

# DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

September 30, 2020, 7:00 pm

Sugar City Hall & Online

**Members in Attendance:** Paul Jeppson, Steve Webster, Spencer Cook

**Others in Attendance:** Quinton Owens (P&Z Administrator), Justin Maupin, Johnny Watson

**Meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**Discussion on Maupin storage unit's site plan:**

This preliminary site plan approval is needed to authorize a letter being sent by Quinton Owens (P&Z Administrator and Building Inspector) to Madison County, since this is in our impact area.

Maupin has submitted an overall future plan of his 2 lots at 1259 & 1295 S Railroad Ave. The plan is to use the two parcels as one in 2023 when UPS's lease ends. The entire two lots will be fenced with a separate paved entrance and exit. Landscaping is shown in the northwest corner and some in front of each of the other storage units facing the street at 1259 S Railroad with possible antique farm implements as added features. He will pave between the buildings for better snow removal. There will also be wainscoting on the front of the buildings and maybe a sign to meet the 30/70 material requirement. Lights will be spaced about 20 ft or so on buildings above doors.

**Motion made by:** Steve Webster to recommend approval of the preliminary site plan as shown and discussed with more details to come and as further development happens.

**Motion seconded by:** Spencer Cook

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Review of Business Park Meeting Discussions:**

Paul identified some items Jon Gregory verbally agreed to with him and Dave Thompson on the site plan for 370 Business Loop earlier this afternoon. The Landscaping Plan still needs to be submitted with landscaping and changes requested in the Business Park meeting. The paving and parking plan were previously reviewed and needed to be approved.

**Motion made by:** Spencer Cook to recommend approval of the paving and parking plan.

**Motion seconded by:** Steve Webster

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Motion made by:** Spencer Cook to recommend conditional approval to City Council of landscaping plan after the required revisions for softscape and hardscape are submitted and verified complete.

**Motion seconded by:** Steve Webster

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Discussion Sun-Glo concerns from previous meeting:**

***We want to reiterate that Design Review is a quasi-judicial body and that we follow SCC 8-4, other applicable SCC, and Idaho Code. Please refer to 8-4-1 for purpose and intent of Design Review.***

***In Design Review we reviewed a multitude of requirements mandated in City Code from 8-4 for the Sun-Glo application. A thorough review of all requirements was made earlier with only our concerns listed. Once these concerns are addressed, we were forwarding the application to City Council for approval. See notes sent to the City on 9/22/2020. This was remanded back to Design Review from City Council 9/24.***

***Concern 1 From the Lighting Plan, was there adequate lighting for the parking area? The lighting on the building was deemed to be adequate and all will need to minimize light pollution.***

With the updated documentation, the proposed lights by the truck scales will also provide additional light in the parking area but the City needs Sun-Glo to verify that it will minimize light pollution.

***Concern 2 Parking Consideration – Discussion***

***Total space minus equipment space would equal what mandates a maximum of 80 spaces instead of the 215+ in SCC Code 8-6-1. This was documented by drawings and testimony that the maximum number of employees would be in the 70's. Applicant specified that the ADA parking requirements would be met and that occupancy could be set for a maximum of 80 along with a notation that if in the future the "load or number of shifts are increased then at that time the applicant would mandatorily increase parking. The applicant's representative went to great lengths documenting equipment space and its relationship to Logically we can see the possibility to make a minor code ordinance change to the table on **SCC 8-6-1**. This SCC 8-6-1 is beyond Design Review purview from 8-4. However, since it is part of the site plan it became applicable under SCC 8-4. We do recommend conditional approval with a statement from the applicant about maximum occupancy and a guarantee that parking would be increased when shifts or numbers of employees changes, or when applicant to comes to the City to increase maximum occupancy. This is in relationship to the parking area. (SCC 8-4-5-C-4H)***

**Motion made by:** Spencer Cook to recommend approval of the updated lighting plan and the parking plan with reduced quantity based on occupancy and use of the building and if in the future the load or number of shifts are increased then at that time the applicant would mandatorily increase parking. It is recommended that to possibly amend the table in City Code to accommodate such future review.

**Motion seconded by:** Steve Webster

**Motion passed unanimously**

***Concern 3 30/70 Wall Surface Requirement SCC 8-4-7A***

### **8-4-6 GENERAL DESIGN STANDARDS**

1. Area Integration: Design review in Sugar City shall promote aesthetic and safe development while protecting property rights and property values. To these ends, the principle of area integration shall apply.

- a. ***In an area with existing development, construction and landscaping shall be of similar or superior design and composition to the existing development in the vicinity.***
- b. In a new plat or on a parcel isolated from existing development, any restrictive covenants of the development shall specify standards of construction and landscaping that unify aesthetic features, promote safety, and prevent anomalous design.

*Applicant has already submitted an appeal addressing this concern to what is required in SCC 8-4-7A. Design Review had previously recommended to the applicant, that they follow the specific Design Standard in SCC 8-4-7A. If Council decides to relax the standard considering what is stated in 8-4-6-1 1 a. and b., we recommend conditional approval with increased landscaping along the eastern and partial southern edges to make the view more aesthetically pleasing to adjacent property owners, citizens, and people entering Sugar City from the South or leaving Sugar City. Applicant presented an improved landscape plan for this area to the City. The current landscape plan met the requirements of the site, but we recommend an increase along the sides visible from the roadways.*

Regarding the 70% maximum metal siding requirement, if relaxing the requirement is considered based on SCC 8-4-6-1-1 for “existing construction” the landscaping proposed could be a condition that promotes aesthetic appeal including landscaping on the south end. Johnny Watson clarified grass would be used only on the north side along 3<sup>rd</sup> South. The existing building has an exterior of concrete block which technically provides about 40% differing material with the addition being metal. The side directly facing the railroad property has an overhang which adds to the appearance of the building as seen from S. Railroad Ave.

**Motion made by:** Spencer Cook to recommend approval to city council to relax the material ratio requirement if they see the landscape plan as meeting the intent of the code by improving the appearance of the building.

Motion seconded by Steve Webster. **Motion passed unanimously**

**Concern 4** DEQ Regulatory Signoff / as well City Engineer – Wastewater Regulations SCC 7-4

**Concern 5** Paving of Staging Area SCC 8-6-2N

The DEQ requirements are not under Design Review purview so discussion was tabled and will be referred to the City Engineer, Public Works, and P&Z. In addition, the paving of the staging area is also not under Design Review and will be referred to P&Z.

**Review of minutes from 9-16-20:**

**Motion made by:** Spencer Cook to approve minutes from 9-16-20

**Motion seconded by:** Steve Webster. **Motion passed unanimously**

**Motion made by:** Steve Webster to adjourn the meeting

**Motion seconded by:** Spencer Cook

**Motion passed unanimously 8:28 pm meeting adjourned**