicycle parking spaces, how
495 will the public safety and health be protected without adequate onsite
496 restrooms? This is a rapidly developing area of Garden City and the standards
497 set for this project. We'll establish a precedent. Careful consideration must be
498 given the extreme parking issues in this neighborhood. Title eight article C
499 establishes a clear role for the planning and zoning commission to determine
500 parking requirements. This has not been done. The application should be sent
501 back for parking and parking needs determination. Number four, ADA
502 compliance staff report, page six states, the site plan shows the elimination of
503 the ADA compliant restroom, where the previous slate proposed that were
504 previously proposed and design review fiscal year 2020, number 25.
505 Elimination of the restrooms might make it difficult for some workspaces and
506 their occupant to meet the ADA restroom standards, if required. An objection,
507 staff must make a determination of what the applicant must do to meet the
508 requirements of the Americans with disabilities - disabilities act, as it relates
509 to the restrooms or accessibility issues, including parking. It is not okay for
510 the staff report to state, if required. Does the project require ADA compliance
511 or not? Staff should make a determination at prior application from (Wee
512 Boise) had ADA restrooms. Why are they admitted in this application?
513 Number five landscaping plans, staff report on page six states, there appears to
514 be conflicting landscaping plans and site plans submitted. The site plan
515 supersedes the landscaping plan. Objection. How are we supposed to
516 comment in this case? Number six, alley; has ACHD reviewed and approved
517 the alley? The application indicates that alleys must be secured and is
518 absolutely required to meet the onsite parking requirements. The alley must be
519 sufficiently conditioned, and there should be a record of an agreement to grant
520 an easement garbage, number seven garbage with the dense parking access
521 through the alley and the necessary travel through the alley access and
522 reasonable clearance to the industrial garbage container dumpster for the large
523 truck necessary for trash removal is not sufficient. Staff should provide a
524 thorough calibrated analysis of onsite parking access off of the alley,
525 industrial garbage truck access and container emptying and how necessary
526 clearances are in actuality possible. Number eight, metal buildings, metal
527 buildings should be prohibited except within the light industrial based zoning
528 district. The applicant's metal shipping container buildings are clearly
529 prohibited. Number nine, safety article C (Surel) work live create 83CS1
530 states ensure work live units, minimize conflicts and protect the health, safety,
531 and welfare of existing development, objections. Given the density of the
532 project, the lack of sufficient parking, the location of the project on a street
533 with minimal egress, lack of ADA compliant restrooms. This project does not
534 in cannot with its design and proposed uses protect the health and safety and
535 welfare of existing development summary. The (Surel Mitchell) work live
536 create district has a major objective. Allow for property developments that
537 incorporate both living and working spaces, including, but not limited to
538 craftsmen and artists and retail and workspaces, workshops and art studios

539 providing affordable living units within working spaces is an ideal. And one
540 to be supported the project proposed by (Wee Boise) is not in compliance with
541 the (Surel Mitchell) work live create district. The assumption by many
542 reviewing this project is what's truly, really envisioned by the applicant is a
543 retail mall with retail food and alcohol sales. The ability to have artists or
544 artisans with linked live workspaces will not be maintained over time. What
545 will be left? What will be left with our container shells, needing a retail mall
546 spaces to justify the cost of the project to constrain this project with the
547 following conditions should be sufficient to cause the applicant to consider
548 designing a project with real live work realities. The project must be
549 sufficiently conditions such that all alcohol sales in the future should be
550 prohibited on premise. The project must be sufficiently conditioned, such that
551 the only artisans and artists and craftsmen products proposed onsite should be
552 permitted. Any food or beverage product produced on site must be consumed
553 offsite. The city need to does the city needs to decide if the applicant is
554 allowed to have two separate applications pending on the same piece of
555 property, parking, ADA compliance, landscaping, alley construction, metal,
556 metal buildings, safety, and garbage all need to be addressed before
557 proceeding. Thank you for permitting the submission of objections to the
558 proposed product. Um, thank you for bearing with me there. Um, are you
559 seeing anybody with their hands up that I'm missing?
560

561 ((Crosstalk))

562
563 Q: Thank you. I am seeing Mr. (Lou Landry).

564
565 A4: (Unintelligible). Hello.

566
567 Q: Hello. We can hear you.

568
569 A4: Okay, uh, so I can proceed now (unintelligible).

570
571 Q: Please.

572
573 A4: Okay. Uh, members of the design review. Uh, I – I too was concerned about
574 (unintelligible) currently there is a appeal of the applicants currently involved.
575 active case in a judicial review against City of Garden City case number
576 CV01-20-3481. Uh, related to the same parcel. So I – I believe that there is a
577 rule in the city that you can't have, uh, two applications pending at the same
578 parcel (unintelligible) same time. And since that's an active case, either the
579 (unintelligible) whatever (unintelligible) permitted and (unintelligible)
580 clarification (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) uh, I – I found (unintelligible)
581 the drawings (unintelligible). Uh, (unintelligible) and part of it being cut off
582 (unintelligible). Uh (having gone to) numerous (unintelligible). I still
583 (unintelligible) review and it's showing, uh (unintelligible) arrows going

584 (unintelligible). I've never seen an application like this in my life. My concern
585 is (uh) the only time (I have ever seen anything like this) and try to find
586 (unintelligible). Uh, and so I think (unintelligible) really going on. How
587 (unintelligible) works. How the (unintelligible). Why (unintelligible) spread
588 throughout, uh, the site (unintelligible) of the third thing I found very
589 confusing is that in the past we were told that there was (unintelligible). And
590 that the city, uh, would, uh, (the city). And it was always (unintelligible). And
591 they are (unintelligible). And that has (unintelligible) department. My
592 understanding is...

593
594 ((Crosstalk))

595
596 A4: A – sort of (unintelligible). And I am not sure (unintelligible) in other settings
597 that (unintelligible) certain (unintelligible). And requires several
598 (unintelligible). So I think the city needs (clarity) with a picture of where is
599 this alley going. How do you enter it? How do you (unintelligible). Number
600 two, or number (unintelligible). I'll go back to that one. The issue of
601 (unintelligible) for those of you who don't (unintelligible) you might
602 (unintelligible) complex. And t hey have their dumpster right on the street. It's
603 not (unintelligible). Dump stuff overflows all over and that stuff is
604 (unintelligible). 'Cause it shows un adequate garbage for provisions for
605 (unintelligible). And my concern was number one (unintelligible) dumpster in
606 back with the uh – with a onsite parking (unintelligible) for the
607 (unintelligible). that's not public parking. That's supposed to be for the living
608 there. And that they're supposed to be seven all on site there I seven units. So
609 the question is how do we then access the dumpster? Is it (unintelligible)
610 where you can't park (unintelligible). And, uh, a number of these facilities the
611 dumpsters are in fact empty (unintelligible). So (unintelligible) how does this
612 (unintelligible) as we (unintelligible) and why (unintelligible) all sorts of – of
613 (unintelligible). This is a critical issue. I heard during a presentation
614 (unintelligible) provisions inside (unintelligible). That has to be on the
615 (unintelligible). It can't be in the 450 square foot (unintelligible). So where is
616 that going to be? I think that – that's an answer that really needs to be
617 provided and then on (unintelligible) Wednesdays when trash gets picked up
618 where will (unintelligible)? So I think this project has a real problem
619 (unintelligible). The other thing is...

620
621 Q: All right, Mr....

622
623 A4: ...application (unintelligible). Then we need another application for
624 (unintelligible). So, (unintelligible)...

625
626 Q: Mr. La- Mr. (Landry), um, I'm - I'm gonna ask that, uh, we are trying to
627 adhere to procedures. Uh, so if you can try to keep your comments, uh, quick
628 in nature, I'll let you finish up.

629
630 A4: Well (unintelligible)...

631
632 Q: Thank you.

633
634 A4: Thee such a (unintelligible) application I think (unintelligible). Uh, how
635 (unintelligible) that this is not gonna be a public – these are not public, uh,
636 spaces. And then there are 29 bicycle spaces as soon as (unintelligible) to give
637 'em adequate space to take care of their hygiene needs and there for
638 (unintelligible) bathrooms. Very concerned (unintelligible) safety issue. So I
639 think it's (unintelligible). I'll (unintelligible) your comments (unintelligible).

640
641 Q: Thank you, Mr. (Landry), any questions of Mr. (Landry)? Seeing none. Um,
642 I'm not seeing anybody else that's, uh, wishing to testify. Is there anybody out
643 there that's wishing to testify?

644
645 Woman: (Julie)...

646
647 ((Crosstalk))

648
649 Q: Okay. There's uh – (Julie) if you wouldn't mind spelling your name for us.

650
651 A3: Sure. (Julie), yeah – Julie (unintelligible).

652
653 Q: Thank you. Uh, please proceed.

654
655 A3: Hi, I'm – my mother lives across the street at 201 East 34th Street, um
656 (unintelligible). And, um, (unintelligible) seven living spaces, um, the
657 management (unintelligible) who would be able to apply and qualify for those
658 units. If they're like criminal background checks, um (unintelligible). And,
659 um, you know, we're right there across the street, um, you know, that was a,
660 you know, a little bit (unintelligible) talking about parking issues. We do have
661 a house just opposite from him and, uh, you know, there's been issues a little
662 bit over the (unintelligible) and people parking all around us. And, uh, for not
663 being able to get her mail delivered or get her car out of the driveway. But
664 people that were, you know, going down to the river. Um, so you know, the –
665 the parking, hopefully will be a little more, uh, addressed not just for this
666 business that people want to enjoy the river because, you know, it's okay that
667 they kind of park around there, but we don't want our driveway and our
668 mailbox closed off so we can't have any kind of living ability in a house that
669 they've been in for 45 years. So, um, it is kind of an old neighborhood and, uh,
670 we like (unintelligible) better, but it would be nice to know that we're still,
671 um, being thoughtful about who's gonna be (moving in) possible and the
672 management company. And that there will be a little bit of a background
673 check. And, um, you know, security that we can be provided on who is going

674 to be living (unintelligible) appreciate that. And do they have (unintelligible)
675 that they do? Um, that would probably be my first choice. (Unintelligible)
676 jumped out there so on the set units um, he could probably designate a couple
677 of homes that would have to be qualified, um, workers that would get access
678 to those units and that would kind of help a little bit with the questions about
679 the parking. But, uh, (unintelligible) answer, but that was just the question I
680 had on the occupants for the building. Thank you.

681
682 Q: And thank you. And the applicant can certainly answer your questions, uh,
683 during his rebuttal. Are there any, uh, questions or comments from the
684 committee? Um, moving on, uh, (Don May).

685
686 A5: Yes, hi can you hear me?

687
688 Q: We can hear you. Thank you.

689
690 A5: (Unintelligible) research on the internet regarding parking (unintelligible). It
691 appears that parking (unintelligible) is established by our government bodies.
692 Are actually not very necessary that are relevant to sixties according to several
693 actuaries who made a career of parking – of studying parking at universities. It
694 appears the best way to manage parking is to actually have developers
695 perform their own parking requirements and managed such parking in
696 conjunction with the city who subsequently managed on street parking
697 appropriate. I found this by professor Dr. Donald Shoup information
698 (unintelligible) dedicated his entire (unintelligible) careers, parking. There's
699 two 700-page books about the (unintelligible). They can be referenced at the
700 website believe it or not, (shoupdogg.com). I've also found King County
701 Washington government site a good source of information. They have what's
702 called a parking S meter tool. And that can be found at the website,
703 (rightsizeparking.org). You need to (unintelligible) within the county and gave
704 an estimate (unintelligible) tool. All though it is in a different state (you will
705 find) similar to your (unintelligible) location from the city, which relatively
706 use it to estimate the direct parking (unintelligible) would be (looking at
707 similar) demographic. And 120 US states have limited parking minimums all
708 together. Most of these are (urban) areas. Very (unintelligible) towards cities
709 implementing parking maximums not in homes. And I understand the amount
710 of information that I just, uh, presented (unintelligible) can be presented here.
711 This (unintelligible) offline. Thank you, very much.

712
713 Q: All right. All right. Thank you. Um, Mr. (May). Any questions for Mr. (May)
714 by the committee? All right. Seeing none, I'll, um, (Hannah Ball).

715
716 A6: Thank you, I wanted to give (unintelligible). I wanted to give a comment on
717 the alley/private drive. So the alley was the name that we called it for a
718 (unintelligible) name. When we had conversations with the ACHD, the, uh,

719 jurisdiction that would weigh in on what is technical classification would be
720 called. It was determined that the quote alley system is technically considered
721 a private drive due to the fact that no public driveway nor maintenance nor
722 any public restrictions would occur on these quote, unquote alley systems. So
723 Ms. Veal comments that this is considered an alley. Technically our ACHD is
724 considered a private drive. There is an access agreement in place on this
725 (unintelligible) block configuration, as well as there is an easement in place
726 from a variety of property owners to discuss access, construction, and
727 maintenance. Those are my comments, and I agree with a (Don May) our
728 communities. Thank you.
729

730 Q: Um, thank you. Any questions of Ms. (Ball)? All right. Um, I'm not seeing
731 anybody else with their hands up. Um, if you're wishing to testify on zoom
732 and you don't know how to put your hand up, please unmute yourself and let
733 me know. All right. Seeing none. And nobody wishes to give testimony, uh, in
734 - in person. Um, I'm gonna turn this back over to the applicant.
735

736 A1: Uh, yes so let me go ahead and just kind of try to address everything that was
737 said, there was a bunch. Uh, Don May we haven't met but I like your
738 (unintelligible). I definitely think that (Don) should probably stay out of trying
739 to calculate parking and let developers, uh, do what they do. Uh, if - if we
740 make bad choices, we're not gonna make money, we're gonna lose business.
741 So, um, may address (Julie). Um, so (Julie), these are their work units, so they
742 will be these (unintelligible) um, whole units of live or space will come
743 together on lease. So whoever is living there will have those work units, um,
744 access to, um, as far as criminal background checks, um, I would assume
745 we're going to do a better job. So our anchors, um, in terms of background
746 checking and making sure that the people that are living there, um, so it could
747 be some - some (unintelligible) also on the site. So we obviously are gonna
748 care, um, about these little (unintelligible). Um, (unintelligible) um, we're
749 (unintelligible). Um, so we are in multiple applications because the other
750 application was not - is no longer active. Um, the city acted within their legal
751 right to deny (unintelligible) their application (unintelligible). So there's -
752 there's nothing the city can do about that. So, um, the other application is not
753 active in the city. And I, like I said they don't have anything to worry about
754 because the city plans on putting that case in court. And so (their) problem,
755 um, this is also seven (unintelligible) units. That's what it is. So there's, no - I
756 don't think there's any, um, confusion there seven units uh, each unit each.
757 Um, in your statement, you said something about (unintelligible) but that's
758 already been taken care of. So that's corrected. Um, we do meet the parking
759 requirements. Um, like I said, maybe there's some question about whether we
760 need to have seven spaces on the back of the site or six. Um, we don't actually
761 care which one the - the design review decides. So, we have enough parking
762 spaces. Um, in terms of, um, the 29 bike spaces, we don't have 29 bike spaces.
763 Those two spaces that are taken up our bike parking, which is flexible spaces,

764 we're saying we could actually have up to nine parking spaces if you needed
765 it. Um, or we can have bike spaces. Those spaces can also be used for shared
766 space. So for example, on the project or the science behind this
767 (unintelligible). Um, we have either more bike spaces that could share with
768 our neighbors or – or car spaces that could be shared (unintelligible). Um, so
769 we just created an extra space just in case, um, to address the ADA. Um, we
770 haven't necessarily removed the ADA bathrooms. We have an 88 unit, that's a
771 living space or somebody who maybe needs that ADA living space, which is
772 probably have mediated parking space. Uh, we would assume within their
773 ADA living space, they've already designed an ADA bathroom. So that kind
774 of interest in the ADA bathroom part of it, they had (unintelligible). Uh, but
775 we then - because we have a ADA living space, now we don't need to show
776 me a bathrooms because they will be built into the living space that the person
777 who uses the workspace would have. Um, as far as like garbage, um, again,
778 we can handle our garbage with just seven dumpsters (unintelligible). Um,
779 these aren't just, these are tiny Live, Work spaces this whole side is only 6,000
780 square feet. So we're not talking about a giant development on the side like I
781 said it's only 33% of the site (unintelligible) very small spaces are small, those
782 workspaces (unintelligible) 300 and 450 square feet total. So again
783 (unintelligible) giant amount of space. Um, like I said, we would prefer an
784 (unintelligible) the city's interpretation where that can be placed
785 (unintelligible) dumpster right by (unintelligible) separate garbage cans. (Lou)
786 asked where those would go. We actually have a storage unit. That's actually
787 four stories located right there next to the dumpster. It's clearly marked on the
788 drawing here that could store those trash cans if we needed that trash. So
789 we've left that space there already, just in case, um, the city side of it could
790 have a dumpster for whatever reason. Um, there was some comments about
791 metal buildings. That's no longer part of code. Um, so it's not relevant here.
792 Um, again, it was something brought up about safety, um, and saying, this is
793 too dense. This project is not too dense. It's far below the maximum density
794 that's allowed by code. Um, we meet the parking requirement code was
795 nationally over park. This, um, if need be, uh, we'll also meet all ADA
796 regulations. I said, we actually had an idea that all of a sudden, um, there are
797 some suggestion, alcohol should be prohibited. Um, we're not proposing
798 having to use yet. So if we weren't going to have a bar and we'll come back to
799 1974 condition use, that's not even part of this application. So I'm not sure
800 why that was brought up. Um, again, uh, we don't, (not quoting) 29 bike
801 spaces, there's some suggestion (unintelligible). We're actually suggested that
802 we could have as many as one to 29 bike spaces that could be shared with our
803 neighbors and share with the surrounding properties. We obviously every
804 property that borders this, except for (unintelligible). So there's going to be the
805 potential for shared parking and shared bike spaces. Um, we already have
806 (unintelligible) five spaces that are actually, I believe two more, three more
807 bike spaces that (unintelligible) are required by code. So we're meeting those
808 goals. Um, if there's a code we're not meeting, let us know. It sounds like, like

809 I said, (Lou Landry) has just come up with new things each time
810 (unintelligible) changed it to adapt to what he asked us to do. Now he's saying
811 he didn't (unintelligible) last time he complained (unintelligible). He said
812 looks like there's gonna be a lot of traffic. So we removed it, we put it in the
813 (living) unit. And now he's saying (safety) issue is now people who are
814 coming here (unintelligible). The person who lives there (unintelligible). Um,
815 I'll also address the (unintelligible) again. Again, if tis necces- you know, we
816 see a number of projects coming through that are (unintelligible) separate lot.
817 They are separate lots (unintelligible) because they maybe ended up
818 homeowner's association (unintelligible). There's no reason we should have
819 setback off of a private drive or parking, especially with the stage requirement
820 for our (unintelligible) involve the street. You can park on the street. I
821 understand you were going to come off the street (unintelligible). And, and the
822 code clearly says that it's only for basically, um, those public alleys and
823 streets. So the code itself addresses it and says, that's for public alleys and
824 streets have to have those set back. Again, this a private drive, but if we need
825 to we'll - we'll work on taking the ownership of the section on the private
826 drive, so that it's part of our property. But again, it wouldn't make sense
827 because that private (unintelligible) share just like a homeowner's
828 associations. So they're actually gonna probably have a set of associations that
829 you may use for that drive because of the multiple properties. So it makes no
830 sense that we wouldn't be able to access just like somebody who
831 (unintelligible).

832
833 Q: All right. Uh, any questions of Mr. Jones? All right. Seeing none, I'll go ahead
834 and close the public hearing.

835
836 A7: Ms. Thornborrow.

837
838 Q: Yes, sir.

839
840 A7: Before the committee goes into deliberations. Can I get a couple of points of
841 order?

842
843 Q: Yes, please.

844
845 A7: Uh, first of all, uh, we've heard there's a record here today that there have been
846 three applications on this property. This is not the third application on this
847 property. There was a record made that there is a petition for judicial review.
848 That's currently pending on the first application. I just went on for the
849 committee and for the public that is accurate, but also it's accurate that the city
850 does not comment on pending litigation. So if we could avoid questions about
851 pending litigation, that would make me sleep better at night. Um, the second
852 thing is, let's see here, there was a question about whether there could be two
853 applications pending at the same time. Uh, and if I could respond to that just

854 briefly, I'm unaware of any legal authority that says an applicant cannot have
855 one appeal pending, and then another application going that's submitted
856 outside of a year at the same time. So if somebody has some legal authority
857 for me, it'd be great to see that, um, I'm unaware of any legal authority that
858 indicates that. The last point of order before deliberations from my standpoint
859 is, um, I noticed, uh, since I've been following this for some time, ACHD
860 commented on the first application, um, and their recommendations were
861 relied on in the - in the first review. Um, ACHD did not comment on the
862 second application is my memory. And my question is, has ACHD
863 commented on this third application? And if the answer is no, do we know
864 why not?
865

866 Q: Um, thank you, Mr. Wadams for the point of order and looking at the staff
867 report, I don't believe, uh, that ACHD has commented, but I'll look to Ms.
868 Veal to verify that.
869

870 A2: That is correct. They have not commented.
871

872 A1: Um, can I comment?
873

874 Q: Sure.
875

876 A1: Well, so they did comment on the second application so (unintelligible).
877

878 Q: Thank you. And then, um, there can only be speculation as to why not, um,
879 my speculation as to why we haven't received, uh, comments is, um, just due
880 to the nature of development in the valley right now. Um, and the - the
881 timeliness of being able to get comments out in a timely timeframe. Uh, again,
882 I don't know that for sure, but that's my speculation.
883

884 A7: Do we know if ACHD's concerns have been addressed in this application?
885

886 Q: Um, that I do not know. I might defer to the applicant, uh, and also, I don't
887 know if staff has looked at that or not.
888

889 A7: Okay. Thank you. Those were my points. Thank you.
890

891 A1: I can comment to at least what happened on the second application which is
892 pretty much very similar top this one. Uh, so we did address the concerns
893 with ACHD had in the first which is basically put those concerns in writing
894 and said (unintelligible) conditions on those. Ans so they were - they were
895 (unintelligible) find the condition (unintelligible).
896

- 897 Q: Um, uh, to Mr. Wadams points of order specifically regarding this, uh, would
898 you be comfortable with a condition of approval stating that all condition
899 ACHD conditions must be met?
900
- 901 A7: Yes.
902
- 903 A1: Yeah (unintelligible).
904
- 905 Q: Thank you.
906
- 907 A7: (Unintelligible).
908
- 909 ((Crosstalk))
910
- 911 Q: Both. Thank you. All right. Well, thank you. And I'll turn this over, uh, to the
912 committee. Um, Ms. (Gresham), Mr. (Labrie), uh, the floor is yours.
913
- 914 Q1: So, I'm – I'm still a little confused on the whole parking issue, um whether or
915 not you have a meets for parking or not. Um, what exactly, I mean, we can't
916 (unintelligible) parking requirements. We can interpret them. What exactly is
917 staff suggesting that we interpret? I mean, not what our recommendation
918 would be, but what exactly are we trying to, um, distinguish.
919
- 920 Q: Um, Ms. (Gresham) uh, I think the - the portion of code that is in question is
921 code states that the - the overall parking can be meant, uh, via a combo of
922 different ways, including one parallel parking or multiple right angled or
923 angled parking. Um, I – I believe that staff was unsure why code would have
924 been written that way and what the intent would be if it's intended, uh, that
925 only one parallel parking be utilized on street. Um, but then, uh, why the
926 allowance for multiple right angled. And so that is where that finding number
927 21 has been highlighted.
928
- 929 Q1: So I get it, I mean task, we looked at aggregations and we have interpreted
930 that, uh, spaces on streets can count for some of their spaces. And it's more
931 than one. Um, now that was a good acknowledgment that there was transit
932 nearby and that (unintelligible) pedestrian or sorry, bus department is
933 provided. Which I think we have (unintelligible) parking. Um, that transit line,
934 I believe is going away. So that can be counted on currently. Um – okay,
935 thank you.
936
- 937 Q: Um, and just as a point of clarification, this application is specifically utilizing
938 the - the work live create, uh, standards, including standards for parking, uh,
939 rather than the base zoning district parking standards.
940
- 941 A1: What I was referring to was how we interpreted (space).

942

943 Q: Thank you.

944

945 A2: Yes my comment on that is that, uh, I would, it's not (hardship) to
946 accommodate the seven parking stalls on that alley (unintelligible). So I would
947 be more comfortable... (that those would be provided all in one area)

948

949

950 The transcript has been reviewed with the audio recording submitted and it is an accurate
951 transcription.

952 Signed _____