

CITY OF BOISE

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES • May 13, 2015

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

DRAFT

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

- ☒ James Marsh, Chair
- ☐ David Rudeen, Vice-Chair
- ☒ Thomas Zabala
- ☒ Trent Koci
- ☒ Jason Smith
- ☒ Hilary Soltman
- ☒ Jessica Aguilar
- ☒ Rachel Orenstein

PDS MEMBERS PRESENT

Sarah Schafer, Josh Wilson, Andrea Tuning, Rob Lockward (Legal) and Nicki Heckenlively.

DRH15-00152 / Holst Architecture

Location: 401 S. 5th Street

Construct a seven-story, 204,345 square foot apartment building with retail and live/work units on the ground floor and structured parking on the first and second levels on property located in a pending C-5DD (Central Business with Downtown Design Review) zone. *Sarah Schafer*

SARAH SCHAFFER: I won't go over a lot of the details of the architecture for the overall floor plans as I know you've looked at the project report and I know the applicant is going to spend time discussing their overall design with you. The property is located on the half block which is located between Myrtle and Broad Street and faces 5th Street.

Photos

- To the west of the property are single-story and 1 ½ story structures. You can see the area in some of the photos. You can see detached sidewalks with a double row of street trees already established in the vicinity. These are properties across Myrtle Street. These are the properties to the east of the proposed site. This is looking down Myrtle Street. These are facilities across and you can see traffic coming from the west on Myrtle. These are the proposed houses.

- The property currently has three historic homes on it. The applicant has worked diligently over the last several months to find new locations for these structures. They've been very successful and the City thanks them for their efforts. We know it was not an easy task to find places to place these homes. We were able to find a lot of takers, but not necessarily locations for the structures. Two structures will be relocated within town with one on Krall and Reserve and the other on 12th and Hays. The third structure will be dismantled and relocated out of town. We thank the applicant for taking the time to make sure those properties all have a home.
- This is the area the property is located. This is Concordia Law College.
- This is the intersection of 5th and Broad.
- This is 5th Street, the property to the east and the property we'll discuss.

I'll walk through the site plan and hit on the areas of concern the planning team had with the project. I know you've read the project report and have gone through the Conditions of Approval as well as through the Design Guidelines.

First Floor Plan

The majority is for the structured parking. They have wrapped the structured parking with bike facilities at the corner of the intersection of Broad and 5th Street. You have live/work unit space at the ground level along 5th Street with retail located at the intersection of 5th and Broad. The main building entry for the apartments is off 5th Street which we believe is appropriate as we're looking to make Broad Street one of our high pedestrian streets for downtown. At this location you can get all the way from the back of Winco, through BoDo, through the JUMP site and into the Pioneer Corridor back down to the river. It is a great pedestrian pathway to be able to make your way through the downtown area. Off to the west side of the main entry into the residential units is a little additional commercial space.

From this site plan I'm also going to talk a little bit about the landscape. In the record you have a letter from Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) dated April 14, 2015. As part of that letter ITD stated they would not allow any trees within their right-of-way. The City's Mayor's Office is currently working with ITD. ITD has agreed with the City in the past that street trees are appropriate within their public right-of-way in the urban context. We do have signed agreements and we're working with them on making sure they provide us with a revised letter. When making a motion you'll need to make sure you strike *Condition 7. Compliance with the requirements of the Idaho Transportation Department dated April 14, 2015.* We will continue to work with both the applicant and ITD on getting at least the street trees attached to the curb line. As part of the suggested Conditions of Approval you will see the planning team has requested those planters along Myrtle Street extend towards the intersection so we get the entire tree lawn along Myrtle Street. Additionally, we requested the tree lawn at this location along 5th Street be extended to include this last tree so that tree is not within a tree grate. It would be healthier for

the tree. We have trees and tree grates along the Broad Street side. Currently CCDC is working on a Broad Street Plan and they have a request for proposals out. They're working on finalizing that and then they'll do a redesign for the overall section of Broad Street. Currently this design meets the current streetscape requirements with the trees and the tree grates. As part of our request with the applicant we would work with them on obtaining Silva Cells or some other kind of structured concrete systems so we can get additional soil volume underneath the sidewalks so we provide healthier trees in those tree grates along Broad Street.

Third Floor Plan

There is lot of modulation to both the north and south elevations with a slight modulation into the wall of the east elevation wall. The wall along the alley which will be the most visible to vehicular traffic is relatively flat with a slight curve at the section closest to the Myrtle Street. The upper levels with all of the residential units follow that same footprint.

Elevations

We do have some concerns with the pedestrian level along Myrtle. As part of the Downtown Design Guidelines it states, "*Landscaped streets the street frontages and the building placement should be at a minimum of 10 feet from the sidewalk unless additional setback is required by code*". In this instance along Myrtle Street we requested a 10-foot setback through the Design Guidelines. We've also required double rows of street trees through the adopted Streetscape Master Plan produced by CCDC and adopted through our Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is showing a single row of street trees along the Myrtle Street frontage. We believe in order to make this a more friendly pedestrian area a second row of street trees would be appropriate in this location. It would also help to soften the wall on the south elevation. This is a bike storage facility and this is screening which is within the parking structure. There is a departure built into the Design Guidelines for this area. Currently required is façade transparency for non-residential uses at the ground floor. At least 25 percent of that ground floor needs to be transparent from 4 feet to 8 feet when it abuts the sidewalk area. A departure is allowed. The departure language specifically states, "*The design treatment of the façade and/or the landscaping elements must provide visual interest to the pedestrian and mitigate the impacts of the blank wall areas. The City should consider the current and desired context of the specific site and determine if reducing the transparency would be acceptable even with the special façade treatment*". Even if special façade treatment is given only up to 50 percent of that transparent façade is allowed. We would need at least 12.5 percent glass within this façade in order to meet the departure requirements at the pedestrian level.

Additionally, when looking at the overall building design, *Standard 4.1.2*, requires us to promote original and distinctive building design. Applicants for new buildings shall demonstrate how the building design accomplishes the following objectives.

- *Create a façade composition with a rich layering of design elements which provide visual interest from a variety of vantage points.*

- *Integrate design techniques that distinguish the buildings top, middle and bottom on all buildings of a certain height range (which this falls within).*

There is a departure for this, *“Departures are considered for buildings that employ a distinctive sculptural form that will enhance Boise’s downtown skyline”*. Because of the flat parapet roofing and the minimal wave placed within the wall plane on the front east façade the planning team is not sure this will provide the sculptural form distinctive enough to be seen from many vantage points throughout the city. Additionally, one vantage point you will see from the city is coming down Myrtle. You’ll see that flat wall along the alley. We do have concern with that.

Standard 4.2.2, provides determination for maximum façade lengths. We look for a maximum façade length of 122 feet. We currently have a façade of 248 feet without any break in the wall planes on the upper levels. Modulation of at least 20 feet deep and 30 feet wide is one option. *“Use of contrasting vertical modulated design components which extend through all of the floors above the first floor. Uses a change in material and is modulated by at least 6 inches and provides roofline modulation in conjunction with it or the use of contrasting articulation which makes it look like two separate buildings”*. This would be needed for both the east and west elevations in order to comply with the Design Guidelines 4.2.2.

Additionally we need to look at the Standards in the Design Guidelines which talk to multi-family buildings. *“Multi-family buildings shall include articulated features at intervals which relate to the location and size of the individual units within the building or no more than every 30 feet to break up the massing of the building and add visual interest”*. As you look at the front elevation you can see the individual units are not articulated through the overall building design. There is a list of items, A-F. Three of which should be used to achieve the modulation and departures allowed for those items. Those departures are as follows:

- *Consider the type and width of the proposed articulated treatment and how effective it is to meet the intent of the guidelines. As you can see there is no additional articulation added to this to go towards the guidelines.*
- *Consider the applicable block frontage designation. Undesignated block frontages warrant more flexibility. This property is designated as a landscaped block frontage.*
- *Consider the size and width of the building. Smaller buildings warrant more flexibility than larger buildings. This property is a full half-block.*
- *Consider the quality of the façade materials in concert with doors, windows and other façade features and their ability to add visual interest to the street from a pedestrian scale and more distance observable scales.*

We believe the quality of materials the applicant proposes along this elevation is appropriate and there are plenty of windows so we do probably meet this one criteria.

It does state we can meet the provision for landmark buildings for public buildings. Private buildings that occupy highly visible street corners or full block developments. This property is not designated as a high visibility street corner. It is not a full block development nor is it a public building. Therefore, it doesn't meet the landmark requirements.

Standard 4.2.6, regarding the cornice line and roofline states, "*The building using a flat roof shall have a distinctive roofline*". This has not been created as part of this design.

With that I would like to draw your attention to some conditions of approval we've looked at for this project. As part of the conditions of approval we have recommended:

- 1.i. A minimum of 12.5 percent façade transparency along the Myrtle Street for the first level.
- 1.j. requires providing modulation within the west and east facades of the buildings to meet Guideline 4.2.2.
- 1.k. requires façade articulation to meet the multi-family building standards.
- 1.l. provides a distinctive roofline for the Design Guidelines.

I believe these are major enough that this is not a decision the Committee would be able to make tonight. If you chose to adopt these conditions of approval, I would recommend conceptual approval be granted tonight or defer the item so we can give final approval at next month's hearing with maybe a work session in between so we can discuss these items closely with the applicant. We can set at a table and look at some different options for meeting these design guidelines with a hearing on June 10th to approve the project.

APPLICANT TESTIMONY

MIKE BROWN (President/Founder Local Construct): I brought with me members of the project team.

John Holmes / Holst Architecture / Principal of the firm and our spiritual leader on this design.
Kim Wilson / Holst Architecture / Senior Designer
Will Howard / Stack Rock Group, Inc. / Landscape Architect
Renee Strand / Holst Architecture / Budget Coordinator
Jason Osterburg / Construct / Construction Operations

We would like to request 30 minutes to present. I was told if I wanted that I was supposed to say so when I got up here to the podium.

Committee Members had no opposition to request.

I have not presented before this Committee before. Local Construct is my firm and I started it with another guy who is a graduate of the Community School in Ketchum. We came to Boise about four years ago with a vision to help Boise in its process of becoming and evolving as an urban center and a really highly desirable City to live in. Over four years we've put together about 600 apartment units in town. Several of those are Garden Style developments approximate to the downtown within three or four miles. We rehabbed all those. That is what we do in that part of our business.

We are the people who delivered the Owyhee renovation. Clay Carley brought us into that project the month he bought it. We insisted on running a series of design charrettes bringing in other designers to work with the local team. As a result of that project we delivered the first 36 market rate apartments in downtown Boise in quite some time. We're beginning to prove out the theory there is a demographic that wants to live in urban apartments in Boise. We have a long-term vision and we don't come here to develop buildings strictly for the purpose of profitability, but to help Boise in terms of place making and in terms of the vision the City has for its downtown and to be a part of that. To that end we bought a number of development parcels in the downtown. When this parcel became available we started to get involved in the Central Addition Master Planning process. We started to consider what the stake holders were asking for and in particular what City staff was interested in, what CCDC was interested in and as Sarah said, we engaged heavily with the preservation community and in fact we'll be able to arrange for the relocation of all three homes on this site.

We're at 5th and Myrtle bounded by Broad, 5th Street, Myrtle, and the alley. We're adjacent to the park, a block from Trader Joe's, two or three blocks from Old Boise, and approximate to the rest of the downtown. When we look at this we want to build a project which helps the Central Addition succeed in what the vision was and it helps the LIV District succeed in what the vision was. We looked at this as an exercise in place making. I say this by way of trying to get you to understand our goal is not just that this be a commercially successful apartment building, but that this be a building which sets a new standard for developers of urban housing in Boise and a standard this Committee can point to when other people come before you with other proposals. Our hope is if this project can be successful in its mixture of uses, level of design and what it brings to the table that will help the Central Addition succeed and it will help reposition Boise within the Treasure Valley as an alternative to the suburban style of development that is proliferating in other parts of the valley and in fact that will help Boise continue its rising prominence on the national stage as a city that is really a place to be. I say that as a long way of setting up this idea that we searched high and wide for architects for this. We interviewed eight firms up and down the coast and here locally. We hired Holst because they are based in Portland. The firm has a 20 year track record, it is a midsize firm, they have 37 employees and they have not only a great deal of experience building podium apartment buildings, but delivering urban product that is high design, successful, very tasteful, and understated. All these were the things we wanted and these were our goals for this building.

We want a building here which is truly urban both in terms of its uses and in terms of its aesthetic. The most important thing about this building is it does mix its uses and in fact activates street life through that mixture of uses. That was one of the primary goals in the Central Addition.

- Here we have an axonometric view of the building now facing southwest (referring to slide).
- This is Idaho Independent Bank here, Concordia Law School and Trader Joe's on this parcel.
- You have in blue the housing block which sits on top of the two-story parking podium. There is no parking immediately approximate to the street. Even behind the screen on 5th or on Broad.
- Here on Broad at the corner we have a retail café programmed on the ground floor.
- Next to that we have the lobbied entry to the housing.
- Next to that we have an additional retail space right across the alley from Boise Brewing.
- Above that, on this façade, we've got the business center and gym for the residents of the property.
- We've got the office of the building right over here.
- Then we have another semi-public for residents of the building...a deck to activate that street frontage.
- On the 5th Street frontage you have the edge of the café restaurant, you have five live/work loft style units here with stooped entries to activate the street and then down at the end there is a bike storage and mechanical room.

We had to squeeze in all these uses to meet the goals stated in the Central Addition Master Plan. Some of reason I'm going over this is some of what we have to cover tonight deals with the geometry of the building. The economics of building a podium apartment building and how to fit active uses at the street and still build an efficient parking garage in a manner that is close to being economically viable.

- Here you have the rendering of the marque corner with the café restaurant space, these uses stepping up the lobby, the additional retail space, the office of the building, and some units in here.

– Going down 5th Street we have the work spaces and light storage down at the end.

What you see here is, we met with our architects and we went through an extensive charrette and we directed them that we wanted a building that was weighty, a building that was modern, but we wanted a building that did this without any gimmicks. We didn't want it to have stuff stuck onto it and we wanted it to look durable. We wanted a building that would stand the test of time and a building that looked like that, that really showed what it was doing, a building that would have that kind of provenance and bring that to Boise. We won't see a lot of the troffs that we see in architecture across the west.

We really think our team has done a fantastic job in delivering on those promises. We are here to ask you for some flexibility from the original interpretation of the code in order to be able to pull that off.

JOHN HOLMES (Holst Architecture): What I'd like to do to start is to talk about the overall big idea for this building which admittedly is different than what your guidelines prescribe. I'll walk you through this.

The first thing we did was we took the program elements of the building which are housing above a parking podium with retail and commercial uses along the ground level.

The curving brick portion represents basically three bars of housing that march through the site from east to west. The building is fundamentally expressive of what is going on inside. It is expressive of the program it has and it is not trying to be sly or do something fake. There is an honest expression which is the starting point. Along with that there is the concern about how we then make this building feel human and warm and inviting. In particular on the ground level as you move around the building as a pedestrian. The big formal idea of this building having this curving form is a way to modulate the façade which is one of the things your Design Review code and the guidelines talk a lot about. The curving form is a way for the building to start to link itself to not only the surrounding context, but also the surrounding landscape. This sort of curving nature of the building is a reference to nature rather than some historic kind of reference per se. We as humans have our bodies which are not straight. The land forms around us, the trees and nature. None of it is a straight rectilinear mathematical thing. It is all kind of formally moving and flowing which is what this building starts to do. As you move up against this building you will immediately begin to feel that. Our bodies can aesthetically move through space and almost without thinking about start to engage with space in this wave. It is almost unconscious. The building is starting to engage the pedestrian in this very basic subtle way. As you move around the building there is going to be this play of light across the façade which will help to create this difference across it. It doesn't necessarily or won't feel monotonous even though there is a lot of repetition on the façade. The movement of the curve as it pulls out and then sort of recedes with the movement along the bottom of the building so the bottom of the brick flows up in a gradual stepping manner and it does this all the way around the building.

Broad & 5th Street

We do have retail and lobby space along Broad and then turning the corner onto 5th Street.

We've introduced these live/work units which will have their own entrances and a little stoop that takes you off the sidewalk and into the units.

Bike parking and obviously we've got the parking which is hidden by those programmatic uses.

Up above you can see this again expressed in the front of the building...these three housing bars that flow north/south.

The curve of the building basically starts out as a flat wall along the alleyway and then the curve gets introduced in a more dramatic way as you move from west to east and the most sinuous wall is along the east façade of the building.

Here we are looking at the Broad Street façade and again you can see the division between the lower portion of the building and the housing portion is stepping down towards the corner so this inherently draws attention to the corner and creates that dynamic movement across the façade.

How we're treating the lower retail areas is with the use of these boxes. They kind of stack on each other in a playful manner. Those boxes have a scaled relationship to the other buildings along Broad Street. There is a nice retail pedestrian experience which is in its early stages, but it is already feeling pretty good along Broad.

He wanted to make sure the addition of the retail along here had that same kind of scale and wiliness so it's not just one thing here, but a number of different elements. You can see here standing in the corner the dynamic nature of the pedestrian experience. This being the corner space here, this is the lobby here, the additional retail of the street, and then the drama of the building as it steps down towards the corner.

Stepping back as you're moving along the street you really feel the sinuous nature of that curve and it gives this building a life and a freshness which will stop people in their tracks and make them take notice. It's not the thing we're used to seeing every day.

You can also see along the ground level we've got additionally opportunity for outdoor seating so it creates a lively pedestrian experience.

Moving down 5th Street

We have the live/work units. You can see the entryways into those units. There are treated slightly different in that there is less glazing, but they are still quite open. The attempt here is to create a little bit of a separation between the sidewalk and the units so we've got a little bit of a layer use of landscaping and entryways which are called out so this helps create a viable living situation for those people.

Stepping back at the corner of Myrtle and 5th, the façade is treated very similarly to how we treated the façade on Broad Street. Returning the corner with the boxes and continuing that language back here where we have the screened parking which we've added some additional openings to. You can see that here.

Also, you'll see the third level which is the beginning of housing and we've got a courtyard up in this area which will have landscape and private and community decks used by the residents in the building and you can see a close view of that. This is the community area which is off the main connector between the buildings and then you have additionally some private decks activated by this angled geometric landscape form.

Alley side of the Building

On this side of the building we've introduced a couple things. One is we have a corridor in plan so we're not just dealing with the units which is typical of everywhere else, but we have a corridor and then the units face in.

We've treated the windows differently with a more playful random window pattern.

The brick turns the corner and actually gets modified into stucco as a way to introduce a texture on the back of the alleyway since it doesn't have the benefit of the curve.

We are playing with the texture as a way to modulate that façade. Bearing in mind that at some point it is highly likely there will be a bigger building here. Typically when you move through cities you see alleyway walls being quite simple and not highly articulated. Usually the articulated façade on most buildings in cities is the street façade. I should add we have a couple of instances like right here...I don't know if you can see it, but there is a wall there which leads you into the alleyway and we think this could be a cool opportunity for art on that wall. You can see it again here on the opposite façade.

This is the entrance into the parking area and the alleyway. You can see it again, this use of the boxes and how they turn the corner with the sort of animated forms above. The building has kind of a life to it that we hope will be exciting for people to interact with.

Materials on the Building

Primarily brick on the upper levels, some raked stucco on the lower areas where the boxes are and smooth stucco in the areas above. An aluminum composition panel which is the white material on the lower floors between some of the storefront window areas. Again, the metal screen which is used to screen the parking especially on the Myrtle Street elevation.

That pretty much gets us around the building and before opening up to questions say our intent here is to create a vibrant authentic building that is really different. Often when you do a building that is a little different people want to engage with it and that's really our intent. To really get people excited and bring some fresh energy to this area.

MIKE BROWN: We really liked working with Sarah and our whole experience with the staff here in Boise has been excellent. I'm in a position where I disagree with some of the things in her report and I'll take a run at them, but I would like to make that clear before doing so.

Some of the conditions of approval in the project report we disagree with and I did some writing which should be in your packet and Renee did some response to some of that and we feel we've made some broader thematic moves with this building which we think do, in fact, meet the departures and the intent of the design criteria. I'll run through those. We also have recognized some of the issues Sarah brought up and reflected in the design tonight are some of those changes particularly on the alley wall and with the transparency along Myrtle. Hopefully these renderings do a better job of representing the effect of that sculptural form than the two dimensional elevations did that we submitted with our application.

Conditions of Approval:

Condition d.

The double street tree requirement on Myrtle and the fact that requires an increased setback for the building is basically a threshold issue for this project. The nearest condition of double street trees I'm aware of is adjacent to Winco on 2nd Street on Myrtle. In fact, coming to the west this block is the last where it is a landscape requirement of double trees and immediately adjacent on 6th Street it goes to an urban concrete standard which is more like we've designed to.

This is the plan view of the first floor. This is a 160 unit building with two retail spaces which has 189 parking spaces. Effectively we've just barely parked the retail and we have one parking stall per door for the apartments which in a typical developer speak is 100 parked. We're comfortable with that in this location, but we're treading thin here. To build a concrete podium radically increases the cost of this parking and we in fact have a letter of understanding with CCDC under which they are going to help us with the cost of the streetscape improvements and they are in fact intending to buy some of this parking from us to help us alleviate the financial burden of a podium parked building. I say that in order that you can understand the economics of building this typology at a really urban typology with a structured parking garage just barely make it with the rents we think we can charge in Boise.

When we brought the Owyhee on line we achieved the highest rents in town by a pretty significant margin. We are \$1.20 per foot. We got a \$1.60 per foot over there. We've got to get \$1.80 per foot to support a structured parking garage. If we eliminate any of this parking...the geometry is what it is. A space is 18 feet and then you have the circulation area and then you have to do more spaces and more circulation then more spaces and then you have a minimum depth that you achieve a viable use at the street frontage and we're trying not to have a screened garage at the street frontage along 5th and along Broad. If we cut any side of this building back the whole thing starts to not work. I would ask that you consider the importance of a double row of street trees against that when you look at Condition d. We do have the single row of street

trees and then we have an 18 inch planter at the base of the metal screen on the Myrtle Street side of the parking structure and we've got vines planted in there which will eventually grow up that metal screen so there is some greenery there.

Condition i.

We agree with and we would ask that you allow us the departure to use the 12.5% transparency in that screen. If you go back to the Myrtle Street elevation John made mention of this, but we did modify the design such that between the perforations in the screen and the actual openings in the screen we're using almost punched openings in that screen which mimic the way we've treated the window openings throughout the façade. We can achieve a roughly 20 percent transparency in that location.

Condition j. & k.

We feel we have met the intent of the vertical modulation and façade articulation although we have not met the specific ways that this prescribes in the very direct reading of the code. This is the street elevation from down low. We think these renderings show much better. There is about a three foot difference in the curve between its furthest point and its furthest end point. There is about a six inch punch in each of those window openings. Between the two of those we feel this constitutes a sculptural element that meets the intent of these requirements. In addition we have a heck of a lot of brick on this building so it's not that we're trying to get away with a less expensive solution and not provide façade modulation. We've made one large move which we think accomplishes this and this move unfortunately doesn't really work with any other moves. If you look at this façade I can't see an alternating color banded effect superimposed vertically across a undulating façade like this so if we are forced to provide those within the strict interpretation that are laid out that basically would put us back to the drawing board and we would have to do a modulated box which likely would not achieve some of the broader goals I've outlined for the building.

Condition l.

The distinctive roofline. We do feel we met the intent. You can see the roofline here and it has a very significant curve in it. Again, this is an urban modern building. We can't really stick a cornice on this. It is an element of the broader thematic course we've taken that is difficult for us to comply with a very prescriptive solution for the roofline. We do think the overall strategy has done that.

Condition m.

The blank wall requirement. We did go ahead and change the alley wall so if you compare this there is a different window strategy here which lays out those windows in a more random configuration where they are opening on a corridor. We've put this sculptural stucco element across the massive brick to attempt to further break this up. We've gone all the way vertically through the housing block. In addition, we have an opportunity for some public art at the pedestrian level at both corners of the alley. We believe those moves should satisfy the letter of the law in fact the blank wall requirement.

We have made a number of the landscape changes Sarah suggested in her project report such as expanding some of the planters, where those locations are and whatnot. If we need to get into the details on those then Renee could probably speak to that better than I can.

The design of this streetscape at this point is basically a cooperative effort between our design team, the City of Boise staff who are working on the broader LIV District Broad Street Streetscape Plan and CCDC of course who owns and designs the streetscapes. All those personnel are working on cooperative effort. This project, in fact, is driving a lot of that streetscape design so if there is a way to word any conditions of approval related to landscape and streetscape in such a way...I don't know how you would word it, but we're able to satisfy City staff and CCDC staff and ITD's requirements that we be let some flexibility in that regard because CCDC and the City in particular do not have full request about design for exactly what they want to do in the Central Addition. We're being very flexible with them in trying to help them figure that out and come up with something we feel is appealing that accomplishes the bio swale filtration needed which deals with the storm water not only from the building, but also potentially from some of the street water and will work hopefully a template throughout the Central Addition.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: Conditions e., f., g., and h. have you met those revisions with your landscape architect?

MIKE BROWN: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: You've indicated you have revised your landscape plan. In fact that addresses the items Commissioner Koci was referring to?

MIKE BROWN: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: One of the questions I had and maybe Sarah can help me with this. On the Myrtle Street alley corner they've shown a clear vision triangle (CVT) and I question why a CVT at that point because traffic is going east on that and there is no real need for CVT so my thought would be to continue to extend that planter as far into that corner as one can and it may give you the opportunity to re-space those trees and get another tree along that frontage. Extend the planter up toward the alley. The CVT doesn't apply because cars are coming west to east on that one-way.

MIKE BROWN: There is a curb radius requirement from ACHD which may interfere with that, but we're more than happy to look at that and fit some more trees in there if that is a palatable middle ground.

JIM MARSH: I see a rooftop screen on the north end. Is this the only place you'll have exhaust fans and HVAC equipment which will be sizable?

MIKE BROWN: In fact when we submitted for our zone change in our initial submittal for Design Review we were entertaining using a central chiller so our height for the zone change and the way we show that roof screen are actually inflated over what they'll need to be. We're hopeful we can use a common boiler system which won't affect roof screening, but through the costing effort it appears that using a central plan for heating and air conditioning is going to be out of the question so the roofing equipment will in fact be smaller than what is shown on the elevations in the packet, but this is the location of the air handling units.

KIM WILSON (Holst Architecture): What we have right now is a centrally located roof screen where we have heat recovery ventilators for the corridors to provide fresh air into those corridors and those units are, including the curb, about 8 feet above the roofing. Again, what we see in the renderings was based on 10-foot chiller. We just determined that we weren't going to be using that strategy. We have a make-up air system here for the restaurant and that's about a 4-foot high piece of equipment. What you see here are condensing units for each apartment and there are about 135 of them on this roof. The remaining ones we're going to locate in the parking garage and they are about 2 ½ feet high so we can show some studies, but you won't be able to see those. The actual fence around...this box here is an 8-foot tall screen. We're proposing the same metal screen as for the parking.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: Is there roof access to this?

KIM WILSON: Yes. There is roof access on each of the stairwells. Those are by a roof hatch and not a penthouse so those won't be up above. Because of our floor-to-floor at the roof the overrun is actually pretty much contained within the roof trusses so it is only going to be up 18 inches from the roof.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: What do you have depicted for the current setback on Myrtle?

KIM WILSON: The property line is here and as you see by the site photos there is only a very small sidewalk. We're proposing a 10-foot setback from the property line. I believe 18 foot, 2 inches to the building face from the curb. Since I'm here if I could reiterate what Mike had said about the parking. It is not solely a function of the space that the parking takes up. It is actually a function of the ramp. In order to get the ramping we really need 108 feet. It is not just a matter of pushing parking in and losing a couple spaces, it actually wouldn't make the ramps work at all.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: Been there.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

DAN EVERHART (Idaho Preservation): I am an architectural historian, a public employee and volunteer. As a volunteer I have engaged in the issues of Central Addition and its redevelopment for over eight years. Of course I have engaged in the Central Addition because of my interest in the historic resources which are there now, but won't be there if this design is approved. This is possibly the best outcome for these historic resources and we've talked about how they'll be

relocated. Though it is not the ideal situation it is possibly the best situation. The houses which will be relocated include several of architectural and historical value including the Fowler House. I'm here tonight though I never speak at Design Review. I only speak at your sister Commission, the Historic Preservation Commission. I'm here because I feel as if the replacement of these historic structures must itself have weight and the authenticity in the replacement gives value to the resources we are relocating elsewhere. I have worried that the townhomes at Fowler Place would have ridiculous Victoria detail applied or something like that. A design without artifice will make the replacement of these historic buildings easier to bear shall I say. A bland replacement or a replacement which doesn't carry its own weight will cut deeper if I make myself clear. Although I'm a preservationist I'm also a modernist. That's a weird juxtaposition, but I believe wholeheartedly in the concept of clean lines and simple application of material. This design speaks for itself. It is cosmopolitan, it is lyric, engaging and I if I were to venture out there a little bit it is vaguely reminiscent of some European capital city. Maybe somewhere in Stockholm. I think it's great and I think it does what we want which is to provide a replacement for these historic resources which has a value of its own. I respect the codes and rely on them as you can imagine as a preservationist. In this case I hope the Committee will review the application appropriately to the codes with enough imagination to compensate in some small way for the loss of historic fabric. I think this application does that.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

JIM MARSH: We appreciate your efforts you went to with the historic houses that were there. It is above and beyond what you're required to do. I also appreciate something a little different as an application and we certainly don't want to discourage that by any means, but I do believe we all find this particular proposal somewhat challenging when it comes to our ordinance. We may find some discussions and ways to justify this to ourselves as well. To be quite honest with you when I first opened the packet information when they sent it to me...I usually skip most of the stuff and jump right down to the elevations. I opened 8.20, the flat elevations, and my heart kind of sunk. As I got deeper into it and when we look at the Broad Street corner and the Myrtle Street in the revised plans we have there are some interesting pieces and nice forms. I'm still concerned on the long axis, but otherwise I do want to commend you for bringing something very unique and something that is going to have certainly an identifiable architecture for the City of Boise. My initial concern is the wave along 5th Street. It is very interesting. At the pedestrian level when you're right up against the building how much you're going to notice it because your eye is down and the wave start...there is not a whole lot of translation of the wave below the 25 foot mark. The wave looks nice from across the street and further down the street...I'm concerned it may be too subtle to notice it is a wave and now it looks like we have a large gray block wall with a very structured window opening repetition which concerns me. When I see the blocks and the wave and the cuts and stuff we have on the Broad Street side its great and I couldn't ask for more. It looks very interesting, inviting and active. The majority of my concern comes down to the 5th Street façade.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SOLTMAN: I'm not as concerned about the wave on the street side. I was concerned about the large expansive blank wall on the alley side and was very happy to see that had been dealt with in the best way you could without altering the structural form on that side. At least there is some randomness in the window placement and some changes in texture which break up the massing understanding in the future that could be blocked. I want to speak a little bit about the Design Review Guidelines. I'm an attorney so I like having guidelines and I like adherence to guidelines, but when you're coming up with a set of Design Review Guidelines which are covering an evolving city you have to allow for a lot of changes, unanticipated designs and quite a bit of flexibility. It was definitely a challenge and I participated in a lot of the discussions in coming up with the Design Review Guidelines and you never want to inhibit creativity and we definitely do want to encourage these types of unique designs and I also commend you for bringing something very different to us and yet you have to come up with some set of guidelines. There are always over/under inclusive at the same time. You don't want to ever end up with a blocky structure. This is obviously what we're trying to avoid with a lot of the blank wall stuff and a lot of the changes in massing. Yet, we also don't want to end up with structured block townhouses. There should be some room in the Design Review Guidelines to accommodate more sculptural forms like this and I hope we can come up with some departures that satisfy the intent and the spirit of those guidelines so we're not just wholesale throwing them out the window. We don't want to see that, but in this case strict compliance would definitely change the nature of the building on the whole. We need to come up with some more creative solutions to keep good solid architecture like this downtown because this is the type of stuff we want to see. It is density, the right materials and it is the right type of creative architecture. I don't want to lose that in favor of something much blander just because we're pushing strict adherence.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SMITH: Obviously this is a unique building and I find the simplicity of the sculptural form to be elegant and a powerful form. You've done a great job in modulation of the first and second floors and in some cases the third where those box elements pop up. I'm struggling a little bit with the east elevation, but the curve is successful. Initially I wanted to see some type of reveal and the same type of treatment which has been done on the north and south sides. Not something significant such as tacking something on the building, but some type of reveal that at least breaks that plane. The curb continues, but the plane is broken in some fashion. In doing something like that I wouldn't see the necessity to modulate the parapet. Some type of relief would go a long way on the elevation.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: Bringing up the little farther out corner perspective which shows pretty much this view stuffed back a few spots. I echo what you indicated as well where one simple cut...as I look on the plan there is one which looks like it is about 7 feet or a really small amount of change and not too far off the hard corner of Broad and if that was echoed somewhere on that long façade of the building it could make it one there. Otherwise, you step back another block and that looks like a flat building on that east elevation. The north and south elevations are great

and the view from the opposite corner is interesting with the wave. My concerns really are just getting back a little bit farther. It needs a little bit of something and that shadow line and stuff...this has just enough to it that I don't know if you're going to get a real dramatic shadow difference even on those wall planes and to get the color difference on the block and such. This is what it comes down to.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: It's almost like a ripple more than a wave. You almost want to see it break like a white cap come up as the form comes around it starts to roll up and before it starts to make its other turn it wraps, comes to a point and extends out a little farther and then cuts back to the building like the top of a wave and drops back. You can do it once or twice along there somehow to get a shadow line going down. I agree I don't think the parapet needs to be ginger breaded up. The requirement we've got and some of the ways it has been applied in recent buildings is horrible. Throw it at it and if it has Velcro on it, it will stick and it doesn't look good. There is some subtleness that could be done and maybe it's playing with the fenestration a little bit. I like the randomness of the pattern on the west side which was created for the alley and maybe it's just the modulation of some window sizes or something. It would appear from what the applicant has indicated with regard to the site specific conditions if we could defer this to allow them to work with staff a little bit on the comments which have been made so we can get over the hurdle on a lot of this because what I see here and I do agree with the design team that the second row of trees on Myrtle won't work. In different life I was involved with a half block parking structure so I know how critical those ramp gradients are with turns and all of that and we didn't have to shove in a bunch of retail on the first floor to make it happen. It was all parking. When you start shoving those things in from the ends you don't have a whole lot of wiggle room on what that ramp can do so I fully appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: We don't have, in our packets, any of their revised landscape plans or any of those for review?

SARAH SCHAFER: No, we don't. If you wanted to defer we can bring all of that back and tell you how it addresses the conditions of approval. It sounds like you're looking towards adopting the conditions of approve minus 1.l., the modulation of the roofline and possibly 1.k. which is meeting the multi-family standards. What you will need to do with that is show how they meet departures for the multi-family standards. It is pretty specific so you, as the Committee, will need to make those findings.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: Condition 1.d. the second row of trees, is that okay for us to strike?

SARAH SCHAFER: Yes, you can strike that as well. You'd moved to defer knowing you'll strike 1.d, k. and l. and then we'll work with the applicant on any of the other items and bring back a revised drawing at a public hearing versus necessarily needing a work session. It is up to you. If you'd like to see it at a work session in between, we can do that. I would like to set that date specific with the applicant so we don't have to advertise. The next public hearing is June

10th. If you want we could possibly do a work session in two weeks if that's alright with the applicant and if we do it to the date specific then we don't have to advertise it so we can turn it around quicker.

MIKE BROWN: Does the work session involve the Committee as well as our design team?

SARAH SCHAFER: Absolutely.

MIKE BROWN: John and I feel we're close here with the wave concept and it seems we need to work through the Committee to come up with something subtle enough to preserve what we're trying to do, but appropriate enough to meet the requirements.

SARAH SCHAFER: Two weeks from now is the 27th. I don't know if that's too quick. The other way we could do it is the week prior to the public hearing so we could do it June 3rd and you could incorporate any comments and get back to us so we could have a public hearing on the 10th. The one problem with that is making drawings available to the public soon enough for the public hearing. You'd only have seven days between the work session and the public hearing.

MIKE BROWN: The 27th works for all of us and if we're able to come up with something there what happens? If we come up with something at the work session do we go directly to City Council or do we need to hit this next public hearing?

SARAH SCHAFER: If we come up with something at the work session that seems to work for the Committee we will take it to the public hearing in front of the Design Review Committee on June 10th and they will adopt the drawings and findings. This gives me the opportunity to rewrite some of those findings in conjunction with what is said at the work session so we have a better record and then approved at the June 10th hearing. There is no need to go to the Planning & Zoning Commission or City Council with your design.

MIKE BROWN: I have another project in another state with a grand opening on June 10th so if the work session is successful may I send an agent?

SARAH SCHAFER: Absolutely.

MIKE BROWN: That's good. We can certainly do that if it works for the Committee.

SARAH SCHAFER: We'll set the work session date specific for the 27th at 5:30 p.m. with the hearing deferred to June 10th.

MOTION: COMMITTEE MEMBER SOLTMAN MOVED TO DEFER DRH15-00152 TO A WORK SESSION ON MAY 27, 2015, AT 5:30 P.M. TO DISCUSS A DESIGN WHICH ADDRESSES CONDITIONS 1. I, J. AND M. AND THE DELETION OF CONDITIONS 1. D. AND K. SUBJECT TO FINDING THE APPLICANT HAS MET THE DEPARTURES UNDER STANDARD 4.2.3 (MULTI-FAMILY BUILDINGS) AND THE DELETION OF CONDITION 1.L. AND ITEM 7.

SECONDER: COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA

ROLL CALL VOTE

	ABSENT	AYE	NAY	RECUSE
COMMITTEE MEMBER SOLTMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMITTEE MEMBER SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMITTEE MEMBER MARSH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMITTEE MEMBER AGUILAR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>