I. **CALL TO ORDER**

PRESENT: Marsh, Aguilar, Zabala, Talboy, Semple, Zuckerman  
ABSENT: Rudeen

II. **MINUTES**

1. Design Review Committee Minutes / June 10, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Dana Zuckerman, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Ben Semple, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Marsh, Aguilar, Zabala, Talboy, Semple, Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>David Rudeen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. **CONSENT AGENDA**

3. **DRH20-00204 / Jeff Likes, ALC Architecture**  
   Location: 1277 E. Exchange Street  
   Construct a self-service storage facility consisting of five buildings totaling approximately 113,700 square feet and associated site improvements in a M-1D (Light Industrial with Design Review) zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Ben Semple, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Dana Zuckerman, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Marsh, Aguilar, Zabala, Talboy, Semple, Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>David Rudeen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. NEW BUSINESS

4. DRH20-00230 / Curtis Crystal
Location: 12451 W. Overland Road
Construct a self-service storage facility consisting of six buildings totaling approximately 77,000 square feet and associated site improvements in a C-2D/DA (General Commercial with Design Review and Development Agreement) zone.

Katelyn Menuge: Presented project report noting she received public comment that included concerns with the construction and operation hours, and lighting and screening.

Stated the Conditional Use Permit limits hours of operation between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. with limited construction hours and the Development Agreement requires a 6-foot tall screen wall or fence in areas where the building cannot be located between the canal and vehicle use. Added there are also conditions requiring downward facing full-cutoff fixtures with a required photometric plan prior to a building permit issuance.

Recommended approval with conditions contained in the project report.

Applicant Testimony
Curtis Crystal: Agreed with terms and conditions.

Neighborhood Association:
Jerome Berner (Cloverdale West Subdivision): Testified his concerns were addressed in presentation and conditions of approval. Waived time for other members of Subdivision.

Public Testimony
Maria Gamboa: Asked how owner can ensure storage units tenants will adhere to operational hours and if there have been considerations made regarding the vehicular lights moving throughout the storage facility and how they would impact the homes facing the units.

Applicant Rebuttal
Curtis Crystal: Stated hours of operation are controlled by security gates and that they will work with staff to mitigate headlight issues
onto the street noting headlights within the site will not be an issue as they are blocked by the buildings.

Public Portion Closed

No Committee Deliberation

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Thomas Zabala, Committee Member
SECONDER: Dana Zuckerman, Committee Member
AYES: Marsh, Aguilar, Zabala, Talboy, Semple, Zuckerman
ABSENT: David Rudeen

1. **DRH20-00051 / Blane Harvey**
   Location: 2502 W. Bannock Street
   Construct a five-unit, three-story multi-family residential building with three detached garage buildings and associated site improvements on property in a R-3D (Multi-Family Residential with Design Review) zone.

   **KayCee Babb:** The property is located at the corner of Bannock and 25th. The land use of the property is high density. In the R-3D Zone the density is 43.5 units per acre and at approximately .28 acres the property would be permitted to construct 12 units. The maximum height is 45 feet.

   This slide shows adjacent properties. As you can see, they are mostly single-story, single-family homes. A couple have somewhat taller roof peaks. We can go back to these images during discussion.

   This project had some redesigns which I think are important to go over to understand what the project is now and to see the overall progress of the design. Originally this project was proposed with nine units and required a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to move forward. It was then reduced to seven units also needing a PUD. The applicant ended up withdrawing the PUD application as well as a Variance that was associated with the designs and redesigned project. Once again, into a five-unit development. Per the Boise City Zoning Code, five units on this property does not require a Conditional Use approval and prior approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission is no longer required.

   Even the five-unit development has gone through some design changes. On the left you can see the initial proposal. After discussions with the applicant they decided to redesign in a way to address some of the public comments that we had received. They
opted for a front gable design that reflects the pitched roofs in the neighborhood. The front façade also presents itself more as three units rather than five with the play of the modulation. The materials were also changed from stucco to lap siding for a more residential feel. Some of the comments in the Committee’s packets were submitted before June 23rd which is when the current design was submitted. All members of the public who had provided comments before that date where directly contacted with the new drawings so everyone should be aware of the current design that we are discussing.

Here we see the up-to-date site plan of the new five-unit development proposed on site. During the latest redesign there were a few dimensions that were altered and as such conditions have been added to meet the 22 feet of backup space and to reduce the front patios, so they no longer encroach 3-inches into the front setback. This has been agreed upon by the applicant and all other setbacks are met.

The landscape plan is providing the required Type B landscaping buffer between the development and the property to the west including five deciduous trees as well as some evergreen planting in between to add some screening between those units.

We have received comments from a neighbor that the proposed Honey Locust street trees were not preferred due to their seed pods. While we believe the variety selected by the applicant are not the same as those that would have those seed pods. We wanted to ensure that the new trees will not cause an issue for the neighborhood and a different species will be chosen. The Autumn Glory Maple proposed by the applicant is not permitted by Community Forestry so the final selection of the species will be through Community Forestry and we’ll make sure that it is not the Honey Locust. There will be tree mitigation in the form of paying into the Tree Fund for an existing desirable tree that will be removed. Rather than overcrowd the site and lead to potential future problems the applicant proposed working with Community Forestry with that Tree Fund. The details of the tree mitigation plan are in the report and I can answer any questions.

Finally, there were some initial comments from Fire that they may need additional aerial access to the site. We are still working with Fire to determine their needs, but it appears that the solution will be reducing the number of street trees along 25th by either one or two. Community Forestry has already agreed and due to it being a requirement for Fire safety Design Review can approve to reduce
the number of street trees. The applicant will pay into the Tree Fund for any removed trees as necessary and will have the tree situation resolved prior to issuance of building permits.

Here you can see the elevations which we can go back and discuss further during discussion as well as the colored renderings.

The applicant has agreed to all conditions in the project report except one. Condition e. reads, “All windows above the ground floor shall incorporate window trim of at least 4-inches in width that features a contrasting color”. Per the Design Review Guidelines, “Windows shall either have the 4-inches of trim or be recessed a minimum of 2-inches”. We find that the trim has a more residential feel while the recessing is a bit more modern. As such, to work with the public comments discussing the architectural style we did opt for the trim. There is a departure option for the window standards. However, no departure was directly proposed by the applicant after they were initially notified of the trim requirement. As such, staff is remaining conservative in our recommendation, but the Committee is permitted to discuss this topic and either strike or modify the condition.

We have a number of people who have signed up to give testimony on the project and as I mentioned, we have a number of written comments beforehand which are all attached to the project report.

Here you can see a summary of the main written comments and their concerns. The main concern is compatibility with the neighborhood. Staff believes the design changes present a more residential and traditional feel that compliments the single-family homes in the area while also providing a balance for the allowed and appropriate density. Concerns about density and height have also been provided. As noted, the R-3 Zone allows for higher density and increased height more than some of our other residential zones. The project is actually below in both density and height than what would be permitted on site.

There are also concerns over parking. The Multi-Family Standards allow for on-street parking immediately adjacent to development to reduce the number of required on-site parking required. As such, the site is actually providing more on-site parking than what is necessary. With the five adjacent on-street parking spaces they would only need three on-site parking spaces and they are providing five. As a reminder parking is determined by the Boise
City Zoning Code and is not within the Design Review Committee’s jurisdiction to modify.

Finally, we did receive comments about existing trees. Again, the tree mitigation plan can be found in the report. Most of the trees on-site now are not desirable and would either interfere with or be damaged by construction on this site.

Due to the public interest on the project I felt it important to highlight the limitations of the Design Review Committee per the Boise City Zoning Code for everyone’s benefit. The Committee is prohibited from requiring reduction in density, reduction in floor area ratio or other general bulk regulations outside of substandard lots unless it can be shown the project specifically harms public safety, health or destruction of property values. If during discussion the Committee wishes to modify the aforementioned elements, I ask that we have specific findings and relations to those harms.

Again, staff does recommend the approval of DRH20-00051 with the attached conditions of approval. I’m now available for any questions and I can help clarify anything during discussion.

Committee Member Semple: I did have one question regarding the 15-foot setback off of the west property line. In looking at the elevations from Bannock it appears that the majority of the massing of the building is at 10 feet. Can you, KayCee, discuss how the 15-foot setback to the third floor is being met? I think that will benefit the discussion as well as provide some more information for the public that has provided comment.

KayCee Babb: The third floor does require 15-foot setbacks versus the 10 feet for the first and second stories. So, the 15 feet is the actual living space as well as the rooftop decks. There is some roofing material that is within the 10-foot just because you have to do that with the architecture to be able to have that sloped roof versus the flat parapet design that was previously proposed. However, there is no living space or anything that we have reviewed for that 15-foot setback encroaching.

Applicant Testimony

Blane Harvey (Applicant): We are excited you are hearing this tonight. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Committee. We definitely have been through quite the process so far. Moving through the PUD process and taking public comment back and trying to find a balance on this site to still meet the neighborhood concerns while
also building a project under the approved Planning and Zoning outline for the density.

We’re relatively in agreement with everything in the report. As mentioned, we have a little bit of concern on the window trim. We would like to ask the Committee to allow us to work with staff to find a balance there. We think that it might not apply to every condition on that structure. We definitely agree with providing some contrast and blocking around those windows, but maybe in some circumstances it would not really benefit the project. It may actually hurt the project. So, that is how we’d like to see that addressed. Obviously, we can answer some questions on that. I have two examples to show you from a rendering perspective.

Secondarily, on the report the only other thing we might want to bring up is neighborhood conformity. I know it was mentioned and shown...there were a lot of pictures of adjacent properties. I think there were two properties that are within a stone’s throw away from this that are structures of at least two stories. We do have pictures of that on-site. We went through the entire West End area and documented every two-story structure in the neighborhood and plotted those for you to see that it still fits within a conforming use within the general broad sense of the neighborhood. I’m happy to bring that up and show it to you. I think I need to get pushed up so I can share a screen.

Josh Wilson: I’ll promote him to a panelist. Blane, you’ll be dropped off for just a second.

Blane Harvey: Okay, thank you. The first thing we were talking about is structures adjacent to the property. This property is directly northeast of the property. It is, as you can see, I’m standing at our property at 2502 Bannock looking northeast. You can tell this is two-story structure. Then I’ve walked up next to that gray vehicle and stood directly in front of it in the middle of street and took an additional picture to show with the dormer that there is living space up there and being used. We want to point that out that we’re not the only structure right there that is of significant mass.

The other thing I want to pull up was just the West End in general. These are just simple Google Maps...obviously Downtown, the West End, our proposed site...I’ll zoom in for a second. This is a screen shot here. I’m going to overlay the zoning. This is a C-2 Zone, this is a C-5 Zone, this is a R-3 Zone. The R-3 Zone as you can see here outlines it as a transitional zone in density and height to move into a residential component. I think that it is important to note that
anyone along all of Bannock, all of Idaho has the right to build this structure or something. That is the intent of that code, to transition from C-5 Zoning into these residential areas. Without this it really could limit…it doesn’t provide that transition and we think that we’ll see more of this continue to develop in this area in the future. I know previous sites on the Salvation Army site had some density, zoning and heights. I know that it did not make it through a PUD application, but it did have similar proposed heights to our structure, and it is located not five to seven blocks away. As far as other multi-story structures in the West End, these red dots represent every two-story structure in the West End so you can see there are plenty of examples of that. Then for non-residential structures those yellow dots represent non-residential structure in the West End. We’re obviously a residential structure, but in size and scale we think that these are a good example of the diversity within this neighborhood. It is not predominantly all single-family, one-story homes. With that, everything else in the report we definitely agree with.

Chairman Marsh: Did you say you had an exhibit that you wanted to show on windows and how you want to treat those?

Blane Harvey: I do. I can bring that up. As far as windows go, we did two options. The option to the left as you can see does not have the designated 4-inch trim that we suggested. Although we agree with some of the 4-inch trim around the windows to get a little bit more massing and blocking as you can see on the right we think sometimes that condition might not be conducive or it might need to be connected as a whole to the upper story massing. We think that what we’d like to see (inaudible) that staff wants it to accomplish.

Chairman Marsh: We had a little audio problem there, but I believe the intent of what you were saying is some consistency on the trim…your desire would be to work with staff to find an acceptable solution between both of your parties.

Blane Harvey: Correct.

Neighborhood Testimony

Lauren Pennisi (West End Neighborhood Association): I think there may be one or two other members from the neighborhood association who are on as well. Maybe I’m the spokesperson.

Josh Wilson: Jason Durand is the registered neighborhood representative. Would he like to speak?
Lauren Pennisi: He is the President, yes. I’m on the West End Neighborhood Association Board, but he is the President.

Josh Wilson: You can certainly speak as well, whatever your preference.

Jason Durand (President, West End Neighborhood Association): I’m the President, but Lauren has agreed to speak on behalf of the neighborhood association.

Lauren Pennisi (West End Neighborhood Association): I do have a little slide show with just a few slides. I think seven or eight slides. I’m used to being the host of ZOOM meetings so this is a new role for me.

I’ve lived at my residence and neighborhood for 30 years. I picked this neighborhood because it is historic and has that old timey feel. I appreciate that and I do value it.

Presentation with photos. This is a picture of the house at 2502 that I just took yesterday as a matter of fact. It is looking a little run down, but it is still a beautiful house and there is a lot of history there as there is with our entire neighborhood.

We’ve had two surveys now of the history of our neighborhood. One from the City and most recently from the State Historical Preservation organization. Both surveys have the historic value of the residences in this neighborhood and that it does have a lot of character and uniqueness. There are two surveys and a lot of noted qualities about this particular house that is going to be demolished. The neighborhood itself, as I mentioned, has a lot of history and in particular about those properties on Idaho and Bannock Street. More than 50-percent of those properties contribute to the historic district of our neighborhood which I think is very important and has been noted in Blueprint Boise that, yes, we want to do infill, but we also want to protect the history of our neighborhoods. That is an important point to focus on.

Also, in Blueprint Boise there is the talk about environment. It is one of the principals preserving the history and the historic resources of the City. Another principal and even though this project has been approved and the house is going to be demolished if there is anything we can do to salvage any part of the house or any of the structures…I don’t know if this Committee does that, but that would be something to at least entertain. The idea that mixed use or infill
projects occur in a historic neighborhood, they should still respect and be in scale with other surrounding buildings. Yes, there are two-story structures and two-story houses in this neighborhood, but there is a harmony and a compatibility with those structures.

I wanted to point this out. This is new construction on 2611 W. Woodlawn. There was a small house here that was demoed, and this is the new house that’s being constructed. This is a two-story, but it fits. It fits with the surrounding houses and it makes use of compatible materials with other homes and I think that’s important.

This is the other new construction I wanted to point out. This is a new house that’s going in at 23rd & Idaho. This was a bare lot, and this is the home that is being built. I don’t know what the finished product is going to look like, but this is at least size and scale with some of the surrounding buildings. Which here, this house faces the park. It is on the other side of Fairly Reliable Bob’s (auto sales). Also, single-story structures, but it kind of fits and I think that’s important to note.

With these five units again, the materials should be compatible with the existing homes. The pictures that staff showed, showed that most of them are single-story, very traditional looking and the designs Blane Harvey showed, while they are very nice, they are not compatible with the designs and the structures and the materials of the existing homes in neighborhood. This is why you come to this neighborhood. That is what you get when you come to this neighborhood. You want the history and that’s why you’re coming here. It is important to respect that and to ensure that we add things that are compatible. What I’ve heard from Blane Harvey and his architects is that people want this modern contemporary design, but where is the research to suggest that? I question that. I just did a Google search myself for new designs and materials that make buildings look like they’ve been there for 100 years. There is a lot of things…this must be a thing because there are a lot of articles and opportunities to do that.

There was the neighborhood input and we still have some concerns about this structure and how it is going to impact the residents who are immediately adjacent…next door I should say…across the street or across the alley. They want to make sure that it’s respectful of the surroundings and not something so contemporary to ensure there is privacy with the second and third story decks. There are concerns that people will lose the privacy of their yards because they will have people’s eyeballs looking at them. That is another concern.
In conclusion, anything new should be compatible. Again, you can use materials and design to make a new structure look and feel historic. We are losing part of the history of our neighborhood. We’re not going to get that back. The institutional design yeah, it may be what people want and may be what is all over Downtown Boise, but this is a residential neighborhood. It is still a neighborhood and it has history and it deserves to be preserved. It would also be a benefit to conform to some of the specs and principles that appear in Blueprint Boise about history and environment.

**Jason Durand:** Nothing further. I signed up to ensure the neighborhood association, at least one of us was present.

**Public Testimony**

**Brian Chojnacky:** I have a couple of comments/questions. I’ll start by saying I live not adjacent to the property, but one house removed on Bannock Street. I have lived there since 2009. I own a home. My question in is in regard to the rooftop deck of the western most unit and how that being setback 15 feet will be enough mitigation and perhaps including some of the landscaping I haven’t been made aware of. How will that mitigate the ability for the residents to peer down into, not only my backyard, but the neighbor next to me between this property and my home. That’s a question I have.

One more thing is in regard to the trees and the tree mitigation. It is my understanding that only the trees on the actual property would be removed. It seems, and I could be wrong here, that the discussion tonight is centering on more than that. So, my question is, will the trees that are currently there...these are 80 plus year old Sycamores on the public right-of-way between the sidewalk and 25th Street, be maintained and preserved or are they planning to be removed as well?

**Robert Finley:** On sign-up sheet, but not shown in attendance.

**Keeley Keating:** I live right next to that yellow house you were talking about. As much as it would be nice to have someone living up there it is really mostly attic. While it could be a bedroom, it isn’t, and it never has been. There really isn’t any three-story around here and as much as we’ve gone back and forth and as much better people than I have articulated tonight, the real point is that the third story changes the whole look and feel of the neighborhood.
While they have gone back in and looked at it, the alley, kids walk down there. I've had several parents come and talk to me about how are their kids going walk to school when all those cars that are going to be coming out? I know they've made it smaller, but that is a walkway that has been designed by the City for those children to walk to school. In the middle of the pandemic maybe they never get to again, but they want to. We want to make sure and we want to preserve this neighborhood so that they can.

My sister has owned that big old yellow house for more than 40 years. It is an amazing part of this community. In one of the other pictures you had a green and blue house on the other corner. My niece owns that. We've all moved here because this is the neighborhood, this is family. We lost one of the members of the neighborhood recently and 150 people in the middle of a pandemic came together because we are a community and we want to continue to be a community if we can. A house that doesn't fit with that community is going to change it tremendously.

Scott Shea: I am speaking from Texas. I own the property across the street at 2501 W. Bannock. It is presently leased, but I do intend, at some point, to live there myself. I submitted written opposition to the building and I'm echoing what has already been said, but I think that property is going to stick out like a sore thumb in our neighborhood. The neighborhood is primarily Cottage Bungalow style. This is the first multi-unit to this extent. It is going to signify a change in this neighborhood for this development to go in. What is going to happen is the other properties will be bought by developers with further multi-units coming in and it is going to change that block. It is not going to be immediate, but it is going to happen, and this is where it will start.

What I would like is to have some structure put in there that matches the rest of that block so that it has its same ambience and charm preserved. If we allow this in it is going to signify the first of many more in the future and the charm and ambience of that historic block will be lost. I intend on living there myself or at least that is what I had intended on doing, but if I have to look at a large structure across the street it is going to detract from the feel and atmosphere that I wanted to have there. That is why I bought the property across the street to begin with. That's all I have to say. I'm basically repeating what the neighbors who live there believe.

Lanna Mclean: I live across the street from the adjacent property that is going up. I agree totally with all the ones that agree. We do not want a three-story apartment building across. We want
something that fits into our neighborhood. My husband’s mom and dad built the house we live in. We just need to preserve this neighborhood.

**Applicant Rebuttal**

**Blane Harvey**: I appreciate the time to address comments that were mentioned. I think they definitely pointed out some neighborhood characteristics, but I would like to remind the Committee that at this time there is no historical designation at all for this portion of the City. Whether an application or a survey has been complete, nothing currently exists. As far as the other comments I felt most of those were zoning issues and not Design Review or the Design Review Committee issues.

Brian brought up a potential for screening from a privacy issue on the neighbors. Landscaping requirements have been implemented under your design review stipulations for landscaping on the fence, an additional divider fence along the front setback and then ensuring that we meet the proper 15-foot setback on the rooftop deck or patio structure up there which should not allow someone standing there to peer over the edge of that structure. It should give a blocked sight line at that point. Now, if someone is leaning over the rail or getting around the corner, I can’t stop that, but architecturally I think we’ve solved that concern.

He also brought up the Sycamore in the right-of-way might be removed. To my knowledge and unless Fire requires that in no way would we want to remove that tree. That tree is gorgeous, and we like it a lot. We think it is a great aesthetic to the site. I think Fire has gave comment that they might require a tree to be removed in the right-of-way on Bannock. Presently there are not trees there. We are proposing planting three new trees there, but if Fire stipulates that we can only do two then we’ll just pay into the tree fund for any caliper we need to replace.

To the lady that commented about access and walkability. I think the alleys are meant to serve vehicles not pedestrians. I would employ her to use the sidewalks that are provided.

I know Scott Shea had a concern on the cross street. He made a comment that this would be the first multi-unit in the area. Scott Shea’s building is a multi-unit building and in fact there are multi-units adjacent to our property at 2501, 2509 and 2425 W. Bannock.
That’s all we have, and we appreciate it and hope to answer any other questions.

Public Portion Closed

Committee MemberSemple: I wanted to make a couple of comments specifically about the neighborhood. I can understand the concern about the massing of the project in terms of what is already there compared to what is being proposed, but in looking at the design of this building or these homes, they are below the allowed height in R-1C even of 35 feet or at really any residential zone of 35 feet. As was stated at the beginning we’re not looking at the height of it. I wanted to point that out. It is at 32 feet and a single-family home can be built in R-3 here at 45 feet if they wanted to. It appears from the elevations they are at 32 feet plus a few inches. It seems that the height is really close to existing buildings there.

I know I heard one of the neighbors talk about or mention an apartment, but as far as I can tell this is shown as a condominium project which is a for-sale product which hopefully encourages or provides additional residents that want to live in the West End to buy a unit and to live there. I personally rent in Boise right now so living in the West End is a very desirable neighborhood. I’ve looked there to try to purchase a home as well. I think that additional housing in this area and this was probably addressed at Planning and Zoning as well, it encourages additional residents who want to become members of this community and members of this neighborhood to live in that space.

The landscaping…obviously anything that is removed from the right-of-way has to be mitigated for substantially. It doesn’t appear that anything in the conditions of approval or any comment from any of the other agencies would require the removal of that existing Sycamore. I did see a chat from Brian that talked about two. I can only see one Sycamore on 25th that is between the alley and Bannock and based on the applicant’s discussion, they don’t intend to remove that. I don’t think, unless it was required by Fire, it sounds like it would be removed.

I commend the applicant for going back through the process to reduce the number of units. I think that shows a lot of effort on his part to try to fit in, as well as modify the design to provide some pitched roofs rather than a very modern design from before with the flat roofs. In terms of the design I think it fits. Those are my comments on it right now.
Committee Member Zuckerman: I concur. I didn’t think the original plan fit in very well with the neighborhood but looking at the pitched roofs and seeing that the five-unit building looks like it really only has three-units makes it work much better with that neighborhood.

I also agree that because this is a for-sale project it should be a great addition to the neighborhood. It’s not that kind of condominium building were people have to go down the elevator into a lobby. It addresses the street and will bring people onto the sidewalk which will only compliment the energy of the neighborhood. It is one of those things that is jarring if you’ve lived in a single-family home on that block or on an adjacent block, but within a year or two it will blend right into the rest of the neighborhood and no one will think twice about it.

I also want to address what one of the neighbors said about looking at materials and designs that can make a new building look like a historic building. That is the worst thing you could possibly do is to try to build something and pretend it is 100 years old or pretend that it is historic. That rarely works well. What works well is what this developer is proposing. To use design elements that echo the surrounding buildings and the pitched roofs accomplish that quite well.

Committee Member Zabala: I concur with Committee Members Semple and Zuckerman on their comments.

I do appreciate the sincerity of the neighbors and the neighborhood for what they have. I do think that there are still plenty of opportunities there for people interested in the existing type of housing in that area. As time goes on and families change and dying move out there will others that come in to take the opportunity to rehab and refinish that existing stock of homes there.

I also do appreciate the effort that the applicant has gone through in listening to the neighbors. As we looked at the progression of the design to what it is now today, they have done a pretty admirable job.

The for-sale units will be approximately 2,600 square feet each with three-bedrooms and the necessary baths and areas so these will not be inexpensive units to purchase at that point and time. They are going to be invested in that property initially and going down the road.
They’ve done a good job and I think the remaining items as far as the window trim, working through the landscape with the screening issues that will continue to be reviewed by staff will fine tune the project to where, as was indicated over time, it will be an asset to the neighborhood that initially will just take some getting used to.

Chairman Marsh:  It looks like there is a good consensus for support of this. We can certainly entertain a motion on it. A question for Committee Member Zabala, is there any concern or need to adjust the requirements on the window trim or do you support it as is in the project report?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA MOVED TO APPROVE DRH20-00051 AS RECOMMENDED IN THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS NOTED IN THE PROJECT REPORT WITH THE ADDITION OF ONE SENTENCE TO ITEM 1.E., IN THE SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS THAT INDICATES, “THE APPLICANT SHALL REVIEW POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO THE WINDOW TRIM WITH STAFF FOR APPROPRIATE APPROVAL PRIOR TO THE SUBMITTAL FOR BUILDING PERMITS”.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZUCKERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Committee Member Semple: Just one added thing, and I don’t think it needs to be a condition of approval because I think the conditions cover it pretty well, but I would encourage the applicant to work real closely, especially with the neighbor to the west adjacent or the two neighbors to the west that were concerned about privacy, to maybe look at the plant selections that they’ve used along that western property line for the buffer and maybe incorporate some other taller columnar evergreens specifically back towards the rear where that roof top deck is to provide and extra level…I know there is a wall there that he’d talked about that will provide some screening, but I think that’s one thing that could go a long way.

In looking through the comments from the neighbor adjacent to the west they had some concern about a couple trees that are in their yard. So, just to work closely with them or at least consult with them about where some of those plants are going to go so it doesn’t create an issue in the future with the growth of those plants and hopefully not impacting as well as being able to provide that screening that they are looking for.
Chairman Marsh: Good points Committee Member Semple. Any other comments or discussion on the motion? None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Thomas Zabala, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Dana Zuckerman, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Marsh, Aguilar, Zabala, Talboy, Semple, Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>David Rudeen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **DRH20-00105 / Jeff Likes, ALC Architecture**  
   Location: 11449 W. Ustick Road  
   Construct a 15-unit, three-story multi-family residential building with associated site improvements in a R-2D (Medium Density Residential with Design Review) zone.

   **Josh Wilson:** Presented project report with recommendation to approve.

   **Committee Member Zuckerman:** Indicated she is not clear on the slatted rooflines and how they and the modern semi-contemporary design echoes anything about the original Ustick site.

   **Josh Wilson:** Stated the applicant tried to pull elements from the single-story white brick buildings that front onto Ustick to pay homage adding if the Ustick Townsite buildings were truly mimicked this would be a white brick box.

**Applicant Testimony**

**Jeff Likes (ALC Architecture):** In agreement with the project report. They had meetings with neighborhood to go over design elements. Understands they have concerns. One being the railings. Noted railings will be black aluminum with an opaque or frost glass panel which will not allow people to see onto the patios.

Added another point of discussion were the colors. They agree to work with staff on modifying the colors prior to building permits noting they have worked with neighbors on a few color options.

Addressed Committee Member Zuckerman question on paying homage to the townsite stating they tried to bring in elements from the single-story parapet type, all white brick painted buildings. Noted they are also dealing a Planned Unit Development which was approved, but with a 35-foot max height they are limited so the low slope roofs help that work. Tried to bring in generic forms with
masonry across bottom with typical stucco and corbels across the top to help mimic some of the general forms of the Ustick area.

**Committee Member Zabala:** Asked applicant how they envision the mechanical units on site and around building.

**Jeff Likes:** Stated they have mechanical room that runs the three stories. Will also have mechanical wells on top of some of the taller units. Added there are some storage rooms, a fire riser room and a com room that will run the full three stories so they can use those to put the mechanical units in noting most will be up a well behind low sloped roofs and it is a mini split system for the units.

**Committee Member Zuckerman:** Asked if these is a reason the center of building is shorter than the rest of the building and the other two massings adding, to her, it looks a bit messing especially if they’re trying to pay homage to the white brick box.

**Jeff Likes:** Stated they looked at multiple elevation types and styles. With creating one plane across there it became large and not in the residential style and too big for the neighborhood and neighbors, so they opted to lower the one to help bring it down to pedestrian level.

**Neighborhood Association Testimony**

**Judy Herman (West Valley Neighborhood Association Representative):** Appealed Planning & Zoning’s decision to Council and surprised this is allowed to move forward.

Shared concerns with transportation issues in the area that they feel will arise from this. Added Shamrock is not a thorough street and that it is a City designated bicycle path and a pedestrian walking path to Redwood Park.

Not opposed to development on this lot, but feel they need to look at appropriate development with main concerns being the size of the lot and the huge project being incompatible with the neighborhood. Stated Council Member Clegg allowed them some input into the design noting this is not the original design, so it is an improvement. Asked for gabled roofs, but due to height requirements those were not allowed.

Not appropriate for a historical area stating they have a beautification project for Ustick which was incorporated as a town in 1907 with the Interurban Trolley running down Ustick Road.
Shared the City has invested $170,000 in neighborhood reinvestment grants in the last five years for landscaping on Ustick Road. Currently in Phase II of project and working with Arts and History for historical sculptures, artwork and signage adding the City has put up $60,000 for the historical interpretive display of the Ustick Townsite. Stated she and several of her neighbors have spent 1,000 hours of volunteer time on the project.

Had hoped not to have an apartment complex noting these are rentals and not for purchase adding the neighborhood opposes this project, but are trying to work with the City and the architect to get something that fits into the neighborhood that doesn’t compromise the work they have done to restore the historical integrity of the Ustick Townsite.

Committee Member Zuckerman: Stated she wanted to be clear what the Committee’s purview is adding they are listening to the transportation and zoning issues, but noted they are outside of the Committee’s jurisdiction.

Judy Herman: Understands and appreciates this. Stated they had worked with Jeff and he has been cooperative with the neighborhood.

Asked Josh to share the drawing of patios on the apartment complex up the street that show what type of items are being placed on patios. Concerned this will happen here.

Landscaping on Ustick was installed by Ustick Beautification project noting there are no trees on the south side. Requested that the applicants put some trees in their landscape barrier on the north side of Ustick that would match their existing landscaping and offer more of a barrier for neighbors.

No Public Testimony

Applicant Rebuttal

Jeff Likes: Addressed some of Judy Herman’s questions stating they tried to do gable roofs but were restricted.

Added their landscape plan is to have about six or seven trees along Ustick but has questions as to where on Ustick Judy suggests they put the trees as he is not entirely sure. Asked for clarification. Noted they are heavily landscaped with quite a few trees at the corner and three along Shamrock.
Propose opaque panels to address concerns with what tenants would put on porches.

**Public Portion Closed**

**Committee Member Semple:** Feels the applicant has done a great job working with neighborhood adding the general vicinity has an existing apartment and this palate matches that well. Adding those have gabled roofs but also have taller towers on the corners of the entry.

Based on his experience with landscaping he believes what the neighborhood association representative meant were trees in the planter strip between the sidewalk and road as it appears to be what has happened in terms of treatment on the north side of Ustick. Noted there is a major Idaho Power transmission line that runs on the south side of Ustick which appears to prohibit street trees within Idaho Power’s specific setback from the power line. Feels the applicant is addressing tree locations within the site due to this restriction.

Added in general the project is attractive, provides housing opportunities, uses in the area, and will hopefully get people here that will be part of this community again. Feels growing communities with a variety of different uses, building and appearances is good and likes the project.

**Chairman Marsh:** Asked if the Committee had concerns with semi-opaque versus fully opaque panels. Stated there are other projects that have these same panels and if items are pressed on the back side of them you can still see through the panels to a certain degree. Only concern with going to a fully opaque panel would be that it contributes to the mass of the building. Feels semi-opaque material is a better solution and makes the building a bit more shallow.

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA MOVED TO APPROVE DRH20-00105 AS RECOMMENDED IN THE FINDING OF FACTS, CONDITIONS OF LAW AND RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS NOTED IN THE PROJECT REPORT WITH THE MODIFICATION OF CONDITION 1.h. IN THE SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS, “THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT DETAILS THAT DEMONSTRATE THE LOCATIONS AND ADEQUATE SCREENING OF ALL MECHANICAL UNITS AND ELECTRICAL GAS METERS FOR STAFF APPROVAL.”**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [4 TO 1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Thomas Zabala, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Ben Semple, Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>James Marsh, Thomas Zabala, Robert W. Talboy, Ben Semple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS:</td>
<td>Jessica Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Dana Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>David Rudeen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. ADJOURNMENT