



## 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](http://www.cityofboise.org/pds)

## Design Review Committee Hearing Minutes of August 10, 2011

**Committee Members Present** Rodney Evans, Chairman, Brian Garrett, Rob Anderson, Tom Zabala

**Staff Members Present** Andrea Tuning, Josh Wilson, Rob Lockward and Nicki Heckenlively

---

### DRH11-00133 / Glenn Levie

Location: 1005 W. Royal Boulevard

Design Review for a four-story 108 unit apartment building with live/work units on property located at 1005 West Royal Boulevard in an R-OD (Residential Office with Design Review) zone. *(This item was deferred at the July 13, 2011 hearing.)*

ANDREA TUNING: We are here in regard to DRH11-00133. This is an application for a 108-unit apartment complex comprised of one and two bedroom units as well as live/work units in four story buildings located at 1005 W. Royal Avenue in an R-OD zone. In this particular case the applicant is proposing to construct two buildings located on a site that is located between Dale, Island, LaPointe and West Royal Streets. The area is located within the aerial map located on the overhead projector. Within this area we have a very large use of a mixture of products that currently exist. You can find residential and office as well as older industrial properties within this area. The Ann Morrison public park is also located one block away. The applicant is proposing the buildings to be located on the site. Each building will contain 54 residential units. The first apartment building would be located on the corner of Dale and Island and the second located on the corner of LaPointe and West Royal Street. 20 of the proposed 108 units are live/work and those are located over what is identified on the site plan as parking garage. The applicant is proposing mostly surface parking. In fact they are proposing 162 parking spaces. Most of those spaces are that surface parking lot that you can identify on the corners of Island and LaPointe as well as Dale and Royal. However, there are 44 spaces that are located within parking structures underneath the live/work units. Typically within our Zoning Ordinance the applicant would be required to provide 1.5 vehicle parking spaces per unit plus one additional space for parking. The applicant has requested a parking reduction in this particular case to allow for the parking of 1.5 spaces per unit. Staff has recommended approval of the parking reduction simply because of the proximity to the University, proximity to public transportation, its proximity to the Boise Greenbelt as well as bicycle and pedestrian routes within the area. The applicant is also asking to provide 20 bicycle parking spaces with this application. 19 of those spaces are required by our current Zoning Ordinance. I want to take you through the area to give you an idea of what we have in the area. You'll notice that looking in the surrounding area that most of the streets are unimproved. They all provide perpendicular parking near the older

structures. However, the area is starting to be revitalized. We have some residential structures some older industrial transportation related structures as well as some multi-family residential structures. Walking through the area you'll notice that the residential structure to the west actually has attached curb, gutter and sidewalk that was constructed with that development as it came in. We have some other trucking and transfer facilities. In general we have a transitional area that is going from the older industrial uses to some newer uses providing housing for the local University nearby. Here we have some streetscape that has been improved with residential units to the west as well as some newer office buildings that were located along the Boise River Greenbelt. As you can see there truly is a mixture of uses within this area. Back to the site plan and what is being proposed with this particular application. The applicant has received correspondence from the Ada County Highway District in regard to the right-of-way street improvements. Dale, Island, La Pointe and West Royal are all under the jurisdiction of the Highway District. As part of the Highway Districts comments they have recommended that the applicant connect those roadway streets as one half of 36 foot street section with vertical curb, gutter and sidewalk. Staff has evaluated the area and made some determination in regard to what the streetscape should look like. In this particular case staff has identified Royal Street as a major arterial to the local Ann Morrison public park. Because it is heavily traversed with both pedestrians and bicyclist we have recommended that the applicant provide an eight foot sidewalk that is detached from the curb with an eight foot planter strip. We also required a five foot concrete sidewalk along Dale and LaPointe that is separated by the eight foot planter strip. Island is a little bit of a unique situation. To accommodate for the larger sidewalk on West Royal we have allowed the applicant to reduce the planter strip along Island Street to six feet as opposed to the traditional eight. The applicant is proposing both one and two bedroom units within the 108 residential units. Of those, we have 20 live/work units. When we look at the elevations that have been provided by the applicant we can note that the flat roofs are all the residential components. Once you get into the sloped or the shed roof type structures that is where we focus on live/work units. The streetscape is slightly different for both of those as well. Once we get along the live/work units staff has asked the applicant to shift the building closer to the street with that pedestrian interaction as well as creating more of a hard surface area with tree grates and concrete surfacing. This application is an allowed use within the R-OD zone. It is located near the University and is appropriate for residential units. The one thing that is unusual about this particular project is the materials that the applicant has chosen to utilize. The applicant has chosen to utilize 16 inch hardi-plank vertical siding which would be located on the first and second floors. You can see that identified with the beige color we see on the overhead projector. The upper stories in this particular case would be the third story. The applicant has proposed to provide a vinyl siding product. Boise City Council has evaluated vinyl siding on a case-by-case basis, but has instructed staff to create minimum standards for vinyl siding. If you take a look at the conditions of approval we have recommended that the applicant be able to utilize the vinyl siding on those upper floors, however the quality of that product shall be of the minimum standards that we've established. The applicant is also providing cement fiber board as well as recycled shipping containers. If you take a look you can see that the shipping containers are actually stacked upon one another within the residential units. In the central location and the location I am identifying those are stacked three deep. The reused shipping containers are only a portion of the building. The applicant is proposing to connect this with stick built construction. We'll have a combination and hybrid of these recycled materials as well as new materials. There will be traditional wood frame construction that would meet current standards. The applicant has also utilized primary colors. In this particular case you'll see the

blues, yellows and reds. The applicant has provided a number of samples that they will walk you through in their presentation giving you examples of international as well as national products of multi-family residential units that have utilized the recycled containers. The building masses are located along the intersections of the streets and they do form the streets and identify a pedestrian connection to the units. The surface parking consists of approximately 38 percent of the street frontage and a parking reduction of less than 10 percent has been recommended. If you take a look at the Site Specific Conditions of Approval you'll notice that staff has a number of recommendations in regard to this. The most unique item would be item q. That eventually requires the applicant to come back to the Design Review Committee under a separate application once 80 percent of their construction drawings and documents have been completed to ensure they have met all the conditions of approval that we are recommending. Most of those conditions of approval are in regard to landscaping and streetscape, but there are a few modifications that we have made in regard to elevations. Those elevation requirements were to require the applicant to provide color samples to the Design Review Committee or staff. They have brought those and you'll have the opportunity to review those. If you find that the materials they have provided are sufficient you have the ability to strike item s. as a condition of approval. The other item is that staff has recommended that the doors for each one of the live to work units be located front facing toward the street so we do get that interaction between the business as well as the street. We've also recommended that the windows...this is a residential unit, but that the windows essentially extend to the ground floor to create the appearance of the display area or business area in which those live to work units would be utilizing. We have received a number of comments from neighboring properties. One of those items we received as written correspondence from a property owner. We've also received some additional documentation that I handed to you this evening so if could take a look at that information. I know the applicant is here to speak as well as a number of residential owners or business owners located in that area that would like to provide some additional comments.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Is there a material board to look at?

ANDREA TUNING: We do not have a material board. We do have the materials sample sheet that the applicant will walk us through. Also, within your packet you'll notice that you have what appears to be a color rendering that identifies the actual materials as well as the colors. The applicant will walk you through the color board that they are proposing. That is here and we can make that available to you as well in hard form.

GLENN LEVIE (Applicant): Staff more than adequately covered the thrust of my presentation this evening. What I would like to do is walk you through some of the ideas behind where we had come up with the concept of the design, what we're ultimately trying to achieve and give you some examples of current projects that are out there. The emphasis of this project is to look at trying to build a more conscientious environmental building. We believe that the recycling of the containers is a portion that will move toward that goal. We will try to integrate sustainable materials. The hardi-plank cement product is one. Oddly enough vinyl siding is one. We look to efficiencies within our heating, air conditioning and mechanical systems in order to achieve a better building product. That is our primary goal. We want to address the social benefits of it and environmental benefits of it as they relate to sustainability. Another one of our chief goals is to introduce a mix of activities on site that promote a more social interactive community within our property and also hopefully will draw from the surrounding community. The live/work

blends into the underlined mixed use that the city has on the property. We're new to this and there is not a whole lot out there. We're obviously not relying on a large percentage of it in our project, but we believe that we will attract people and it will bring some form of activity during the daytime to the pedestrian level of the property hopefully giving it some life. Hopefully these businesses as the evening goes the dwellers come back or neighbors come around. There may be applications where these businesses can interact with the community past normal business hours. It is a bit of an experiment. We do believe that it does have a good place here. It has been proven out successfully in other communities. We're willing to jump in and see...let's give this a shot, not over do it, but let's see what happens. As staff discussed there is a number of ways that you can go about building with shipping containers and I'll show a number of examples. Our choice was to do a hybrid of shipping container and conventional construction. The properties with the shipping containers that we felt were most suitable for what we were attempting was that inherently they are rigid steel frame structures so if we place them in an order where they are separated the voided spaces between them basically become infill. The natural product to use for infill would be conventional stick construction. Some of the advantages that the containers bring in the infill is that infill doesn't become this onerous wood frame construction anymore where we're relying on plywood sheeting to keep stabilization for horizontal forces. We're really minimizing the amount of wood in these infill pieces. As I said earlier, we're trying to utilize sustainable products so there is a bit of an added advantage to using the container. From a structural perspective clearly this is an infill product. This is the number of examples of shipping container projects. This is the mother of all that I have visited. It may work where it is. It is in Amsterdam and it is a student housing project. I visited it recently and it just isn't applicable to the United States. It is barely applicable to Amsterdam. It is an example that I wanted to show. It is so literal. It is just stack them up and live. It is not something I feel is compatible or conducive to living environments and I do not feel it is compatible to Boise at all. This is one other literal example. This is an office building outside of London. I visited this as well. They're very interesting. They are fun to walk around. There may be interesting one-off notes, but the bottom line is that the appropriateness in my view and particularly the appropriateness for Boise and this site is, "Don't go there". This is the other side of the shipping containers that is a little more extreme than what we're proposing. These are shipping containers that are used inherently in a greater project and they are used with a variety of materials to create a diversity of space. The upper project was recently completed in the Mojave Desert. The lower space is a prefabricated unit that was constructed offsite and then delivered and erected on site. The lower project is actually a product that was built by the company that we are most likely going to have our units constructed by. This particular project was the one I laid eyes on three years ago and I was most impressed with. It really inspired me to think about solid versus void and how a shipping container doesn't have to be the main part, but is a strong acting part in the overall design. I thought this was a brilliant example of open space and a void of shipping container. Personally it was something I really enjoyed. From that design I really looked at and thought about how containers and void spaces worked together and this was the kickoff for doing this particular design. Basically you have prefabricated units that get delivered on site, they get stacked up and then the general contractor comes in and infill's and completes the project. This was an early study of that void and container idea. These are other applications that I'm currently looking at in my office. This is an art center for a private school that is again the void and solid. That is an interior view of one of the art studios. This was another project we briefly looked at. A little more literal on the shipping container side, but it was for a hotel development. This brings us to the Royal Cube site. Two notes that I want to

make on the presentation from staff and there are very incidental. We have 164 spaces not 162. I counted, counted, counted and I'm fairly certain that is the number. The second one is that the staff report said that this is a four story building. The original submission was four stories. We met with Planning and we reviewed trying to put the buildings at the corners and parking in between and both the Design Review staff and I concluded that the parking in the middle with buildings at the ends didn't quite fit the site as nicely as we like with this particular design. The design is three stories now and not four stories. We've pretty well covered all of the design features from the site. This particular sketch does show the updated sidewalks with the detached paths and also shows the tree grates and trees along the live/work units that face the street. These are a number of views. This is in the parking lot looking back towards the courtyard area. This is a pedestrian way from the street back toward the center of the project. We've made a modification to this in that we've eliminated the concrete. We're going to look at a little more environmentally friendly product like decomposed granite that takes and absorbs rain versus repelling it. This is a cutaway. It is a little difficult to see, but in the left hand portion you can see how the parking garage, the live/work and the unit all integrate. The live/work is on the ground floor and the staircase takes the tenant up to his apartment area directly above the garage and then the floor above it is a straight forward one bedroom apartment. This is a discussion of materials. Basically we've got the exposed corrugated metal. We've got cement fiber that is 16 inches wide and applied in a vertical manner and then we have a more traditional shiplap vinyl siding. As far as colors are going and as far as the finished colors I would just as soon defer and present a final pallet. It will be very close to this, but I want Design staff to be very comfortable with the pallet before we finalize it. This gives you a good idea of where we're headed. We're looking at warm neutral tones as far as the beiges and the grays. The colors for the containers will be toward earth tones. They will not be vibrant primary colors so the color pallet will match with the earth and warm tones we're trying to achieve. The vinyl color in the upper left...at the moment the cement panel in the lower right...I would like to see the cement panel be a little lighter. This is actually an application in Philadelphia of a row house that used the cement panels. It is a very interested application. They silk screened a number of the panels so they had natural panels plus silk screened panels.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: I'm a little confused because I thought at the beginning you said you were going to use recycled containers for sustainability then later in the presentation I thought you mentioned you're looking at a particular company to build your units.

GLENN LEVIE: Yes. We're looking at taking the bedroom units and pre-build them before we bring them out to the site starting with the recycled shipping container, but then doing the interior improvements before bringing them out for erection.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: So they are recycled but you will have somebody retrofit them before bringing them to the site?

GLENN LEVIE: Correct. They would do the partitioning, insulation and the finishing. Basically what you'd do with a modular home. Prepare it for being dropped on the site and tied into the existing site and utilities once they get there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Does this decrease your build out time?

GLENN LEVIE: I don't have a sense that it will. It would be a plus, but it is not something that we're baking into our idea at the moment. It would be obviously be a nice thing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: What are the floor-to-ceiling insulation materials on these?

GLENN LEVIE: The raw floor of a shipping container is 1/8 inch of teak so it is a pretty bullet proof floor. There is a gap below it that gets insulated for sound. On the lid you have a nine and a half foot container so the upper part will have sound attenuating insulation and/or weather insulation if it is a top floor unit. A question that has come up over, over and over and I would be remiss not to tell the Committee. One of the interesting things that I've learned through this process and it was the first question I had. How are these things sustainable from a living point of view, how can somebody live in a metal box. I need that answered before I even try to do this project. One of the fascinating things that has come out of it is that there is a paint product that they apply to this. This is not something that just showed up out of the blue yesterday. This is something they've used for about three or four years now. It was developed for the space shuttle. The ceramic tiles were painted with this for the space shuttle. Basically it is the thickness of a credit card. It gives an R-19 insulation value. I said, "Great. What about condensation?" They take a piece of metal and they put a blow torch on one side and you can touch the metal on the other side. It is a fascinating product. We're not relying on every square inch of the perimeter of these containers to be finished with this material only because you can't live in a metal box. There has to be a drywall finish in the design that we're working on for three of the four walls exposing one wall just for character. The insulation was my first question when I delved into this. How the heck do you this? I was fascinated by the product.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: Is it just coated with this for the roofing on the metal containers as well or is there a second.

GLENN LEVIE: I'm looking at this to coat the walls. Because of the narrowness of the unit how do we do our best not to infringe the finished interior width? I looked at the roofing as more of a conventional type of insulation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Are you the designer?

GLENN LEVIE: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Are there other projects of this type that you have designed?

GLENN LEVIE: No.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Boise is the first?

GLENN LEVIE: Yes. I'm not the only one out there doing it. There is a boatload of people doing it right now. There are some projects that are starting to come to the surface. S.G. Blocks, which is the company that we're looking at to do our container build-out, has been in business

for three or four years now. They've done a number of projects some of which I've been really impressed with and some which I haven't. It is all gaining momentum.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: The vinyl siding is a sore spot for me personally. I'm not that thrilled with it. I wanted you to touch on why you're not using cementitious panels for the vinyl siding areas as well? It seems a little bit out of character for this building to put on something that is, in my opinion, going to stand out. Cementitious panels, fine, steel is fine and then vinyl siding? How does that work into the overall design?

GLENN LEVIE: The presence of the vinyl siding came late in my design review. I was actually looking at how a particular project had secured the cement fiber board to the exterior of the project and I was looking at the variation of materials that they had used and I was impressed with this particular project. They showed a visual of it that had the combination of those two materials. They seem to suit each other very nicely. I like the idea of getting some variation in materials. It is not a deal breaker for me, but it was something that when I took a step back and looked at this particular project I was impressed with it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: Are the cementitious panels going to be applied as a rain screen?

GLENN LEVIE: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: So you'd be opposed to possibly replacing the vinyl with a cementitious panel?

GLENN LEVIE: It wouldn't hurt my feelings.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: Vinyl siding hurts my feelings a little bit.

GLENN LEVIE: Thank you staff for the nice report it was very well done.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY

MIKE KELLER (General Partner / Morrison Park Investors): We are the 280 unit apartment complex located directly across the street from this property. I believe you have, in your record, a letter from Rick Nelson who is my partner in the project discussing our concerns with the project. I would ask that you carefully read that letter as well. Because I don't have a lot of time and I don't want to take a lot of your time I will highlight some of the issues that we're concerned about. First and foremost we're not opposed to development on the site at all. We think apartments are an appropriate use for the site. Our concern is what the project is going to look like and how it is going to affect the neighbor. I'd like to also make one quick point as it relates to the design review and my understanding of design review. I got on the City's website and one of the items and one of the purposes of the Design Review Committee is to encourage architecture that responds to the needs of users and presents an attractive exterior to the public and adjoining property owners. I'd like to go on record that I'm concerned about the exterior and how the property will look long-term. When you build a project you build it for a 50 plus year life. I'm concerned not that the containers won't last, but I'm concerned about the viability

and how they will look long-term. We're sort of in the experimentation stage on a project like this because nobody has really done it. It doesn't mean that it's not a good idea, but I'd sure feel a lot more comfortable if we had a little more to sink our teeth into as it related to that. Another concern is parking. If you'll note in the aerial that is in the package there are all kinds of cars that are parked along the side perpendicular to the site now. When the site is developed and the curb and gutter is put in there will be parallel parking on the street. In the staff report they are recommending a 10 percent variance on the parking and in their opinion this is fine because it is close to Boise State and there are all these different uses in the area. Well, to the contrary. Because it is close to Boise State a ton of students park over there and they walk or take the shuttle. We have a shuttle stop at our property that is free to Boise State Students to transfer them over to the University. I'm concerned about parking. I've got my resident manager here that would be happy to testify. Parking is a huge issue in that area so I have a concern about parking and the design itself.

ROCKY TOWLE: My business is at 1014 LaPointe Street across and on the east side of this proposed project. Basically as far as the project we have no qualm with what they're looking to do. The main thing we look at is the parking issue that is there. I would really recommend at least on the east side of LaPointe Street...a lot of the businesses there park perpendicular to the street itself and we've talked to staff and they had no problem with what we were doing. They said that development would not be considered until somebody develops our site as far as doing the curb and gutter there. The main thing I look at is the students and the people that are living on this...I would like to have included in our recommendation if at all possible that the east side have one hour parking from 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday so we have spaces for our clients to park and not be interrupted by long-term parking there. The 1.5 parking stalls that are done there is more than what is done on the existing apartments that are adjacent to the park, but still I'm concerned about the overflow of parking. Also, I submitted a letter from House of Wheels who is adjacent to me basically restating the same thing I've said.\

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Could staff please read the letter into the record?

ANDREA TUNING: It is not necessary to actually read the letter. It is more appropriate to notice that we did receive that this evening. It is written correspondence identifying a number of concerns specifically parking. That letter was received from Bill Kelly of House of Wheels. We'll implement that into the record.

MATT GOEBEL (Boise Green Investors): Boise Green Investors is the ownership group for Park Village Apartments at 989 Sherwood. Generally speaking we're excited to see some new development coming into the neighborhood and think it is a positive catalyst for everybody. But, with that said, we have a few concerns. The first of which is traffic congestion heading toward the intersection of Capitol Boulevard and University. Basically anybody coming from the proposed development site that is looking to head north on Capitol Boulevard would need to flow up to Ann Morrison Park Drive and head out to Capitol and take a left at that intersection that is already pretty congested and gets backed up particularly during rush hour and during the school year. That also happens to flow right by our property, which is at the intersection of Ann Morrison, Lusk and Sherwood. We have some concerns about that. I echo the other gentleman's concerns about parking in the neighborhood. I can attest like they did that during special events at the park and during the school year that street parking is hard to come by. The



multi-family properties that exist in the neighborhood currently are under parked generally as it aligns with the City's requirements so I have concern about bringing a third project into the neighborhood that will be below the City code requirements on parking. Lastly and something that ties into my prior two points is pedestrian safety in the neighborhood because so many people do park and walk those streets and ride bikes to try and get over to the University. I can tell you anecdotally of instances in the neighborhood where people take corners quickly and have low visibility because of all the street parking so it can feel a little bit dangerous in the neighborhood. We're just asking that you guys give some more consideration to the traffic and parking impacts that this will have. We trust the Committee to make a good decision.

ROCKY TOWLE: The development shows that there is a part of that corner that is not being used and yet the illustrations show that the full block is. I don't understand that.

ANDREA TUNING: In regard to Mr. Towle's comment that the entire site is not hatched is correct. There are actually two different addresses in our addressing. The City did not identify the entire site. The site is bound by all four roadways and encompasses an entire block. To emphasize on his other comment asking us to make a recommendation for one hour parking along LaPointe Street, the public right-of-way is under the jurisdiction of the Ada County Highway District. In order to restrict that from a first come first serve basis it would require their specific review and approval. We simply don't have that jurisdiction at the Design Review Staff or Committee level. We would ask that this recommendation not be included in this particular item. I did hear some other comments that arose under the public testimony in regard to the concerns with traffic congestion. We do look to the Ada County Highway District as our experts in the transportation industry. In their report that they submitted to us they've identified that this site will generate 718 vehicle trips per day of which 67 of those will be peak hour trips. They don't have any traffic counts that are available, but have estimated that the streets do have the capacity to hold these additional 718 vehicle trips per day that will be generated by the site. So we don't have this instance in the future I have recommended that ACHD do a number of traffic counts and I'm anticipating those counts will be returned to me next week so we'll have some additional information in regard to those and exactly when those p.m. peak hours trips are happening. We're actually going to do some other counts as well because we do know that we're out of school right now and that the park is heavily utilized during this time of the year, but what happens when seasons shift and the park isn't being utilized as much and we do have students coming and going. We'll have some traffic counts that we can actually examine in those different seasons so we have recommended that this be conducted and ACHD is working on that right now. I believe those are the comments that I heard this evening that I was able to address.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I have a question about condition q., the resubmittal of a separate application. This is kind of a quirky item in my opinion...we get another crack at it independent of this review. Correct?

ANDREA TUNING: A quality assurance check is essentially what that is. When we got this application and when you take a look at the landscape they aren't real definitive and they are more conceptual in nature. To ensure that we have all of the recommendations and site specific conditions of approval incorporated into the site plan that moves forward for construction we

want to give you the opportunity to make sure that the quality is there, that we have identified all of the items and that the applicant has actually taken steps forward to incorporate those.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: So if we made a motion on the vinyl siding and/or window material, which I haven't seen mentioned anywhere in the report...or did I miss that? The quality control and that type of stuff, but as we make a motion on these site specific conditions and then they come back with 80 percent then this is not a binding document at that point?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: No, this is binding.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: It is a separate application at the 80 percent...they are bringing a new application right?

ANDREA TUNING: We'll keep it under this file number so it would be a continuation of this particular application, but it would be a new agenda item to you for you to ensure quality assurance. If I understand where you might be headed you are looking a site specific condition of approval that eliminates the use of the vinyl siding on the project. We can go ahead and add that as a site specific condition of approval and continue from the letter u.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: Typically we'd do a worksession instead of a new application, but you're saying that there are enough major issues here...

ANDREA TUNING: A worksession or a public hearing. Essentially we have the same public noticing requirements so it could be held at either one.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: What is the roofing material of that sloped roof on that single story element...there are two of them and it is an interior...I don't know what that space was in the plan, but on the opening rendering the roof was quite visible and it is just white in the model.

ANDREA TUNING: That might be a more appropriate question for the applicant. It hadn't been identified at the time of the review.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: We will reopen the public portion.

#### PUBLIC PORTION RE-OPENED

GLENN LEVIE: In response to the roofing material. We haven't selected a particular material, but it will be in the same warm gray earth tone. It's a relatively flat roof. If we were to move into a standing seam metal roof we would obviously come back to Design Review and ask to have that reviewed as a separate item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: That is all I can think of that roof being, but then if you slap TPO up there or something like that...

GLENN LEVIE: I have bigger fish to fry at the moment, but that is a good question. One thing I'd like to address and I know it is a particular concern in the neighborhood with respect to parking. One of the measures I've looked at and obviously parking is problematic if you're a neighbor and you are disgruntled about it. Parking is also problematic if you're a building owner and it is inadequate. It becomes a deterrent to your ability to run a successful project. One of the ways that I've looked at parking which I know the City doesn't use as a benchmark, but I do, is to review physically how many bedrooms you have on a project and assume every bedroom is going to have a car and use that as a measure upon which to determine...I do personally feel it is adequate parking. In our case we have 130 bedrooms and we have 164 stalls. If everybody in a bedroom had a car we still would have more parking than bedrooms. I don't believe and I don't know this to be a fact, but I don't believe that is the case with the adjacent properties. I know that I was the former owner of the project at Sherwood and I know when we initially did this project it was designed for student housing. We went to the University to get parking ratios of people who lived in the dorms and how many used cars and we used that as our determining factor for parking. We exceeded the 1.5 stalls per unit, but they were four bedroom apartments. It just didn't work and it was very upsetting. That was a lesson. I walked away from that project knowing I really need to pay more attention to the ratio of bedrooms to parking than maybe an underlying code. These are all three bedroom apartments and we'd be awfully under-parked in my opinion. I use that as a personal measure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I'm not trying to be hung up on this 80 percent review thing, but at that the time they would address these site specific conditions of approval?

ANDREA TUNING: After this evening they would go home and they would take all of our recommendations and site specific conditions of approval and incorporate them in their plans and then they will bring you a finished product and ask if they have attained the Committee's goals.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: They would incorporate it and reissue it for staff review and then reapply and then we'd review it at that time?

ANDREA TUNING: That is correct.

GLENN LEVIE: I've reviewed the conditions and I'm comfortable and I have no reservations about meeting them.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: Even striking the vinyl?

GLENN LEVIE: If you want to strike the vinyl, let's strike the vinyl. I may want to send you a photograph, but I'm willing to strike it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I have not been thoroughly impressed with any of the vinyl that has come across Design Review. Have you selected windows or do you know what the window material is going to be?

GLENN LEVIE: We've narrowed it down to either an aluminum window that is compatible with the look we're going towards or a vinyl window that would meld in with the exterior.

We're not going with anything more abstract than that. It will be benign versus attention grabbing.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: I for one like the idea that at 80 percent we get another chance to look at some of these topics. It seems pretty conceptual right now and it would be more firmed up obviously. I would also like to comment about the vinyl going away. That has been our stance and we ought to continue it.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Yes. It is in a high traffic area and a lot of people will see this project when going to the park.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I'm on a shaky stance about some of the specific conditions of approval. I agree 100 percent with staff with what we've been presented. There are a lot of questions to be answered and a lot of details. I do like the fact that there is pathway lighting and building lighting. Chairman Evans, are you comfortable with what we're asking for in the site specific conditions for a landscape plan? I don't see anything that says...I guess the 80 percent construction documents should incorporate a pretty thorough landscape at that point.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Staff's been going above and beyond on landscape and site stuff lately so it's fine.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: There's the street frontage landscaping, but the actual building landscape plan is what we haven't seen anything for.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: Right, it is very conceptual.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: Conceptually the project is rather interesting. There has been a lot of student project studies done in this area and it is a sleeper area in our city that started out as light industrial uses and over the years it has slowly transitioned, but it's positioned in today's world and moving forward where a project like this again, conceptually, has a lot of merit in terms of the development of that area. It is close to the City, close to the college, the park and Green Belt. The live-work concept is interesting. There have been a couple of projects here in town that have tried that on a much smaller scale. I don't know how successful they have been in making that work, but a lot of that depends on the spinoff that occurs on a project like this with service facilities, a market and a deli. Some of those things are in the area right now, but for a lot of those services you still have to get in your car or on your bike and go to them. If those things started to backfill into the neighborhood there you could really develop a community that really works pretty well for adversity of people. With regard to the conditions of approval and the 80 percent point, my only concern there is at that point in the development of the construction documents on a project like this you're more than a little pregnant with the project. Maybe we want to look at it a little earlier. Say 50 percent or something like that to where the applicant has a little bit more flexibility and isn't so invested in the time with engineers and such to make those kinds of changes. I don't know if that makes sense to you or not (*speaking to applicant*) in that regard?

GLENN LEVIE: Absolutely.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: It gives you more time to react and you haven't gone too far.

GLENN LEVIE: (*speaking from audience*) I'm a big fan of working together and the earlier the better.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: The parking comes up on every project as well as traffic issues. If the world keeps going the way it is gas will drive us out of the marketplace and there will be a lot of us walking most likely. It is something the applicant has stated would be a problem for him and a problem for the neighbors and we'll have to work together with staff and ACHD to resolve some of those issues as they come forward.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: Condition c. says. "*Building façade shall be modulated at no more than 20 feet for a minimum depth of three feet*". Given this unique design I was wondering how...or is that something we can strike? I don't know how we can meet that condition to be honest with you looking at the plan.

ANDREA TUNING: As a formality we would have to open the public hearing in order for me to answer that question. However, I would be happy to answer it.

#### PUBLIC PORTION RE-OPENED

ANDREA TUNING: That condition of approval was identified specifically because this project is located in an R-OD zone. That R-OD zone allows some flexibility in regard to your setback. When you read the zone and the allowance that takes place in that, it allows 50 percent of the building façade to encroach at 80 percent setback so when we ran that calculation 42 percent of the building façade was covering 80 percent of that setback so we don't have the ability to strike that because it is actually built in an R-OD zone. If they are going to encroach into that setback then they have to provide that three foot modulation and that is specific to the Zoning Ordinance as it reads today.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: The three foot depth that we're talking about in Condition c. is the encroachment on the setback?

ANDREA TUNING: Correct. Then the 20 feet in width is that every 20 feet it has some...

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: The way I was reading that was that it was a three foot modulation at 20 foot of width. This has twenty feet of modulation or whatever it is?

ANDREA TUNING: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: That makes sense.

GLENN LEVIE: Would you like me to elaborate on that a little bit because I did work with staff on that. The area that we do encroach is specifically the area that is the business or live/work.

We wanted it to be closer to the sidewalk and more pedestrian oriented so that is where it occurs and we do meet the specific conditions of the code.

MIKE KELLER: I would like to have adequate parking too. The applicant made the point that he has got 108 bedrooms and he's got 160 parking stalls and I agree with and understand that. A lot of times there is more than one person sleeping in that bedroom. My wife sleeps in the same bedroom I do and she has her own car. I'm very, very concerned about the parking and I want to go on record for that. I know staff is recommending a ten percent reduction, but the Committee could do something about that if you believe that is a concern.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I worked off LaPointe and parking is a concern in that area, but meeting the requirements...in my opinion this is probably going to be used a lot for student and non-student housing and it is mixed use and all that good stuff. This project is not necessarily, with the parking that they are providing, exasperating that problem. A lot of it has to do with the BSU students that come in there during the day, park and leave their car all day and drive back home at night. That is a huge problem, but as Andrea mentioned that is an ACHD issue. If I could wave a wand I would definitely make it an hourly and/or residential zoned area for parking so that BSU would have to take care of their own parking problems and not burden you with those problems. In my opinion I don't know how we can put that on this development.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: Limited residential parking is imposed on a lot of neighborhoods around odd areas and I suspect it just a matter of the property owners approaching the Highway District with the issue and getting a two hour limit for residential parking on the street.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I'm very much in line with something like that being done down there, but we can't do it.

#### PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: As I have made it abundantly clear the 80 percent is a little bit difficult for me and if it weren't for that some of these conditions would have to be locked down to a much greater degree. However, with condition q. I'm relatively comfortable passing these things off. We were discussing modifying that to be a 50 percent set in construction documents or money numbers.

**COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT MOVED TO APPROVE DRH11-00133 MODIFYING THE CONDITIONS. THE VINYL SIDING WILL NOT BE ALLOWED, STRIKING CONDITION N. SINCE IT IS RELATED TO M. AND MODIFYING Q. TO READ THAT THE APPLICANT SHALL COME BACK WITH A 50 PERCENT CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT SET INSTEAD OF AN 80 PERCENT DOCUMENT SET.**

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: At the time of the 50 percent review would we have more traffic numbers so we could possibly address the parking issue at that point and time? I'm somewhat concerned about it and it is a valid point. But, I don't have ACHD's input other than

they haven't done any studies. There are a couple pinch points in that area, if you view it, that are of concern. It is an area that needs to be developed. It is properly located for becoming and attribute to Downtown Boise. As we start this process of adding new developments there the traffic study should be paramount and come first and right now it seems to be behind the cart as opposed to leading the issue. I would like to hear more about the traffic numbers and would like to withhold approval of the reduction in parking based upon the provision of additional information.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA: What I'm trying to understand is that the traffic study will just reveal traffic counts and won't have anything to do with parking. All it will demonstrate is that they've either created a street flow of Morrison Center, Capitol Boulevard and the block point and I'm not sure how that necessarily reflects on this project or how it would affect our decision on this project.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: It might give us an ideal of the numbers of cars that are coming in going out. I agree with your comments that it's probably not apples-to-apples in all respects, but it is of some concern to me.

CHAIRMAN EVANS: As in the interior parking lots for this project and adjacent roads?

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Right.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: I agree parking is a concern, but I'm not exactly sure how we would in effect remedy that problem as Design Review. While I agree, I don't know if we'll have a lot of impact.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: It would be up to ACHD to determine how long people could park on those exterior streets, correct?

COMMITTEE MEMBER GARRETT: We could require that this project have more parking stalls, but I don't think we are going to necessarily alleviate the street parking concerns the adjacent neighbors seem to have which is my point. If they needed more stalls they would have to go with shared parking or whatever they wanted to create it. If they go after that, but the street parking issues will remain regardless of what we do.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you for the discussion.

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ZABALA SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE 4:0. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**