

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
August 8, 2011**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Great Falls Design Review Board was called to order by Ms. Jean Price at 3:00 p.m. in the Rainbow Conference room of the Civic Center.

ROLL CALL & ATTENDANCE

Design Review Board Members present:

Ms. Jean Price, Chair
Mr. Bruce Forde
Ms. Mary Klette
Mr. Jule Stuver

Design Review Board Members absent:

Mr. Todd Humble

City Staff Members present:

Mr. Charlie Sheets, Development Review Coordinator
Ms. Jana Cooper, Planner II
Mr. Dave Dobbs, City Engineer
Ms. Patty Cadwell, Neighborhood & Youth Council Coordinator
Ms. Phyllis Tryon, Administrative Assistant

Others present:

Mr. Sam Barer, applicant for proposed retail store at 720 Central Avenue
Ms. Jo Dee Black, Great Falls Tribune

MINUTES

Ms. Price asked if there were any comments on the minutes of the July 25, 2011 meeting. Mr. Forde moved to approve the minutes as stated. Ms. Klette seconded. All being in favor, the minutes were approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS 720 Central Avenue

Mr. Sheets, Development Review Coordinator for the City, reviewed the City staff report on the proposed renovation of the building at 720 Central Avenue for a retail store. The building formerly housed Al's Repair and Appliance and has been vacant since 2009. Proposed renovations include steel-Delta Rib Vertical siding, replacement of front windows and the entry door, mullions over the window transoms, and interior renovation. The property is within the Central Historic Business District but is not within the Business Improvement District (BID). Ms. Ellen Sievert, City Historical Preservation Officer, recommends a masonry veneer rather than steel, and repair of the wood windows.

Four off-street parking spaces from the alley are on unmarked gravel and will be used by the owner and employees. Customers will use on-street parking. The proposed roof sign is prohibited by City Code, and the applicant would need to take his sign plans to the Board of Adjustment for approval. Lighting requirements are not triggered by this project.

Mr. Sheets concluded the staff report with recommendations and offered to answer any questions for the Board.

Mr. Sam Barer presented details of the project. Ms. Price asked that he address, in particular, the suggestions made by Ms. Sievert, City HPO. Mr. Barer explained that the current store front has steel siding, and that the improvements he is proposing will significantly improve the building façade. He stated that if the City mandates he use historical masonry brick veneer and refurbish the wood-framed windows (currently covered with plywood), he will not be able to proceed with the project. He consulted with Nelson Architects to design a restoration consistent with the appearance of other stores on the block. He also stated that neighboring retail establishments desire him to complete the project. He said the BID had called him and requested the building be improved and graffiti removed.

Mr. Forde asked for clarification on the term, "historical brick." Mr. Stuver said there was some brick veneer on the building which has been covered and the condition is unknown. Mr. Sheets explained the term, "historic masonry veneer" as a running bond or simple course with a solder row in it. Mr. Stuver asked if veneer would put the building over the property line on the parking lot side. Mr. Sheets explained an encroachment is allowed.

Ms. Klette asked if the restoration look chosen ties in conceptually to the store itself. Mr. Barer explained that cost was the factor in choosing the outer design. Mr. Stuver suggested raising the parapet and placing signage on the parapet. The board inquired as to the type of retail store, and Mr. Barer said it will be "The Magic Shack," for retail sales of magic items. He said the frontage was designed more with a clean look in mind rather than specifically the sale of magic items. The title of the store will be on the windows rather than on the building.

Mr. Stuver inquired about exterior lighting, and Mr. Barer said he would like some exterior lights along the side of the building. Currently, there is no electrical service along that facade. Mr. Forde said the proposed siding may not be correct for this building. Delta-rib has the appearance of metal storage buildings and may not be suitable for Central Avenue retail.

Discussion ensued about stone or brick veneer materials, Delta-rib versus corrugated steel, and wrap-around options. The commission suggested a horizontal metal on the lower portion with a different texture. Further discussion ensued about using brick or stone on the lower portion and the cost differences involved. Also discussed was the cost of replacing wood windows and the energy efficiency factor.

Mr. Stuver summarized the DRB recommendations as using a paneling other than Delta-rib, using a different style wainscot in a different color, and allowing the Planning Director to review and approve the revised plans.

MOTION: That the Design Review Board approve with the following conditions the Application of Samuel R. Barer, 720 Central Avenue, as shown in the conceptual development plans contained within the staff report:

1. The proposed project shall be developed consistent with the conditions in the agenda report, all codes and ordinances of the City of Great Falls, the State of Montana, and all other applicable regulatory agencies.
2. If after the approval of the concept development plan as amended by the board, the owner proposes to expand or modify the conceptual development plans, the Director of the Planning and Community Development Department shall determine in writing if such proposed changes would alter the concept for one or more review criteria. If such proposed change would alter the plan, the proposal shall be resubmitted for review as a new application.
3. The applicant would need to consider taking the roof sign to the Board of Adjustment.
4. Require the front façade material be changed from Delta-rib to corrugated steel siding with a different texture steel wainscoting running vertically and being of a different color than the other siding.
5. The applicant will work with Planning staff for approval of Board directed design changes.

Made by: Ms. Klette
Seconded: Mr. Forde

VOTE: All being in favor, the motion carried.

**Great Falls Warehouse, LLC
701 River Drive South**

Mr. Sheets reviewed the City staff report for the proposed renovation of the exterior façade of the existing warehouse to accommodate five commercial suites to be leased. Mr. Sheets explained that the proposed use was a good example of transitioning from former industrial uses along the river to commercial spaces which contribute to the river corridor. A fitness center is one of the uses proposed, which would increase traffic in and out of the property.

The owner proposes to keep garage doors on four of the suites and place siding over the garage door for the fitness suite. The parking lot is currently gravel and the owner proposes to pave the parking area and include two handicap parking spaces. The landscaping plan proposes 4,000 square feet of maintained landscaping with 99 shrubs as well as boulevard plantings. Planters will be placed in front of each suite. No signage is proposed at this time, and will require a separate permit.

Mr. Sheets concluded the staff report. Board discussion followed to clarify details of the proposal. The chain link fence will be removed. Ms. Price inquired if the handicap parking spaces were too far from the buildings, but Mr. Sheets clarified that they are placed correctly. The garage doors are white and the roof will remain as it is. The Board was concerned about outdoor lighting. Mr. Sheets explained that lighting review is triggered by expansion but not renovation of existing buildings. Due to the large warehouse garage doors, planting along 50 percent of the frontage is a difficult requirement to meet.

After reviewing the proposed design, the Board recommended that overhead garage and man doors be painted a color complementary to the existing window color, that the landscape planters along the front of the building be extended under the windows to the man doors, and that an outdoor lighting plan be developed for the parking lot .

MOTION: That the Design Review Board approve the Design Review Application of Great Falls Warehouse, LLC, Braylen Sykes, Agent, 701 River Drive South, as shown in the conceptual development plans contained within this report subject to fulfillment of the following conditions by the applicant:

1. The proposed project shall be developed consistent with the conditions in the agenda report, all codes and ordinances of the City of Great Falls, the State of Montana, and all other applicable regulatory agencies.

2. If after the approval of the concept development plan as amended by the board, the owner proposes to expand or modify the conceptual development plans, the Director of the Planning and Community Development Department shall determine in writing if such proposed changes would alter the concept for one or more review criteria. If such proposed change would alter the plan, the proposal shall be resubmitted for review as a new application.
3. That overhead garage and man doors be painted a color complementary to the existing window color.
4. That the applicant extend the landscape planters along the front of the building under the windows to the man doors.
5. That the applicant develop an outdoor lighting plan for the parking lot.

Made by: Mr. Stuver
Seconded: Ms. Klette

VOTE: Mr. Forde recused himself from the vote. The motion carried with a vote of 3-0.

Cascade Ridge Senior Living @ Benefis Medical Complex
3001 15th Avenue South

The applicant was not present for the design review.

MOTION: That the Design Review Board table this review for the next meeting of the Board.

Made by: Ms. Klette
Seconded: Mr. Stuver

VOTE: All being in favor, the motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Sheets stated there will be two applications for a meeting on August 22. The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.