MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD May 13, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Great Falls Design Review Board was called to order by Mr. Jule Stuver at 3:03 p.m. in the Rainbow Room of the Civic Center.

ROLL CALL & ATTENDANCE

Design Review Board Members present:

Mr. Jule Stuver, Chair

Mr. Bruce Forde

Mr. David Grosse

Mr. Todd Humble

Ms. Mary Klette, Vice Chair

Design Review Board Members absent:

None

City Staff Members present:

Ms. Jana Cooper, Planner II

Mr. Jim Young, City Engineer

Mr. Todd Seymanski, City Forester

Others present:

Mr. Nick Jeffries, for Maple Garden

Mr. Tyson Kraft, Nelson Architects

Mr. Ryan Smith, Nelson Architects

MINUTES

Mr. Stuver asked if there were any comments on the minutes of the April 22, 2013 meeting. Mr. Forde moved to approve the minutes as stated. Mr. Humble seconded, and all being in favor, the minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

DRB2013-7 Voyagers Picnic Awning 1015 25th Street North

Ms. Cooper reviewed the staff report for the application from Nelson Architects for new picnic awnings over an existing picnic area at Centene Stadium. Ms. Cooper entered the staff report into the record. The subject property is ± 8.8 acres and is zoned POS – Parks and Open Space. The application is specifically for two shade awnings over the picnic area adjacent to the first base line at the stadium. The awnings are 25 x 30 and 25 x 50 feet and will be constructed of arched structural steel spaced 10 feet on center. The steel portions will be painted green to match the existing facility. The shade canopy will be made of outdoor fabric and be tan in color.

The proposed project does not trigger any new requirements of the Land Development Code (LDC) for landscaping or outdoor lighting.

Ms. Cooper concluded her review of the staff report and offered to answer any questions from the Board.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION and BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Smith said there used to be temporary structures in this location that had to be taken down in windy conditions. He said the fabric will be lighter colored canvas with red stitching to keep with the baseball theme. Rain will run off the back of the canvas and be carried out through a drainage system. There will be cross-bracing in between columns at the roof plain. Mr. Stuver asked about any lighting for late-night games, and Mr. Smith said they plan to add lighting on the columns which will reflect upward and illuminate the canvas. The picnic area will be available to rent for large groups.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

BOARD ACTION

MOTION: That the Design Review Board approve the Design Review Application for the picnic awnings at Centene Stadium located at 1015 25th Street North, as shown in the conceptual development plans contained within the staff report and provided by the Applicant, subject to the following conditions:

- A. The proposed project shall be developed consistent with the conditions in this staff report, all codes and ordinances of the City of Great Falls, the State of Montana, and all other applicable regulatory agencies.
- B. If after the approval of the concept development plan as amended by this 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 change 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.

Made by: Mr. Humble Seconded: Mr. Grosse

VOTE: Ms. Klette recused herself from the vote. All others being in favor, the motion

passed.

DRB2013-8 Goodwill 1201 7th Street North

Ms. Cooper reviewed the staff report for the application from Nelson Architects on behalf of the owners for a new retail store for Goodwill located at 1201 7th Street South. Ms. Cooper entered the staff report into the record. There was an existing building on the site which was demolished in May 2013. The subject property area is $\pm 91,366$ square feet and the proposed 26,440 square foot store will house retail operations. Ms. Cooper reviewed the details of the proposed building materials as listed in the staff report.

Staff made recommendations included in the staff report as follows:

- 1. Building placement. Buildings should be located to facilitate pedestrian access and circulation. The applicant shall meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act including providing an accessible route from the building to the public way.
- 2. Consistent use of exterior material and finishes. Staff suggests the applicant consider adding either windows to the north façade or taller shrubs/trees along the north facade to break up the ±210 feet of continual metal façade.
- Outdoor Lighting. The applicant has stated that the lighting design for the project is not yet complete. The Outdoor Lighting will consist of poles and wall packs and shall meet City Standards.
- 4. Landscaping. The applicant has submitted a proposed landscape plan that includes 11,169 sq. ft. of landscape area. The code requires 13,700 sq. ft. of landscaping. After the plans were submitted, the applicant was informed by their engineer that the geo-tech report states that the soils in the vicinity of the project are expansive clays. As a result, it was recommended that plantings not be put within 10 feet of the building. Staff is recommending the applicant shift the parking located south of the building, to the north, and provide a new continuous planting bed along the southern boundary line of the project adjacent to the parking lot. Staff is recommending the plantings provided at the front of the building be relocated to the boulevard planting area. Staff recommends the front of the building be accentuated with large container plantings, benches, an art sculpture or large boulders in lieu of providing the foundation planting. Additional innovative solutions and recommendations from the Design Review Board shall be considered by the applicant. The applicant shall provide an updated landscape plan with the building permit, which will be reviewed for code requirements at that time. Additionally, there is an unused portion of the site on the east side of the property which staff assumes will be used for on-site detention. Staff requires this area be planted with native grasses or other treatment and be maintained to prevent the growth of weeds.

Ms. Cooper said that regarding Recommendation 4 listed above, a geo-tech report received since the staff report was written stated that there should be no plantings within 10 feet of the building, so plants are not an option. She said the applicant has stated that the lighting design for this proposed project is not complete, but will consist of poles and wall packs and will meet City standards.

The required number of parking spaces per City Code is 75 parking stalls, and there are 81 proposed stalls, three of which will be ADA accessible. The current configuration of the property is three lots, and staff is requiring an amended plat be filed prior to building permits being issued to consolidate the three lots into one in order to meet relevant building setback requirements. Sign information has not been provided for the proposed project at this time, but all signage would be subject to review by the Planning and Community Development Department of the City.

Ms. Cooper concluded her review of the staff report.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION and BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Smith talked about changes in the landscape design per the geo-tech report. Extensive discussion followed about possible landscaping solutions. Mr. Smith said there will not be a pole sign, but there may be a monument sign. Outdoor lighting includes sconces on the building and lighting for the canopy. Mr. Stuver asked about ADA accessible curbing in the back drop-off area, and Mr. Smith confirmed the curbing would be ADA accessible. There will be two large containers for after-hours drop-offs.

Mr. Smith said they will get civil information to Public Works, and will coordinate any approaches, curbs and service lines with that department. There is a proposed agreement with Big O Tires to share the drive space between the two buildings. Mr. Forde suggested that the Black Hills Spruce indicated on the initial landscape plans can grow pretty large and should be trimmed back if they get too big.

BOARD ACTION

MOTION: That the Design Review Board approve the Design Review Application of Goodwill, as shown in the conceptual development plans contained within the staff report and provided by the Applicant, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed project shall be developed consistent with the conditions in this staff 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 this 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 change 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. Building placement. Buildings should be located to facilitate pedestrian access and circulation. The applicant shall meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act including providing an accessible route from the building to the public way.
- 4. Consistent use of exterior material and finishes. Staff suggests the applicant consider adding windows to the north façade to break up the ±210 feet of continual metal façade.
- 5. Outdoor Lighting. The applicant has stated that the lighting design for the project is not yet complete. The Outdoor Lighting will consist of poles and wall packs and shall meet City Standards.
- 6. Landscaping. The applicant shall provide an updated landscape plan at the time of building permit application consistent with the discussion of the Design Review Board, and staff shall review for code compliance. Additionally, there is an unused portion of the site on the east side of the property. Staff assumes this will be used for onsite detention. Staff requires this area be planted with native grasses or other treatment and be maintained to prevent the growth of weeds.
- Amended plat of the property shall be filed prior to building permits being issued to consolidate the three lots into one lot in order to meeting relevant building setback requirements.

Made by: Mr. Grosse Seconded: Mr. Forde

VOTE: Ms. Klette recused herself from the vote. All others being in favor, the motion

passed.

DRB2013-9 Maple Garden Addition 5401 9th Avenue South

Ms. Cooper reviewed the staff report for the application from Nick and Sui Jeffries for a 969 square foot addition to the existing Maple Garden restaurant located at 5401 9^{th} Avenue South. Ms. Cooper entered the staff report into the record. The proposed addition is being constructed to accommodate additional storage of supplies and equipment. The proposed exterior renovation includes a 17 x 59 foot addition to the northern portion of the existing building. Ms. Cooper reviewed information in the staff report on the proposed building materials. The applicant is proposing wood siding to match the existing building and a dark grey split-faced concrete block wainscot on the proposed addition. They had initially intended to match the existing brick veneer of the building, but have been told this specific brick is no longer manufactured. Staff encourages the applicant to continue researching brick alternatives.

Staff makes the following recommendations:

- 1. Consistent use of exterior material and finishes. Staff suggests the applicant further explore options for providing a brick veneer in lieu of the proposed split faced concrete block.
- Minimum proportion of doors and windows. At least 30 percent of the first floor façade facing a public street should consist of windows and doors. Staff recommends the applicant consider providing a window on the west elevation of the proposed addition adjacent to 54th Street South.

3. Landscaping. The proposed project does not trigger the requirements of Title 17, Chapter 44, Article 3. However, maintenance of the existing landscaping is required and staff recommends the applicant update and add additional planting to the existing bed on the south elevation of the building. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant consider expanding the existing foundation planting bed on the west side of the building and add additional plantings to enhance the view to the building from 54th Street South. Finally, staff is researching whether there are utilities located in the boulevard of 9th Avenue South. If there is not a conflict with utilities, staff recommends the required boulevard planting be installed along 9th Avenue South.

Ms. Cooper said the proposed renovation does not trigger any requirements of the Land Development Code for any change in outdoor lighting or any additional parking. She concluded her review of the staff report.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION and BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Jeffries said they have been planning this addition for a couple of years and have done extensive research to find brick to match the existing building, and there is none available. They instead considered colors that are in the existing brick and worked to complement those. He said the proposed addition is for storage, and he didn't think a window is appropriate. Mr. Stuver suggested sending a manufacturer a sample of the brick color, which could then be matched, but recognized cost could be a factor.

There was discussion about the proposed landscape plantings. Mr. Jeffries said they planned on planting grass along the boulevard and that kids drive through the area as a shortcut. There is no sidewalk along 9^{th} Avenue South, and Mr. Jeffries understood there are utilities in the area. City Engineer, Jim Young, said he would look at that area and see if sidewalks are required. Ms. Klette said that since the proposed addition came very close to triggering additional landscaping requirements, she would like to see the owners take the opportunity to expand on the landscaping. Mr. Jeffries said he had been told that if the addition was any larger, a 7,500 square foot landscaping requirement would kick in, and then there wouldn't be enough parking spaces. For that reason, he kept the proposed addition under that requirement. He clarified that the addition is 17 x 57, not 17 x 59 as stated in the staff report. Mr. Forde discussed irrigation with the landscaping.

Mr. Jeffries said that basically, all they are doing is enclosing freezers so they don't stick out like a sore thumb. Mr. Stuver suggested again that they check into cultured brick, which would look more in context than split-faced block. He also said the roofing looks out of context and asked about whether the cedar would be changed in the future. Mr. Jeffries said the existing cedar fascia will need to be changed within the next two years. The material used will depend upon price. Mr. Stuver asked about screening the mechanicals on the proposed addition. Mr. Jeffries said originally they were considering a parapet to screen the mechanicals, but the contractor removed it on the plans. He said he has no problem adding it back.

Mr. Jeffries said he started working on this project four years ago, and because he was told that he would have to increase landscaping by 7,800 square feet, he instead purchased a building in Atlanta, Georgia. Then he found out he could stay under the 20% size for this existing building and not trigger the extra landscaping, so he started working on this addition again. The goal is to enclose the freezers. He reiterated that a window is not feasible. Mr. Forde asked if a

"dummy" window is possible. Mr. Jeffries said he didn't think the addition is so large that it needs a dummy window to break up the space, and it will actually be out of the public view as well. Mr. Stuver agreed. There was further discussion about the brick fascia colors. Mr. Jeffries said he would continue to see what could be found in brick veneer.

BOARD ACTION

MOTION: That the Design Review Board approve the Design Review Application for the addition to the Maple Garden Restaurant located at 5401 9th Avenue South, as shown in the conceptual development plans contained within this report and provided by the Applicant, subject to the following conditions:

- A. The proposed project shall be developed consistent with the conditions in this staff report, all codes and ordinances of the City of Great Falls, the State of Montana, and all other applicable regulatory agencies.
- B. If after the approval of the concept development plan as approved by this 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 change 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.
- C. Consistent use of exterior material and finishes. Staff suggests the applicant further explore options for providing a brick veneer in lieu of the proposed split faced concrete block.
- D. Landscaping. The proposed project does not trigger the requirements of Title 17, Chapter 44, Article 3. However maintenance of the existing landscaping is required and staff recommends the applicant update and add additional planting to the existing bed on the north elevation of the building. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant consider expanding the existing foundation planting bed on the west side of the building and add additional plantings to enhance the view to the building from 54th Street South. Finally, staff is researching whether there are utilities located in the boulevard of 9th Avenue South. If there is not a conflict with utilities, staff recommends the required boulevard planting be installed along 9th Avenue South.

Made by: Ms. Klette Seconded: Mr. Grosse

VOTE: All being in favor, the motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.