



Planning & Development Services

Boise City Hall, 2nd Floor
150 N. Capitol Boulevard
P. O. Box 500
Boise, Idaho 83701-0500

Phone: 208/384-3830
Fax: 208/384-3753
TDD/TTY: 800/377-3529
Website: www.cityofboise.org/pds

Design Review Committee Hearing Minutes of April 11, 2007

Committee Members Present Franklin Lee, Chairman; Robyn Salathe, Steve Christiansen, Michael Simmonds, and Elissa Flandro

Staff Members Present Sarah Schafer, Pat Riceci, Greg Johnson, Josh Wilson and Paula Schmidt

Consent Agenda

DRH07-00078/ CATE IDAHO EQUIPMENT CO.

Location: 6418 W. Gowen Road

REQUEST APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A WAREHOUSE BUILDING FOR HEAVY EQUIPMENT SALES IN AN M-1D (LIMITED INDUSTRIAL WITH DESIGN REVIEW) ZONE.

DRH07-00108/ DAVE EVANS CONSTRUCTION

Location: 1449 S. David Lane

REQUEST APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ONE AND A HALF STORY, OFFICE BUILDING IN AN L-OD (LIMITED OFFICE WITH DESIGN REVIEW) ZONE

DRH07-00109/ DAVE EVANS CONSTRUCTION

Location: 1880 W. Judith Lane

REQUEST APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY, OFFICE BUILDING IN AN L-OD (LIMITED OFFICE WITH DESIGN REVIEW) ZONE.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE MOVES TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS LISTED ABOVE BASED ON FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CHRISTIANSEN SECONDS THE MOTION.

CHAIRMAN LEE RECUSES HIMSELF FROM A VOTE ON DRH07-00108 AND DRH07-00109 AS THE APPLICANTS ARE CLIENTS OF HIS FIRM.

MOTION CARRIES.

Deferrals

DRH06-00517/ ASPEN DEVELOPMENT LLC

Location: 1575 S. Clear Creek Drive

REQUEST APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT AN APPROX. 4,700 SQ. FT. OFFICE BUILDING AND AN APPROX. 4,700 SQ. FT. DAYCARE IN AN N-OD (NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICE WITH DESIGN REVIEW) ZONE.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE MOVES TO DEFER DRH06-00517 TO THE MAY 9, 2007 REGULARLY SCHEDULED DESIGN REVIEW HEARING.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CHRISTIANSEN SECONDS THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES.

DRH07-00107/ BENCO PROPERTIES LLC

Location: 8189 W. Overland Road

REQUEST APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-STORY, OFFICE BUILDING IN AN N-OD (NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICE WITH DESIGN REVIEW) ZONE.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE MOVES TO DEFER DRH07-00107 TO THE JUNE 13, 2007 REGULARLY SCHEDULED DESIGN REVIEW HEARING.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CHRISTIANSEN SECONDS THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES.

Regular Agenda

DRH07-00021/ NEIGHBORS OF 1805 GOURLEY STREET

Location: 1821 Gourley Street

APPEAL OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR'S DECISION TO APPROVE THREE, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS ON THREE, CONTIGUOUS SUBSTANDARD LOTS IN AN R-1C (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE.

JOSH WILSON PRESENTS THE STAFF REPORT INCLUDING A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE IMPACTING THIS PROJECT.

Melissa Saunders / 1810 Gourley / Boise, ID: I have some pictures that I am going to take over to Josh, is that all right? Will all those who join me in this opposition stand up? I have lived there for 32 years. I live across the street from the 1805 project. Your findings state that the project is compatible with the surrounding dwellings but I will show you that this is not the case. These homes face Gourley Street and as you can see, they are not eclectic but they are all single level homes and the majority of these homes have basements. We all have large lots and we all have manicured yards and there is no parking on the streets. (Second photo) The second photo is both lines of homes on either side of Gourley Street and we have inserted the one with the blue sky was the home that was demolished. This home that was demolished was the original farm house on the acreage that encompassed the Eagleson Park Addition. This home was built in 1933 and being a single story home with a partial basement it did compliment the neighborhood and as you can see just to the right of the insert you see the two story duplex that was built behind the yellow home which is 1801 Gourley Street. This was an infill that took place a couple of years ago and the owner of the home since then has sold the home and that home at 1801 is now a rental. If you look at all of these homes you see that the roof lines are all compatible, all large lots, we have more than five feet between

each home. The driveways are off of Gourley Street into a garage so there is no street parking. The residents are non-transient and we are all well established. We have a very unique neighborhood here as most of the residents have lived there from ten up to fifty years. (Third photo) I have just inserted the project at 1805 of the three homes in that lot. You can see that they are all two story and they have a two story roofline and they invade on the privacy of the home at 1821, they all have small yards; there is no Gourley Street driveway; there is no garage off of Gourley; they have detached garages with alley access in the back and historically, alley access garages have been unsuccessful. I spoke with Velda Shaw and she has lived at her home on Shoshone Street since 1948. She said that approximately 50 years ago her neighbor built a detached garage with alley access. At the time the owners drove a small vehicle, they called it an Austin Healey and they ended up not using the garage because the turning radius off of the entry of the garage was too small. They then made that garage into a one bedroom apartment for their Son and it eventually became a rental and street parking resumed and you can see the outcome of the detached garage right now. The 1805 project does not capture the elements of the existing older homes in our neighborhood. Building three infill homes on these substandard lots would remove the historical implication of these pre and post World War II structures, the impact on the 1800 block and the impact of the 1800 block in a negative manner. This project creates an incompatible design, loss of privacy, increased traffic, increased street parking which can impact safety of pedestrians, and eventually as we have noticed with a large majority of the infill homes now they have become rentals. That is something that we do not want to have happen to our neighborhood.

Paula Spang / 1821 S. Gourley / Boise, ID: I have been there 11 years. I am only the third owner of the house, it was built in 1947 and it is on the southern edge of the 1805 project. The house next to mine, the proposed house is called the Four Square. It has the eight foot setbacks and what not. I am going to talk about Guideline Standard Number 1 in the Code. It does in deed discourage full length two story houses and the circumstances to be taken into consideration on whether or not to allow a two story house are these: 1) the size and the height of the adjacent dwellings. That was clearly stated by my friend Melissa. I think she made a good case that they do not match with the height of the adjacent dwellings. (Second picture) This is the side of the house that will be mostly affected. I tried to build a crude fence so that you could see exactly how close this house will be to my property. The next consideration under Guideline Standard Number 1 is that excessive shading of the adjacent units; if I have an 18 foot tall house next to my house that will cause excessive shading. The windows along the house line looking into the most used room of the house which is the family living room. We depend on them for light in that room and I know it is not much of a lawn, but there is a five foot strip of lawn that will not be able to survive. The next issue would be privacy impacts on the adjacent yards. I know that the intent was to design the house so that to mitigate the issue but the windows on the upper level and the lower level are large, they are much larger and they run the full length of the stories. The fourth thing to consider is mass height of window placement and design; the rooflines have to be flattened in order to reach the 18 foot midline requirement. That in and of itself increases the mass of the house, you can't do anything but that. Further adding to the mass, the setbacks are 20 feet for the proposed units. The setback at 1821 Gourley is 26 feet, therefore the Four Square will stick out five feet beyond the front of my home which absolutely adds to the mass of that house. The Four Square does not take into consideration the design of 1821 in any way. I think if you take a look at...there are 19 feet of windows along the edge of the house, they are three feet in height and they are 4-1/2 feet off of the ground. Again that is a living area and if you are sitting on the opposite wall where the couch is, without going to too much detail, your angle of sight is up. It is elevated quite substantially. It is not level at all. (Picture #3) On top of that we have compared the site of Four Square. So you can see again, the size of the windows are quite large and will actually impact the side view from my house. We will be able to look at each other quite easily. I know that the top level and the bottom level are both supposed to be bedrooms, again the privacy is, because of the angle of the window, the eight foot setback for privacy reasons, it doesn't accomplish what it was intended to accomplish. Regardless of the height of the house whether it is a story and a half or two stories the issues remain. (Picture #4) Finally these are neighborhood constructions that are happening up on the Bench in our area. These are examples of construction on Sunday. The building on top is 2006 Arcadia where there was a nail gun being used at

noon and the other is at 12:30 on Ona Street and that generator was running quite loudly. We are concerned with what the builder's intentions are for hours of construction and that is all I have.

Marney Hauser / 1824 S. Gourley / Boise, ID: It is on the corner of Gourley and Spaulding I am right across the street and three houses up from this, it will be facing my house. We have lived in the neighborhood since 1994. We are the second owners of this home, which was built in the 40's. The bottom picture there is a picture from Nez Perce up our street. You notice the streets are...there is no parking along the street. The top is just a few blocks down where some more of this infill went in and there is a lot of traffic parking on the street up there. That is one of our major concerns. I am concerned mainly with the parking and the utilities, the access. The power lines, the utilities, they all run down the alley way. The alleys look like they have a lot of room but when you actually try to pull into these garages it is very difficult. I have tried to do it myself and I drive a Jeep Cherokee, I tried to pull in beside another car inside the garage and I couldn't do it. I thought maybe there was something wrong with me and I kept wheedling and wheedling and I just couldn't get into it, so I pulled around front where I parked. The trash pick-up is also in the alley way, so on trash day those trash cans are going to be sitting out there about two to three feet from the fence line where they will get hit or knocked over or parked in front of where if anybody is parking in that alley the trash company won't even go down the alley. They will just skip the whole alley and won't pick-up any trash. That happens in the front and that has happened to me before. People park in front of the trash cans, they just drive right by. I have had to apologize to the resident for parking in front of their trash because now they have to sit there for another week. The Post Office has also stated that they will not deliver if there is an obstacle and they are in the middle of moving all of our post office boxes out to the street as they improve with sidewalks and curb and gutter they will do that and any car that is parked along the street will they just drive right by they won't deliver the mail. According to the Idaho Automobile Association, the best selling vehicles in Idaho are large pick-up trucks and according to the car and driver.com the average length of a large truck is 18 feet. I had trouble pulling a Jeep Grand Cherokee into these garages. My husband's truck, he couldn't even try it. The apron is set, I believe they said 12 feet. So if they can't park in the garage there is no where for them to park on that setback, they will go out front and park in front of their house or the neighbor's house, because there will only be room for one car in front of each home. This is a picture all of the cars parked along and also there is no sidewalks. As you have noticed on the picture Whitney Elementary is three blocks away from this. South Junior High is also close and all of these children in the neighborhood walk to school. They walk down the middle of the street because there are no sidewalks. With the cars there it does provide a very serious concern to me for my children to walk down the street. This has been a real problem with the house on the corner. This is the house on the corner, the house to the north of the proposed development. This is a rental and they don't use their garage because it is not big enough. Most of them drive trucks and there are usually 4 to 5 vehicles parked in front and down the street. My fear is that the same thing will happen with these other three which will bring it right down the full length of the block.

Susan Donnelly / 1816 Gourley Street / Boise, ID: I have called 1816 Gourley Street my home for 55 years. The four neighbors that spoke and one other, we all share a combined total of 136 years living in this neighborhood, paying property taxes at the same addresses. We believe the proposal for the three family dwellings at 1805 Gourley is flawed in its planning with respect to design, parking and privacy. The reference guidelines standards No. 1 states: The proposed structures are two stories in height and have utilized design features to insure compatibility with the surrounding dwellings. None of us certainly agree with that statement. Homes in this neighborhood as you have seen are all single level, ranch style homes with garage access in the front of the street. All of our homes are set back at least 35 feet from the street to as much as 60 feet with spacious yards, meticulously maintained. The new homes proposed will be about 20 feet from the street. Five mature trees are going to be removed and they are going to be replaced with starter landscaping. We are not opposed to progress in our neighborhood and we do understand that it is coming, but we support progress that is going to enhance our neighborhood while maintaining original historical values. Building without any regard to our neighborhood concerns, using economic as a motivation for that building is something that we strongly oppose. A builder one street over from Gourley on Hervey built a little infill house (Josh if you could pull that up) that is using a driveway off of the main

street, not an alley way entrance. We would like to see this builder come back to our neighborhood and to you all with some designs that would be acceptable to maintain the integrity of our neighborhood as well as some of the historical traditional values.

Committee Member Salathe: As far as having a front loaded garage or an alley garage, it sounds like you would prefer to have a street loaded garage?

Ms. Donnelly: Correct.

Committee Member Salathe: Are there any other garages that come off of the street on your street?

Ms. Donnelly: All of our garages, everybody drives in off of our main street on Gourley, yes.

Committee Member Salathe: Josh could I see some other pictures. I wasn't paying attention necessarily to that I was looking at the height, are most of the garages single car or double car?

Ms. Donnelly: Mine is a single. Probably in the old days it could have been a double, my Mom and Dad probably squeezed two cars in but I can't.

Committee Member Salathe: Are most of the homes with a car in the garage and one in the driveway?

Ms. Donnelly: Yes.

Susan Pisani / 1809 Hervey /Boise: I am here for the Vista Neighborhood Association. I wasn't here to testify but I have been listening to some of this and some of the things that I would like to say is; #1) I do commend them on the design. This is much better than what we have been getting in the neighborhood, so I do applaud that, but one of the issues that we are facing; we have had over 90 of these substandard houses built in our neighborhood. The majority of them are rentals and many of them are rented to college students as is the case on Lemhi. We have had 12 to 14 of these substandard units built and one of the neighbors who lives across the street from one of them that has been sold or is rented to college students no longer has mail pick-up or trash delivery. She has had to rent a PO Box. The Post Office will no longer deliver to her. This is a problem that we are facing with these smaller homes is the City's allowance for two parking spaces is simply not adequate. Especially when you are looking at a three bedroom home and you figure that many of these turn into rentals. We are looking at more and more people than what the capacity can handle. One of the things and I am not sure of my facts on this and I see you have an attorney over there, but it is my understanding that the Idaho Supreme Court made a ruling that even though these folks have a right to build on these properties they do not have the right to pose an undue burden on existing neighbors. I guess what I would like to ask you to consider, it is my understanding that the City Legal Staff is reviewing the Idaho Supreme Court decision. We would like to ask you to defer your decision until the City has made a decision on what their interpretation is of the Supreme Court's ruling.

Marilyn Frazier / 1730 Gourley Street / Boise: I could be looking at these houses kitty-corner from my house. We take pride in our neighborhoods. It is our home where we spend time, raise our families, visit with our grandchildren, eat, sleep, garden, entertain and dream. We like how it looks when we drive down the street. We like the aesthetics. It is an older neighborhood like many of us and has a good history. The lawns are green in the summer, well maintained, the gardens finely tended. The trees are large. Now someone wants to put an albatross in the middle of this lovely neighborhood. Three new houses pushed closely together, too tall for the landscape jutting out above the rooftops of the older homes on the block, out of character with the neighborhood. In some areas of the Boise Bench these other homes have been an improvement to the neighborhood but not here. The Planner for the City of Boise, the builders, the developers, the neighbors should all have a say in the new developments. When the change is so out of character to a nice neighborhood, the people who live there should have a major influence on the decision. The planners move on to a new project. Builders and developers go to the bank with money in their

pockets, but the people on Gourley Street will stay. Please look at the issue very carefully when you choose the fate of this neighborhood.

Janet Perkins / 1711 Gourley Street / Boise: I went for a walk tonight and just from Overland to Targhee, which is about 5 to 6 blocks we already have 12 infill houses. If you add three more which is 15 it changes the whole entire look of that street. It is going to look like row houses in no time at all. You are taking away our neighborhood and I am questioning that every time a property goes up for sale we are going to have the same issue because that seems to be happening. We have also got, it is not on the agenda, but there is open block at Gourley and Palouse that is going to have some sort of a development of this nature, so I am sure that is going to come up soon.

JOSH WILSON READS AN EMAIL THAT HE RECEIVED TODAY (5/9/07):

From: Bill Weber To: Josh Wilson. Dear Josh, I am writing to oppose the construction of three houses on 1821 Gourley Street. There are several concerns as to why this would be detrimental to myself my neighbors and the Vista Neighborhood traffic. With the construction of three houses it will be at least three possibly more than six more cars driving past my home several times a day. With the close proximity to Whitney elementary this is a potential hazard to school children. Parking; Building 15 foot wide homes on these substandard lots only allows for a one car garage which may or may not house a car in the driveway. If this is a front loading parking garage and there are no curbs and sidewalks. This allows the occupants new and creative ways to park their vehicles. This is also dangerous for children who will be forced to walk in the street to pass by these cars. Aesthetics; three long skinny monoliths will look out of place surrounded by single level homes and speaking of look out, the new inhabitants will have the opportunity to look out on their new neighbors backyards from their windows. Is the thought of privacy considered before the planning directors approve these plans? The children; many City Officials use the saying, "Children are our future". If that is the case they are not giving the children much thought. Any of these new houses will be priced as starter homes meaning that they will be affordable to young families, families with children. I am not sure how the children are going to play baseball or football on these postage stamp sized yards or the five foot wide side yards. This will force the children to play at the nearest school or at the nearest park, ten blocks away out of the protective eye of Mom. Maybe Mom can watch them play in the street. City Council Woman Mary Ann Jordan recently spoke at a Vista Neighborhood Meeting and was very happy to inform us of a new community center that will soon open in our neighborhood. This is a wonderful opportunity for all of the children with no yard of their own to play. I thank you the opportunity to have my concerns voiced. Respectfully, Bill Weber, 1703 Gourley Street.

Evelyn Grime (applicant) / 720 Idaho Street, #38 / Boise, ID: I am the designer and the planner for the project. Dave Aingers and Judy Aingers are my clients. I wonder if it please the Committee if I could use Staff's podium please? I would like to walk you through our process and the things that we did that are (I am going to leave the technical skills to Josh). What I would like to start with is an aerial photograph to help address some things. First I do appreciate the neighbors coming out. We sent out our letter and I received a call from Melissa and they said they were going to have a meeting to talk about this and I offered to come. We sat down and they shared about an hour and a half of their time with me. I think the predominant concern voiced at that time was to do two homes instead of three and then trying to talk about the architecture and the look of the front of the homes. Again I appreciate everybody's time and I certainly understand their concerns. For this project I would like to point out a few other things, however background wise we are in an R-1C Zone and if you look at this in that context a bit when we talk about services and utilities and density and the health and growth of the neighborhood, long term. This one half of the block is about an acre, it is .99 and this one half of the block is about the same size. So with these three homes, this is a duplex, this two story here is a duplex according to these records. If you were to count all of these homes that would be 9 units. On this side of the block these are four lots four homes, this lot has been recently demolished and I don't know what is happening there, but I would like to point out that if this was an acre and our goal is eight units per acre and duplexes are allowed in an R-1C Zone regardless of density, we are achieving our goal density by looking at some of these infill projects. Also,

Mr. Simmonds had a question earlier about the garage to the north and the setback from the existing property line. I do not know what it is, but I do know that if a detached accessory garage, less than 500 sq. ft. it can be three feet from the property line. I don't think it is out of compliance. I also wanted to clarify a few conceptions. Our setback from Paula Spang's residence to the north there is actually a six foot setback and then a seven and a half foot section of one story building, so it is a total distance is closer to 13 feet and I think there is an impression that it is eight feet away from the property line. That is not quite true. That second story element is in fact 13 feet away from the property line and I think it helps make a difference. We talk about shadowing, generally a southern exposure term, but when talk about looming over your neighbor, was to step the building away from Ms. Spang's residence and to finish that concept, just to show a difference; the first lot is 35 and 1/2 feet wide. These two lots are 25 feet wide. We have the option to adjust those property lines. Maybe make each lot the same, but we felt that with the northern lot, this having a detached garage here and quite a bit of separation from the actual residence, do this under current approved standards for the one and a half story structure was approved and the roofline appropriate and then utilize the full width of this parcel to help make this a wider structure and also help the elements to move it away from Paula Spang's residence. So if we look at the front elevation, this is a study and it is rudimentary but, as a study one and a half story with the second floor predominantly within the roof area could also achieved this way. This a three foot D Wall with a roof slope and this is the same width that we are proposing for our one to two story building. This would be a one and a half story building. So if you change roofline to that idea of predominantly within the roof slope I think you are actually moving the mass of the structure towards her home rather than a little more defined distance. During the review process Josh did bring up some other privacy concerns. We honestly feel we have adjusted the windows facing her home so that they don't conflict with her living room windows as much as possible. The size of those windows are 30X50 windows and that is the minimum egress size from a bedroom for a single hung window and we think a single hung window is a much nicer character than some of the sliding windows. So those are some of the thoughts behind the decisions that we made. While we are discussing that four-square home, I would also like to show you a shadow study of the face of it. This is just a light study but I would like to point out that on the second floor element as well we have a nested porch. This nested porch is five feet deep. Paula Spang's residence is to my left. This main floor porch is an L shaped porch which is very deep on this side as well. It is hard to depict this in a front elevation but I think this elevation from this corner is very three dimensional and there are a lot of void spaces in there that would break it up rather than being this looming wall that comes to the street, there is a lot of open space within the porches that counteract the height of this and the width of this. When we talk about the existing front setbacks of these homes, there is modulation on these homes up to, it seems to me more like six to seven feet as they move down the street and we have set ours at about 20 feet but we also modulate five feet between homes as well that I think reiterates a pattern that is already existing between this home and this home and this home. I think it also breaks up the sense of this wall of three homes in the same place. When we talk about child safety and pedestrian safety that takes us into parking; we will be required to put in curb sidewalk and gutter as part of the project. We are suggesting that we do detached sidewalk to help emphasize safety between the street and establish a pattern as the rest of the block develops that will have planter strips along the sidewalks and the street. When we talk about parking, these lots are 125 feet deep. We certainly have some flexibility here because these lots are large enough where we can meet our outdoor required open space and have slightly deeper garages than what the minimum is required, which is helpful. Right now we are showing a 12 foot apron with a 15 foot alley. A minimum apron size, if we were just going to go by code would be seven feet, but I was just talking to Dave here this evening, we could move this to a three foot additional on the apron which would put it at 15 feet. That is the same size as a compact parking space per City Code which helps people pull in behind the garage to those turning radiuses but then also provides parking for those additional cars. Again, to point out that separation issue, I am showing the setback line at five feet, but the home is actually set at six feet and I obviously didn't make that clear enough in my application to Josh. Then you have got the additional seven and a half feet right here. When we look at privacy issues on the north side this wall plane doesn't have very many windows and part of that was this idea of privacy not only to this residence but somewhat to this direction. You are still up on a second floor. You are going to see in your backyard and you are going to see in other's backyards, however part of this design also moved master bedrooms in these two homes to the rear with the idea of when are you in your

bedroom, number one, but then generally as either a parent or an adult how much time do we have there during daylight hours. I think it is a better place for privacy issues, not only for the home owner but also for neighbors. In this four square, this one story plane gives us the flexibility to put a master suite on the main floor as well as to have bedrooms upstairs. I think it is difficult to come into a neighborhood which is used to wide open lots, I live in one myself and design that same type of a wide low slung home on a lot that is not low and wide slung. So there are two ways to approach that design you look at the neighborhood in a larger radius and in that larger radius, yes most everything here seems like a 900 to 1,500 square foot single story home with basements, some of those basements are raised. Melissa has a beautiful home and it is larger, it is this one, correct? But she has enough of a width of a lot to have a very large home. If I am moving in with my family, I need three bedrooms, I need the square footage, otherwise I can't really live there. The size of the yard, I just have to point back to my own personal experience, and my yard where my kids play is actually larger than my house and it is about 900 square feet. So when you look at the size of the yard for these spaces, I think it is a usable playable yard. For football I am not going to want that in my backyard anyway because I don't want to have to repair the windows. It is a concern that doesn't mean that these homes aren't livable for families. I am just going in a random list because I was taking notes while everyone was speaking. The construction guidelines and concerns about construction happening during off hours. I think Dave can be willing to step up and exceed the minimum expectations that are outlined in the building permit for residential construction. There is a limit there that says don't work on the weekend. That is something that he is more than willing to do. He has already shown a willingness to participate with a neighbor, in fact once that is between Paula Spang's home and this property now, when they took the old fence down part of that was attached to, actually they took the old garage down which her fence was attached to, is my understanding, correct me if I am wrong and they worked out an agreement between them where Dave put in the fence at his cost and shared the cost with Paula so there is a cooperation there and I think that has been evident. So I think that in closing, also we look at design, we have the option to try to do a small house or you have the option to try to build in character at a higher level of detail to a new house and I would use our Statehouse and our historic Ada County Courthouse as an example. Those two buildings in our downtown are very different. Some people don't like the Ada County Historic Courthouse, it is a little too 1930's for them, but I would say that the contrast, they are both fine structures in my opinion with a high level of architectural detail and the contrast of those two structures help you see the detail in the Statehouse and help you see the detail in the Ada County Historic Courthouse because they are different. So I think things can be designed compatibly and not be the same and I would stand for questions.

Mr. Wilson (staff): I do have a couple clarifications of code I think if the Committee so desires in terms of some issues that were brought up. The issue of front loaded garages; in this circumstance front loaded garages are specifically not allowed because there is alley access. If a property has alley access the ordinance does require that the garages are placed on the alley so that is not an option in this case. In terms of the front setbacks; the 20 feet mentioned that is our maximum allowable setback. The code states that new structures will be within five feet of the adjoining properties with a maximum of 20 feet. So that setback adjacent to Ms. Spang's property is at the maximum allowable. Also, it has been mentioned a couple times before, but the back-up space in the alley does exceed the standards. Boise City Code would allow 22 feet from the face of the garage to the other side of the alley for back-up space. As stated they have a 12 foot apron with a 15 foot alley. So they do exceed that standard as well.

Committee Member Simmonds: Josh I was wondering if you have that aerial photograph of the neighborhood if you could just verify for me again which, if all of the homes there, that are single story homes, if there are any two-story homes?

Mr. Wilson: This aerial is a little bit hard to see but there is the two-story duplex that lies on the back portion of this lot. I believe I mis-spoke earlier when I said it was on the other side of the alley because it is on the same side of the alley as this property, but on a lot that has been split the other way essentially. So there is a two story duplex there, that blue structure that was shown in the photos and then my understanding would be then the rest of the homes immediately adjacent to this would be single stories.

Committee Member Salathe: Could I get a clarification from staff or from legal on what the status is right now with changes in substandard lot in the ordinance.

Mr. Wilson: I will defer to Andrea on that.

Andrea Tuning: Staff is currently going through the revision process of the substandard Lot Ordinance. The final version should be complete by early next week and should move before the Planning and Zoning Commission scheduled on April 23rd. We are hoping that we can get before the City Council as quickly as possible and the new modifications to the Ordinance would be implemented by July. That is assuming that our substandard lot Committee can come to a consensus tomorrow afternoon for our final meeting. If that consensus is not obtained at that time that would obviously put the schedule back so then we would be looking at a May Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting with implementation after Council approves it with implementation actually occurring in August at that time so by mid to late summer we should have a revised ordinance back.

Committee Member Simmonds: Josh I assume that those lots have all been platted and recorded. The three substandard lots and were they originally one? My understanding is that they were originally one lot that was sub-divided into three.

Mr. Wilson: The legal description listed as three lots. I believe lots 23 thru 25 of Block 24 of Eagleson Park Addition Subdivision.

Committee Member Salathe: I just want to be clear that it was one lot and it was subdivided into three lots?

Mr. Wilson: I don't have that information in front of me. In order to go through the Design Review process they have to submit a form from the Subdivision Department that states that they have legal buildable lots. That information would be contained in those documents and the applicant is probably more knowledgeable than I would be at this point.

Committee Member Salathe: Could we find out from the applicant whether these three lots were recently one lot.

Sarah Schafer: It was used as one parcel but it has always been three lots. When the block was originally platted it was typically platted in 25 foot lots. They would buy several of the lots and utilize them as one parcel although those lot lines underneath remain. So the original structure sat on three or four lots originally. When that structure was removed it has been determined that you can implement those lot lines that are underneath.

Public Testimony (designated speaker for the group): The only concern that I had when I was reviewing this information from Planning and Developing that in the original, I think it is application maybe, for the Design Review on a Substandard Lot, it was indicated by the designer, question number four; How are the adjoining properties used and it says, to the north there is a residential house, number of stories – one; on the south it says residential, number of stories – one; east – residential, number of stories – one and a half, and that would be my home and it is just a one story on there; and then on the west, it said one and a half stories and that was the one that they were discussing in regards to the duplex that was in-filled behind 1801 Gourley Street. So I just wanted to clarify that that was incorrectly documented on that application.

Committee Member Simmonds: I just have a couple of comments. It seems like there are a number of issues. There are definitely some Planning and Zoning issues involved in this over which we don't have any purview. But I think that, you know we have seen some of these infill projects that have been successful and some have been less successful than others. Because the City Staff is reviewing the ordinance right now, I think for a number of reasons, one of which is I believe is the appropriateness of the substandard lot when it is within a given neighborhood. I guess that I am struggling a little bit given the

fabric of the neighborhood and the massing of the residences in the need for substandard infill lots. It appears that the applicant is following the requirements in the ordinance and is complying with minimum requirement. The massing of the homes in that area just doesn't seem to me blend with the neighborhood at all. As the residents have stated that there are a number of these developments that have turned out to be less than everyone had hoped for in a number of cases, not all cases, but some. There was some discussion about density. Density at least in my mind is a little bit different as massing. You can have the same number of residences and not necessarily have two story homes. The adjacent structures, adjacent homes seem to be, they appear to be much less massive than the long narrow homes, especially when you look at the side elevation of the proposed homes and they are pretty massive. The ordinance talks about the one and a half story requirement and when that would apply and at least with the one and a half story residence would have the opportunity for large windows along the sides of the residence is less than when you have a wall of windows. As far as parking is concerned, I think we all have the same concerns about parking. There are definitely minimum standards listed in the city ordinances that don't work with some of our vehicles and so I think in all fairness to the applicant, all they can do is comply with the requirements that the City Ordinance has listed and I don't know how much more they could do than they have already done but those are just comments.

Committee Member Christiansen: I would completely concur with Mr. Simmonds comments here. Even though by the letter of the law or to the letter of the ordinance, the applicant I guess is working on meeting those to a T and in some instances exceeding them in that we have, in my opinion, full two story homes proposed there. I think we have to go beyond on trying to meet the letter of the ordinance and if we meet the letter of the ordinance it is automatically approved in some cases. I think that is why we have these Design Guidelines in Section 11-04-14-04, it talks about full length two story buildings are generally discouraged but may be allowed in some circumstances. The circumstances that they indicate here to be considered shall include the size and height of adjacent dwelling units and the neighbors did an extremely good job on pointing out the neighborhood fabric that the proposed dwelling units are attempting to be constructed at. In my opinion it is kind of night and day on the mass of the units vs. what the existing neighborhood fabric says. It goes on to say, excessive shading of adjacent units and privacy impacts on adjacent yard and so forth. So I think even though the applicant is working on meeting all of the requirements of what the substandard lot ordinance says, there are other four two story homes, there are other options for substandard lots and that is the one and a half story unit that is also allowed there. In my opinion may be better met for that neighborhood fabric.

Committee Member Salathe: I think that there is a generic character in these tall skinny lots which is really taking away from the character and charm of a lot of these neighborhoods. We have seen over and over what these tall skinny homes do to neighborhood. They are starter homes, they are going to turn into rentals, it just happens over and over again. Insufficient parking, the traffic does get worse. I think the only saving grace with these tall skinny homes is that there is parking in the back. I think you do want parking in the back because if you do have it in the front you really take away from the human to the street. Personally I think it is very unfortunate that this is so close to, you know when Planning And Zoning is going to hear this and so is City Council. I think these tall skinny houses put an undo burden on the members of the neighborhood.

Chairman Lee: We have an appeal before us. The question is whether to sustain the appeal or to deny the appeal, otherwise make a motion consistent with our jurisdiction.

Committee Member Simmonds: Could that motion include a recommendation from the Committee or would it need to include some direction from the Committee, specific direction. As another note here; I think the designers are to be commended on the attempt that they have made to do something of quality in the neighborhood and I don't take issue with the aesthetics of the project at all. I think what we are all struggling with here is just the massiveness and the appropriateness of what the ordinance allows in working with the neighborhood. So having said that I guess I would move that the approval of the project be upheld with the condition that the homes be single or one and a half story as opposed to a two story.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE SECONDS THE MOTION.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE: I AM WONDERING IF THE MAKER COULD ELABORATE ON HIS MOTION AS AN EXPLANATION. AS FAR AS SEEING HOW THIS WOULD PLAY OUT IN THE PROCESS OF THE DESIGN.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIMMONDS: I THINK WE ALL SHARE SOME OF THE FRUSTRATIONS ON BOTH SIDES HERE WITH THE RESIDENTS AND THE DESIGNS AND THE DEVELOPER. SOME OF THESE THINGS I THINK OUR HANDS ARE FAIRLY TIED AS THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NOT NECESSARILY PLANNING AND ZONING. THEY CAN ADDRESS SOME OF THESE OTHER THINGS IF THEY ARE AS CONCERNED AS I THINK THEY ALREADY ARE. I GUESS THE PURPOSE OF THE MOTION WOULD BE GIVEN THAT THE PROJECT IS LOUD AND GIVEN THAT THEY ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH P & Z STANDARDS FOR THE SUBSTANDARD LOTS, IF OUR CONCERN IS THE MASSING OF THE HOMES WITHIN THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD THAT IT JUST SEEMS LIKE A ONE AND A HALF STORY OR A SINGLE STORY SOLUTION WOULD BE A LESSER IMPACT THAN THE TWO STORY BUILDINGS THAT WE ARE SEEING, ESPECIALLY AS CLOSE AS THEY ARE TO THE EXISTING STRUCTURES.

CHAIRMAN LEE: IF THE MAKER WOULD HELP ME UNDERSTAND; WE HAVE THREE DIFFERENT BUILDINGS AND WE ARE SAYING TO BE ONE OR ONE AND A HALF STORIES FOR ALL THREE BUILDINGS, INCLUDING THE LARGER BUILDING, AS WELL AS THE MIDDLE ONE?

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIMMONDS: YES.

MOTION CARRIES WITH ONE VOTE IN THE NEGATIVE AND THREE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

DRH07-00110/ V2 PROPERTIES LLC

Location: 2745 Victory View Way

REQUEST APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-STORY, OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE BUILDING IN AN M-1D (LIMITED OFFICE WITH DESIGN REVIEW) ZONE.

ANDREA TUNING PRESENTS AN ABBREVIATED STAFF REPORT.

Committee Member Salathe: Is there a color board or do we just have the samples or the color copies in the packet?

Ms. Tuning: We did not receive a materials board instead we received a colored piece of paper that shows the stucco as well as the paint colors and the wainscot. That is posted on the overhead currently.

Dan Schwalbe (applicant's architect) / 11422 East 44th / Spokane, WA: I have got an enlarged color board that I could probably just pass to you.

Chairman Lee: I will mark this as Exhibit A.

Mr. Schwalbe: We started the project with a metal skin building basically all the way around that was approved by the Architectural Review Board for the Big Park Subdivision. When we came into Design Review we went ahead and we took the stucco up to the bottom of the roof gutter and then wrapped the sides as was shown in that first rendering. Then I received a call from Andrea that we should probably take another modification and try to add some more elements to it, so that is what we did and the latest elevation which is shown in this rendering here. I think that the owner has taken a large step towards trying to bring

the image of the building up to curb appeal and meet the requirements of the other buildings in that subdivision. We toured that today again and took some photos and some of the buildings, as you first enter that off of Victory Way, are actually tilt-up they are not stucco, they are just colored, that is probably why they look stucco, but anyway there is just about every type of style of building is in that subdivision from tilt-up to CMU, to metal, to the combination, like what we have shown here. Some of the comments that Andrea spoke to me about prior to the meeting were some concerns about vertical elements and massing and we do think that we could add some other tone or color to that rendering of the front elevation that will help in breaking up some of the elements and we could do that on the horizontal band on the cornice as well, several things could happen too, we could also bring the parapet down. What we are showing at that latest presentation is a full parapet with a gutter behind the parapet wall for drainage points for that front half of that roof and by doing so that completely hides the gutter and the roof if that vertical element is too much for the Committee, we could bring it down two feet from where it is currently at and not change any of the design or we could go back to putting the parapet down to three feet and show the gutter again and eliminate the pilasters. There are a lot of things that we can do. We could also bring the entrance canopy down. I guess what we would like to do is get some comments and specific points from the Committee.

Committee Member Salathe: I think, maybe it is just a level of detail, but the screed lines where you have got your stucco, I mean things like that where those lines would relate to the rhythm of the breaks in the overhead doors; things like that that tie the vertical elements to the horizontal elements would be helpful. The entry portico, somehow if it could relate more to the entry. It is all very symmetrical but it also has a lot of weight to it and it is a linear building, but I think what I would feel more comfortable with is if you could accentuate that instead of fighting the linear nature of the building with these strong verticals.

Mr. Schwalbe: Excuse me are you talking about the cornice on top? Or the

Committee Member Salathe: Well the cornice is a strong horizontal, but I think these....well the pilasters going all of the way up and the cornice isn't really resting on the pilasters.

Mr. Schwalbe: I see, you would rather see that pilaster cap stop below the cornice so it looks like it is supporting it. Okay, that would be easy to do.

Committee Member Salathe: Those are my comments. The doors are so strong and they are so modern in feeling compared to the more classical nature of the architecture, so somehow if they could blend and work together.

Committee Member Christiansen: Couple comments on this one. It appears like we almost have two separate buildings going on here especially when we have the front and that is understandable that is going to be the main part of the building viewed by most people coming up to the building, but I think also you are going to see the side of the building quite a bit maybe when you are approaching the building and when you look on the side elevation it is really apparent that we have two types of buildings, two types of architecture that is occurring here. I almost want to downplay the front a little bit to bring.....I want to kind of downplay the covering the metal building, let the metal building express itself as the main building and structure and then put in some architectural elements and the pilasters and that kind of thing to jazz up the front, but maybe carry that theme around the side a little bit but to tie the whole building together. I hope I am making some kind of sense. Right now we are looking at the front of the building. Okay, this is one building (boom)then you look at the side elevation and you say, "what is going on here?" It is like all of a sudden we have this kind of stage set up a little bit and in my opinion is that we probably need to take a hard look at that and probably reduce the amount of stucco and let the metal building express itself a little bit even removing the three foot high parapet and let the metal roof come down and express the gutter. I think that would help a lot on the side elevation as well as the front to bring it down and form some kind of continuity between all sides of the building.

Mr. Schwalbe: I think if I could clarify with Mr. Christiansen, if I could go back to this first submittal, but go ahead and even remove that upper level of EIFS/Stucco and still wrap the wainscot on the sides, is that part of your ...

Committee Member Christiansen: I think we would still take the wainscot around the sides but the one thing that is kind of nice on the second reiteration is that you do have some windows up high as well and the first one does not, so it is almost a combination of the two, we keep some of the elements between both of them but I kind of like the first one a little bit better. I like the pilasters on the second one, but I guess I don't really care for the big heavy parapet concealing what is really a metal building. Especially the side elevation doesn't do anything for me, it is like an arm wrestle between the two styles of architecture there.

Bart Graves (applicant) / 2688 Cinnamon / Meridian, ID: That other picture that Andrea has got there was are original submittal for this application and if I could clarify with you for some changes that might satisfy the Committee. Pretty much going back to this design and incorporating those two story windows for that element, obviously removing that signage above the first level windows. We could use those pilasters as a detail in that second rendering and bring them up to the bottom of the gutter area there. Is that something that would satisfy the Committee?

Committee Member Salathe: I think that takes it back to a more industrial feeling which I think is appropriate. You have got the skin of the building and then you have got these two very dominant overhead doors and if somehow, I mean it is a matter of integrating those with the façade with the entrance. The entrance is also very domineering, but it is a very different style than the overhead doors. So I think this building really needs to be cohesive in its design and by using vertical and horizontal lines you have got a proportion, these overhead doors are a rectangle and they are a certain proportion if you could.... And the windows are actually similar in proportion so that works. But I think that breaking this down, the elevation down, into workable parts; relating the pilasters to the overhead doors to the entrance. It is sounding a little esoteric, but you know it is all a matter of relationships between the parts. So you have got the overhead door that is pretty dominant. The entry way which is as dominant, but it doesn't relate to the overhead doors. The windows are another element. Somehow everything needs to work together or be tied together.

Mr. Graves: In your opinion, if we blend out that entry vestibule, that canopy, instead of having a pitched roof over it and with a gable end facing the street we made that a flat roof and pretty much squared it up, we would have the attachment between the garage door, the windows and the entry.

Committee Member Salathe: That could definitely work better. The gable roof really leads to nothing. What I would worry about is that you would put a box entry on the front and maybe it needs to be something more constructed and layered and lighter, but I think that is absolutely the right track, that it is something that is maybe a little higher but maybe relates to the lines that you have going on. While we are at it, the column bases, those don't really relate to anything either. So I think they are too high, the form isn't relating to anything either, so I would work on those too.

Ms. Tuning: I think staff has been given clear direction as to what the Committee is looking for and I think the applicant has received the direction that they will need to end up with a more effective product that they will be happy with.

Mr. Graves: I do have a very good understanding of what you are looking for and I will be happier with these changes that we have talked about today. I think we can make it happen.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE MOVED TO DEFER APPROVAL OF DRH07-00110 FOR A WORKSESSION SCHEDULED ON APRIL 25, 2007 AT 12:00 PM (NOON) TO REVIEW CHANGES TO THE ELEVATIONS AS FOLLOWS: MAINTAIN THE PILASTERS, BUT THEY SHOULD STOP JUST BELOW SUPPORT THE CORNICE LINE; THAT THEY MAINTAIN THE SECOND STORY

WINDOWS; THAT THE GABLE BE REMOVED FROM OVER THE FRONT ENTRY AND THE FRONT ENTRY WORK WITH THE LINES THAT ARE ALREADY EXISTING ON THE STRUCTURE; AND THAT THE COLUMN BASE HEIGHTS AND FORMS BE REVISED, AS WELL AS MAINTAIN THE CONSISTENCY IN MATERIAL AND DESIGN FOR ALL FOUR ELEVATIONS.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIMMONDS SECONDS THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SALATHE MOVED TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 21, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW HEARING.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SIMMONDS SECONDS THE MOTION.

MOTION CARRIES.

Approved:

Franklin G. Lee, Chairman
Design Review Committee

Date: _____