



Planning & Development Services

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

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

Design Review Committee Worksession / Hearing Minutes of December 12, 2012

Committee James Marsh, Chairman, Bruce Taylor, David Rudeen and Trent
Members Present Koci

Staff Members Present Sarah Schafer, Josh Wilson, Rob Lockward and Nicki Heckenlively

DRH12-00319 / Hawkins Companies

Location: 300 S. Capitol Boulevard

Design Review for four single-story retail buildings totaling approximately 19,560 square feet with a drive through and a surface parking lot in a C-5DDC (Central Business with Downtown Design Review and Capitol Boulevard Overlay) zone.

SARAH SCHAFFER: Brian Vaughn with Hawkins Company is requesting approval to construct four, single-story retail/commercial/restaurant buildings located at 300 S. Capitol Boulevard. The site is along two major gateway frontages of Capitol Boulevard and Front Street. 6th Street is located to the east and Broad Street to the south. The site is currently a gravel surface parking lot with landscape along both Capitol Boulevard and Front Street. To the west of the site is the BoDo Development with the Hampton Inn and Suites as well as structured parking in the Office Depot along Capitol Boulevard. To the northwest of the site you can see the Grove Hotel and Century Link Arena. To the north on the corner are the Bank of America Building and then the laundry service and Bizprint. To the west is a portion of the University of Idaho development and then further west is the Concordia Law Building. To the south you can see some of the older single story warehouse buildings turned into commercial and offices uses. Here you see some of the access points currently in existence which this proposal will close. I'll go through some site photos for you so you can get a feel for the area. This is at Broad Street. The site is laid out with the buildings located at the three major intersections. Retail 1, the largest of the four buildings is located at the main intersection of Capitol and Front Street. Pad 3, with the drive through in behind it, is located at the intersection of Capitol and Broad Street and Pads 1 and 2 form a plaza at the intersection of Front and 6th. The remainder of the site is set aside for the 80 on-site parking spaces. At this point, I want to let you know I did have an error in my staff report and want to point that out to you. In the staff report under parking that is required (Page 3 of 21) and under total number of compact spaces allowed I should have put in there is an allowance of 40 percent in our ordinance. 40 percent of the provided parking spaces are allowed to be compact. The applicant is proposing 26 compact stalls which put them at 32.5 percent so they are well within the requirements of the ordinance. Vehicular access to the site will be in from Broad

Street and 6th Street through the two access points you can see on the site plan. Truck access will be through the curb cut on Broad Street. Trucks will turn towards the access point on 6th and back into the loading dock at this location. Pedestrian access is provided through the public walkway system along the perimeter of the site. There is the access point at corner of Front and 6th as well as through the outdoor seating area off of Pad 3 along Broad Street. As a recommended condition of approval staff has suggested clear pedestrian pathways on the north side of the 6th Street access so along this location we are requiring changes in pavement or color of the pavement in behind the parking stalls so access can be gained to the Retail 1 Building. Additionally staff has suggested along the west side of the curb cut on Broad that the walkway connect to this location so you can get along to the Retail 1 building as well. The proposed landscape plan meets the dimensional requirements set forth in the ordinance, in the adopted River Street – Myrtle Street Master Plan and the Capitol Boulevard Standards. Street trees and the interior planters generally meet the requirements in the ordinance. Staff has suggested a condition of approval which would require larger trees in the parking field. The trees staff proposed will provide a broader canopy than those noted. Those noted on the plan are columnar and we'd like a little bit larger branching habit so we can cut down on some of the heat gained through pavement. The building located on the northwest corner of the site is the Retail 1 Building. It is approximately 13,060 square feet. The building to the top of the parapet along Capitol Boulevard is 26 feet tall. Just for reference the Office Depot building across the street is 28 feet in height so it is similar to what you get across the street. There is a mix of materials ranging from a honed face concrete masonry unit block which you can see on the materials board, to a midnight black matte finish brick as well as metal panels. The changes in material along with the stepping of the wall planes and modulation of the parapet provide shadow relief and design interest along the street frontages. Staff did suggest a condition of approval for this building. Along the Capitol Boulevard frontage there is a set of three storefront windows. You can see those here. We have suggested this center bay be dropped down to within the two feet similar to the bays on either side. These windows are display windows with visibility into the building of approximately 30 inches. They are not clear visibility into the interior of the store. Product storage is anticipated from behind these display windows. Another suggested condition of approval would require continuous canopies along the Capitol Boulevard Street frontages. That would be along this street frontage. This side of the street is anticipated to be the main pedestrian walkway given the cross walks at the intersections of Capitol and Front. You can only cross from the north side of Front Street to the south side on the east side of the street and then you have to cross over to the west on the south side of Front Street. With this development going in we are anticipating a lot more street pedestrian activity on the east side of Capitol Boulevard thus the suggestion of canopies. Staff believes a modified condition on Condition 1.r., would be appropriate. We could look at expanding these canopies above the storefront to a six foot depth. As you can see from the side elevation these are more minor canopies along this area. Additionally there is possibility of putting canopies above the windows at the rear of the loading dock. It could be in keeping with the canopy along the street on the side of the loading dock. You can see on this elevation it has a little bit of depth to it as well. This is something the applicant is definitely going to want to discuss with you. They do have concerns in regard to the awnings located along Capitol Boulevard. Those are a couple of options for the Committee as well as the completely striking that condition. Pad 1 and Pad 2 are very similar in design to this structure and to each other. The entries are oriented towards the intersection of Front and 6th Street. Storefront is located along a large portion of the street frontage so this is the street

elevation for Pad 1. Pad 2 is very similar to this. Given there is approximately only 22 feet in height for these buildings and they are approximately 2,000 square feet apiece, staff has suggested a condition of approval requiring an architectural element connect the two buildings to provide additional massing and a stronger corner at the intersection of Front Street and 6th Street. An additional suggested condition would require a design of this area which is located interior to the site and addresses the parking. Because there is no landscape planters located between the sidewalk and the building we can't rely on plant materials to soften some of the building façade and add design interest. Staff has suggested a condition of approval that some kind of architectural element be added in there as well. Pad 3 is the building that is currently designed as the drive through facility. Within the C-5 zone, a drive through is allowed through a conditional use permit, which the applicant is seeking in front of the Planning & Zoning Commission at the beginning of January. The drive through would be allowed as long as it is enclosed within the building or part of the overall building design. It can't be fully visible from the public right-of-way. The enclosure of the facility is best seen through the perspective drawings for the site. This is the Retail 1 building, Pads 1 and 2, which front along 6th Street and Front Street and this is the Pad 3 building with the enclosed drive through area. You can see the roof structure has been provided over the entire facility. These are some additional perspectives you see of the buildings. Here is where staff has suggested conditions of approval for Pads 1 and 2 as it faces the parking area. This is the intersection of Front and 6th Street as you see into the site for the plaza. This is where staff has suggested some additional height connecting the two structures to provide a little bit more mass along the street corner. You can see the elevations of Pads 1 and 2 and additional perspectives of the retail pad. You can see Retail 1 from the corner and this is what you would see mainly from the corner of Broad and 6th Street and along Front Street with the main entry off the parking field. Here is where you start to see some of the drive through area off Pad 3. There is outdoor dining area here and as part of the conditions of approval staff has requested a sidewalk that would be from here to the accessible route to the front of Retail 1. In enclosing the drive through the applicant has utilized the cut-out metal panels as well as the black brick as pilaster to hold up the roof plane. You can see how this is enclosed through this area and the extension of the structure. Here again this is what you'd see along Capitol Boulevard. Capitol Boulevard has very specific streetscapes standards and the applicant has incorporated this. There is a condition of approval requesting some low plant materials be changed out to the standard within the ordinance and the applicant has agreed to do this. Then you can see that the drive through screening is recessed and this area will also be planted. It is not currently proposed as hardscape if you look at the landscape plan you can see this is all landscaped along with the cut-out metal panels, solid metal panels and then the black brick as columns throughout the drive through area. You can see this again on this elevation. The applicant is here to talk further about their design concept and to provide you with any additional information you may need. After the applicant has given their presentation I'd be happy to stand for any questions that haven't been answered.

APPLICANT TESTIMONY

ANDREW ERSTAD (Applicant's Architect / Representative): Staff has been great to work with and we've appreciated the candid dialog back and forth. We don't always agree with things, but this is what makes projects better. We are in agreement with all of staff's recommended conditions of approval with exception of Condition 1.r., which is in your Conclusions and

Recommendations, “*Provide continuous canopy along the Capitol Boulevard side of Retail 1*”. I want to talk about it briefly because there are a couple of things going on. I’m disappointed with the scans of these images...I know you’ve all had a chance to look at them on-line and on the computer they are much clearer. This is the west elevation along Capitol. The layout of the structure is this honed faced CMU block. There are a series of windows across here and then there are a series of panels which sit in front of some of those windows. We have the three openings so we have the brick and metal panels and a small canopy over each of these pieces with the large canopy over the entry. We are in agreement with all of the conditions which would mean the glazing drops down to the sill piece and we continue the articulation. As we look at the request for the canopies a couple of things come to mind. We are putting canopies on this elevation and we don’t have a problem with some adjustments if it is to make these a little bit deeper canopies, but to come in and do a continuous canopy all across here is incongruous with what is going on and it is not consistent with anything. It is not consistent with any of the buildings down in this area. Many of you have probably walked by the Office Depot and the parking structure into the Hampton Inn and all you need to do is continue down and around any of the streets. The one area where there is a continuous canopy is on the old Bon Marché building. I’m dating myself because I guess we call it the Macy’s building now. That is not a pleasant place to walk and I challenge any of us to say it is really an enjoyable place with the continuous canopy all the way around the building. The articulation of the materials and massing is the canopies above the three major windows and the major canopy at the entry that actually wraps and runs down part of Front and then picks up the smaller canopies again here. It is a much more consistent and much more aesthetically correct approach. We feel strongly there is no precedent for the continuous canopy. It is not actually within any of the guidelines so it is a condition I have hard time saying we can go to a standard, go to the guideline and look at this ordinance and it says do a continuous, but it doesn’t. We’re happy to work with staff in making the canopies that are there, especially the three along here and the three along Front, perhaps a little deeper.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: On that elevation and I can’t remember if it is on the other elevations...what you call the metal panels between the black and brick was it stucco for metal panel?

ANDREW ERSTAD: As I said we’re in agreement with the conditions of approval. There was a request to eliminate any notion of stucco.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: It’s carried through in all like this...the pad buildings too?

ANDREW ERSTAD: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN: My questions are all going to deal with the drive through.

ANDREW ERSTAD: That will be going up in front of Planning and Zoning for a conditional use application. The questions are probably associated with the design and not the actual functioning of the drive through?

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN: That would be correct. In the Boise Code sections they provided us it talks about having drive-through lanes that completely enclose all vehicles waiting in the drive through. This doesn't appear to be doing that so if I could get your comments about what you're trying to do there, whether you're meeting this standard or how you feel about that.

ANDREW ERSTAD: Our attempt is to meet that standard and we're working with our clients. We've laid out a number of stacks on the cars and things of this nature. We're in process, if you will, on that aspect.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN: My next question is for both staff and the applicant. You're in agreement with the pedestrian linkage that takes something from the patio area on the other side of the drive-through entry lane and connects it up with those other buildings. It seems like a horrible conflict. Number one, it takes down the screening from the patio area to the cars that are stacking and queuing up in exchange for having a pedestrian who has to walk across that drive-through lane to get to the other building. I'm troubled with...

- a. Somebody would want to make that journey.
- b. We want to make somebody make that journey.

Some of it is due to the nature there is a drive-through there to start with so you're kind of dealing with the animal the best you can, but I personally would struggle with this as a requirement.

ANDREW ERSTAD: The challenge with the drive-through is sort of systematic around the City of Boise. We have two brand new drive-throughs with the same exact conflicts. There is one called Chik-Fil-A down the street on Front and Broadway and if you go up to Overland and Vista there is a new Jimmy John's and you run into very comparable conflicts there. There is not a perfect solution. The access across with the pathway... if you look at this pathway the series of screened panels as we lay them out will accommodate a path through them and still provide the screening of the vehicles. The other access staff identified was a pathway across here. We have pathways all the way around into each of the frontages of these buildings. We recognize human nature as going to cut through the shortest path so we've actually looked at...what do you do across here and we've looked how you address it across here and in here. We will certainly and have already been working with staff on this aspect and we're comfortable coming back with a workable solution. It doesn't perhaps address totally what your concerns are with the drive-through, but at some point there is the uncomfortable conflict between a car and crossing over a pedestrian linkage. We see it all over unfortunately and we're trying to do it gracefully in this case.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: Is there a perspective view from Broad at the drive-through?

SARAH SCHAFER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: It doesn't appear there is enough parapet height to screen rooftop equipment. Will there be rooftop equipment on this building? You see the patio side and there is glazing within what looks to be a couple of feet at the rooftop.

ANDREW ERSTAD: Great question. We are working currently with...because we don't have a specific tenant in this area we don't have specific mechanical loads and things of this nature to identify the actual heights of the units. As we evolve those the parapets will be adjusted. Part of it is what are the ceiling and roof structures and where do they sit within the parapet. The images here don't have all of the refinements at this point as you are well aware. We're confident the parapets will screen the mechanical units.

SARAH SCHAFER: I added a condition of approval which requires all of the building permits for the elevations to outline the mechanical units on the rooftops so I can make sure the parapets do screen those at that point and time.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: It looks like the trash is here. Is this how it is proposed? To be shared between Retail 1 and the drive-through pad and then Pads 1 and 2 will have shared trash?

ANDREW ERSTAD: That is correct. We met with the City and spent a lot of time hashing it out if you will so these two pads share this trash enclosure which is a pretty sizable enclosure and then Retail 1 and Pad 3 would share the trash enclosure down here. Another one of the conditions staff put on that we're fine with is we had a trash enclosure out of honed blocked only at six feet and we'll take it up to 20. 12 feet was the minimum height to go up. We're fine with this. If we need to adjust it up a foot or so or down to make it a logical location we're fine with that. You can see on the elevation Sarah pulled up this is the enclosure and now it will come up.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: I thought I remembered seeing that condition, but I don't see it now. If you are heightening the roof up will you be doing this with the exterior building walls or will you be putting a screen on the roof?

ANDREW ERSTAD: Right now the sketch of the structure has the top of the roof at 12 feet which gives us adequate parapet size to cover it without having to come in building another screen on it. We'll work with staff on this as well as the tenants and their loads are identified.

SARAH SCHAFER: That is Condition i.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

MIKE BALDNER: I have a unique perspective on this project because my office window looks directly over the top of it in an office condominium we've owned for six or seven years. Along with my good friend Dave Wali we were early adopters of the BoDo lifestyle, which means at times we feel a little lonely over there on Front Street hoping there will be some more development to anchor some of the retailers vital to the community we're trying to develop. By that same token I park there so when I heard they were going to develop here I was a little sad to lose my parking spot and was curious as to what it was I was going to be looking at. I will tell you as owners of our space for the foreseeable future and probably the next 25 years all of the concerns on our mind from day one when we bought that property on how it would be developed were adequately addressed and have exceeded our expectations. Our side of the street has a really neat streetscape with the fences and stuff. Staff has done an excellent job of marrying this and we're excited to see how this will become an entry point for our Capitol. Over the years

previous administrations have not taken care of this corridor, but this is the last best chance to address this building we're standing in right now and I think it is going to frame it in a fantastic fashion. We're pretty excited about that, but we still had some concerns with issues relative to a fairly large building across the street from us and having some of the service components over there in principal the trash, loading and also the drive-through. In disclosure at different points of my career I was actually in-house at Albertson's doing design and construction on the east coast so I am familiar with some of these issues and what retailers have to do. I have not seen many retailers go to this length anywhere let alone even in this town to break up the different elements and I literally will be looking at the window getting lowered which is straight outside of my office. It is going to be an interesting visual piece there and we're excited about that. The trash, loading areas and the screens for those were pretty clever and how all of you worked together to figure this out in the drive-through. We understand having been down in this neighborhood how important it is for retail to have some level of parking and so you have to deal with the car issues. It would be great if you didn't, but we watch Office Depot struggle from time-to-time. When we look at the layout of this site we understand there is the balance that needs to be made. It is a great project and ultimately the types of uses likely to be there are going to be required to make the whole core of downtown work which is that live/work/play/shop sort of deal. As someone who'd like to finish my career in that building...living down there we're looking forward to having those services available to the residents down here too. As an owner we'd like to give our unequivocal support to the project.

MARK DUNKLEY: I own the building to the south (Dunkley Music). The warehouse area is really not a warehouse. We're at 410 South Capitol Boulevard and we've been there for 63 years. I want to give my approval. I saw the plans and it is a great option. It will enhance the area and it will be nice not to have the gravel parking lot there anymore. I want to give my approval to the project.

JOHN BERTRAM: I had the good fortune to work on the Capitol Boulevard Action Plan for the 1990 State Centennial and the resulting tree planting and signing so I got heavily involved in the Boulevard as a citizen. Capitol Boulevard is a special place and is our ceremony entryway into the City so it is important to pay attention to what is going on there. I want to thank the Boise Weekly for running a story about it otherwise I might have missed the whole thing. It is hard for a citizen to come into a meeting like this and have a good sense of these materials and shapes. I've seen the drawings through Sarah's presentation and Andy's follow-up. I like the openness, but I'm concerned about the view corridor. This doesn't affect that at all, but in some ways I had hoped for mixed use on this site. This is what we've been looking for...a mixture of use. This is one use, but this doesn't forbid the project from moving forward. Design wise I'm trying to get a handle around the different materials I'm seeing and how they blend together with the screening. It is hard to tell. It looks interesting. I've seen Andy's work previously and he does good work. One of the things really important to me is we have to understand what is happening right down there. I happened to go to First Thursday last Thursday night and I walked over to the glass shop, the Bricolage and the Classic Sign Studio and what is starting to take hold is pedestrians move about the area. One hope and I followed Sarah's comments is to try and integrate these four structures the best you can because there will be movement between them as well as...Broad Street was the intention to go into the central addition as the primary pedestrian bicycle link into Broad so that's important as you're walking from BSU to the State Capitol.

Those are important issues. I do a lot of history work with Preservation Idaho and have worked with the Preservation Commission in the past and I wish somehow clients and owners could look back to see what has been there previously before they forge ahead on new projects. The northern piece along Front was the only Barber Spur Railroad. The railroad is gone, but there is a history there and cars helped build the two dams up river going that way. Because of my knowledge I pulled the files on this particular building that used to be there. I think we've all forgotten once it is torn down you forget what was there. (*Distributed drawing*) I pulled up the files of the 1936 Bunting Tractor Company and you might have all forgotten it. Most recent it was the St. Vincent de Paul and it was in poor shape. It was built in 1936 and torn down in the early 1990's when the block was essentially cleared for the gravel parking lot. This turns out to be a really interesting building in the sense it was coming out of the depression and it had an Art Deco façade with a lot of attention for detail on Capitol Boulevard. Pilasters with Deco relief...kind of sunshine image which is on the back of the drawing I passed out. I want to reflect on history in trying to remember what was there and possibly incorporating some of the features. Not necessarily in this design, but somewhere in the history of the block. In recapping I have concern about design, use, pedestrian movement and history.

TIM WILCOMB: I have a piece of property on 6th Street adjacent to this property. We fully support what is going on here. It is nice to see something actually coming about in this area and look forward to the continuation of future development in a friendly neighborhood and in a conservation manner because we've been in the same property for over 75 years. In fact, I think my grandfather built the Bunting Tractor building. We'd love to see the nature of the area and flavor continue on in a good process and this is a good way of doing it so we're in support of this.

DAVID WALI: I overlook Mr. Baldner's office. I'm on the third floor so I'll have a different vantage point on this property, but as an owner in the 755 Front building on the third floor we fully support the project. If rumors are correct the type of tenants that come here will add to future mixed use projects for the marketplace.

SARAH SCHAFER: I would like to thank everybody who has shown up tonight. This is the largest audience we've had for a Design Review application in years. We didn't have this many people turn out for 8th and Main project, so thank you very much for coming and letting us know what your opinions are in regards to the project. We appreciate the public being interested in what we have going on.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

ANDREW ERSTAD: I appreciate John Bertram's history and he has been very involved in Capitol Boulevard from day one. I had the privilege of sitting on the Capitol Design Guidelines with John and others. We've been incredibly sensitive to Capitol Boulevard in this design and we understand density is an issue and we understand a lot of different things about the dynamic quality of this site. At the end of the day when you're driving up, walking up and biking up Capitol from the south crossing the river and heading north this will be a compliment to the streetscape and not a detraction from the big beautiful building we're all sitting in right now which went under a tremendous restoration. Again, we're very pleased to work with staff and

achieve all of the conditions with the one exception. I'd like for you to consider either removing Condition 1.r. or eliminating the notion of the continuous canopy. It is not consistent with a true streetscape and Capitol Boulevard.

PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED

CHAIRMAN MARSH: My personal thought is with Mr. Erstad's thought that a continuous canopy might break up some of the vertical elements he's placed on the building. Maybe extending one out to staff's recommendation of six feet would be sufficient on that side.

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: The drawings look like they are a foot now and I was thinking maybe three foot to provide some form of protection from the weather.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN: Are you saying a consistent canopy?

CHAIRMAN MARSH: Extending the existing canopies on Capitol.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Make them deeper?

COMMITTEE MEMBER KOCI: Yes. They exist over the windows now.

CHAIRMAN MARSH: Right...those three canopies to be three feet or more possibly? It is nice to have a little weather protection as you walk by and a little additional shadow relief as well. I do want to make a quick statement to Mr. Erstad. I certainly appreciate the abundance of graphics you've provided along with the different perspectives, birds-eye views and views down Capitol Boulevard, etc. It certainly makes it much easier to visualize on our behalf so I really appreciate it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Recommend a three foot minimum.

COMMITTEE MEMBER RUDEEN MOVED TO APPROVE DRH12-00319 BASED ON THE FACTS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS CONTAINED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND STAFF'S RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL MODIFYING CONDITION 1.R., THE APPLICANT SHALL INCREASE THE OVERHANG DEPTH OF THE THREE SMALLER CANOPIES TO AT LEAST THREE FEET IN DEPTH.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR SECONDED THE MOTION.

ROLL CALL VOTE 4:0. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.