

SUGAR CITY DESIGN REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING - THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2020

Commissioners in attendance: Paul Jeppson, Steve Webster and Spencer Cook

Others in attendance: City Building Inspector Cliff Morris, Jeff Patlovich, Bret Stoddard & Johnny Watson

6:05 P.M.

Meeting called to order by: Paul Jeppson

Pledge of Allegiance

Discussion on Design Review Application for Sugar City Self Storage:

Discussion on lighting, streets, with other items particular to the lighting that gave us more information. The applicant had sent pictures from their Rexburg storage area, which served as a supplement to their site plan of the proposed project. Information item: The City needs to complete the process of giving the North / South street 50% to each owner. (This has not been done yet.)

Discussion of SCC 8-6-2-G needs to be considered ultimately for discussion/approval from City Council:

Improvements; Construction: Improvements to parking and loading spaces shall be constructed according to the city's standards and drawings and specifications, including screening and landscaping requirements. All parking lots shall be blacktopped and marked within one year after construction on the lot begins.

At this point what happens? Do we need a bond assurance and reevaluation for completeness?

The board reviewed the guidelines for Design Review for application completeness. Motion to recommend: Steve Webster to accept the application plans as being complete and satisfactory with the consideration to paving to be forwarded on. Seconded: Spencer Cook
Passed unanimously

Discussion on Design Review Application for Teton Heights Apartments in Old Farm Estates Division #3:

Following up from last meeting there was verification of parking which is a follow-up to the site plan for future consideration of planning and zoning. Snow storage was a concern in the previous meeting. Mr. Patlovich presented an updated site plan that includes improved snow storage which moves it out of the parking area. A lighting adjustments question with the application lacking a lighting plan as required, which Mr. Patlovich claims is not required and discussed the International Dark Sky ordinance. (Please see SCC 8-4-5 C 3). Garbage placement needs to be front loaded and one area needs to be updated on the site plan. Both lighting and landscape plans were also asked for in the earlier meeting with

examples given to the applicant's representative Mr. Patlovich who claimed that what was on the site plan was enough and not what was illustrated on the perspective drawings. The site plan may be missing some lights. SCC 8-4-5-A 2 states the purposes of design review are aesthetic and safety. (Please see SCC 8-4-5 C 4f which requires a landscape plan.) Ryan Lerwill submitted his approval of matching the perspectives in an e-mail thread dated 2/4 @ 6:04pm. Please have as an exhibit the e-mail dated 2/05 @ 1:00pm that went out to the Design Review Board. See Attachments A & B.

For reference SCC 8-4-5 C requirements for DR application:

An application for board review shall include the following items, as applicable:

1. City map showing the location of the site. For an existing building or facility, the address may be substituted for the city map.
2. Traffic plan showing vehicular, non-motorized and pedestrian access and flow: ingress, egress, and internal to the site for future consideration of planning & zoning.
3. Site plan showing footprints of buildings and/or other structures, signage (see SCC 8-2), topography and landscaping, utilities, outdoor lighting, and streetscape features.
4. Plans of buildings and/or other structures, including elevations and/or sketches, with schedules of exterior materials and colors.
5. Standardized features pertaining to franchised businesses.
6. Landscape plan showing locations and descriptions of trees and other vegetation, non-vegetable landscape features, and installation and maintenance details. Landscape planning includes consideration of the Sugar City forester's list of trees that are suitable to the climate and the city.
7. Permission for the design review board to inspect the site.
8. Other information relevant to design review.

Clarification of open space with the desire to accurately calculate open space was discussed several times with the intent of the code. Applicant mentioned willingness to address safety concerns with lighting and parking area also. The City Engineer in an e-mail today listed other items that should be considered. Please exhibit his e-mail 2/06/2020 @ 5:46pm. (24 minutes before this meeting began.) Discussion of relevance will be forwarded to Planning and Zoning. Storm water management was a concern that probably should be considered sooner better than later.

Chairman proposed ad hoc task force suggested by the Mayor to help this and all future applications when applicable.... A group to address concerns and questions. Mr. Patlovich misunderstood and thought that this ad hoc group would try to change code or requirements, it WILL NOT. The City Code in place at the time of application is what is required. It will only help the applicant complete the application to move forward. Design and Review is not asking for new items to consider, some of the same concerns have brought up multiple times.

As Design Review we want to assist this application. It is our desire to follow the code and have the assurance from developers to follow the code also. Discussion of the site plan still needing to be corrected, with garbage, lighting, and the City Engineer's concerns needing to be addressed.

Steve Webster started a motion, which resulted in more discussion.

Motion: Spencer Cook, "To recommend and accept the application with the stipulations to consider as completeness to Planning and Zoning for its determination. Concerns that the City Engineer brought up to also be addressed. utility plan, storm water management plan, and information on the proposed infrastructure."

Seconded: Steve Webster

Passed unanimously

Note: The appropriate code has been listed above in the minutes, with only clarification needed with a MU zone abutting a residential zone. (Please see SCC 8-6-2-K). All other observed code considerations are listed above. The question here is even though this is MU residential also; it is abutting another zoning classification of residential. This is a Planning and Zoning question, not a Design Review issue.

8-6-2 K Abutting Residential Zones: Whenever a parking lot or driveway to a parking lot is hereafter established in other than a residence zone so as to abut the side or rear line of a lot in a residence zone, a solid masonry wall or a substantial sightly fence not less than five feet (5') high and not more than eight feet (8') high, shall be constructed and maintained along said side or rear lot line up to, but not beyond, the setback building line. In addition, in all zones, the lighting, including any permitted illuminated sign on any parking lot or driveway shall be arranged so that there will be no annoying glare directed or reflected toward residence buildings or residence zones.

Motion to approve the minutes of September 5, 2019 made by: Paul Jeppson (since the other two were not involved in that meeting)

Seconded by Spencer Cook

All were in favor, motion carried

Commission reviewed the September 5, 2019 minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes of January 30, 2020 as amended made by: Spencer Cook

Seconded by Steve Webster

All were in favor, motion carried

Discussed the need to converse with the Mayor about having the City Engineer and City Inspector more involved with Design Review. This was brought up because of the e-mail / letter that listed concerns with the Teton Heights Design Review application that was sent 5:36pm from Winston "Dick" Dyer and that we had received immediately before the meeting.

7:30 P.M. Motion to adjourn the meeting: Spencer Cook

Motion seconded by: Steve Webster

All were in favor, motion carried

Meeting adjourned



Attachment A

Ryan Lerwill

Tue,
Feb 4,
2:14 PM

to Shelley, Jeff

Shelley,

I have sent this over to the applicants and their landscapers to verify that they can replicate this proposal as close as possible in real life when constructed. I am waiting for their response, but I assume it will be very close to this depiction. I need them to verify, I am working on that.

I will get back with you ASAP.

Thank you

Ryan

Ryan Lerwill

Shelley Jones <sjones@sugarcityidaho.gov>

Tue,
Feb 4,
2:46 PM

to Ryan

Thank you!

Ryan Lerwill

Tue,
Feb 4,
6:04 PM

to Shelley

Shelley,

Landscapers are saying 4 to 8 trees per building and 10 - 20 shrubs per building.

This will depend on building placement in relation to open space and roads. They will balance out each building to look as similar to that design as possible, or maybe even better?

That is the report.

Hope that helps.

Ryan



Attachment B

