

DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING

Conference Room #5, City Hall
710 E. Mullan Ave Coeur d'Alene Id, 83814
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2023
12:00 pm

12:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: Ingalls, Lemmon, Messina, Pereira, Gore, Snodgrass, Priest

MINUTES: ***ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM

October 27, 2022

NEW BUSINESS: ***ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS

1. Applicant: 512 North 1st, LLC
Location: Garden Avenue between N. 1st Street & 2nd Street
Request: A request for a one-year extension for item DR-3-22

ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:

Motion by _____, seconded by _____,
to continue meeting to _____, at ___ p.m.; motion carried unanimously.
Motion by _____, seconded by _____, to adjourn meeting; motion carried unanimously.

**Please note any final decision made by the Design Review Commission is appealable within 15 days of the decision pursuant to sections [17.09.705](#) through [17.09.715](#) of Title 17, Zoning.*



MINUTES



**DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MINUTES
OCTOBER 27, 2022
In-person/Zoom
Conference Room #6, City Hall
12:00 pm**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina - Chairman
Jef Lemmon
Michael Pereira
Skip Priest

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tami Stroud, Planner
Shana Stuhlmiller, Admin. Assistant

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Jon Ingalls
Joshua Gore
Greta Snodgrass

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Messina at 12:00 p.m.

MINUTES: *ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS**

June 30, 2022

Motion by, Periera, seconded by Priest, to approve the minutes for the Design Review meeting held on June 30, 2022. Motion approved.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Applicant: 512 North 1st, LLC
Location: Garden Avenue between N. 1st Street & 2nd Street
Request: A proposal to build a 34-unit condominium building along with a structured parking garage and two 5-unit townhome structures. The condominium building will be flanked by townhouses on each side that will front 1st and 2nd Streets. The site is located on a 33,000 SF parcel along Garden Avenue between 1st Street and 2nd Street with an alley along the south property line. The subject property is in the Downtown Overlay North District (DO-N) with the Downtown Core (DC) zoning district as the underlying zoning. The project must adhere to the DO- N Design Guidelines and Standards.
(DR-3-22)

Ms. Stroud provided the following statements:

- Monte Miller, Miller Stauffer Architects, on behalf of 512 North 1st LLC, is requesting a First Meeting with the Design Review Commission for a proposed 34-unit condominium building with a structured parking garage and two 5-unit townhome structures.
- The subject property is in the Downtown Overlay North District (DO-N) with the Downtown Core (DC) zoning district as the underlying zoning. The project must adhere to the DO- N Design Guidelines and Standards.
- The site is located a 33,000 SF parcel along Garden Avenue between 1st Street and 2nd Street with an alley along the south property line. The subject property is currently vacant.
- The Roosevelt Inn bed and breakfast lies to the south along with an 8-unit complex.
- The applicant is proposing a modern 34-unit residential condominium building with a structured parking garage and two 5-unit townhome structures.
- The condominium building will be flanked by townhouses on each side that will front 1st and 2nd Streets. Each townhouse structure will consist of five units (10 total) with private garages accessed off a drive aisle between Garden Avenue and the alley.
- The maximum height allowed in the Infill Overlay North District is 45'. The proposed 10-unit townhome project is 40' in height.
- The 34-unit residential loft project is four stories with the building height of 39'-6" with the top of the elevator shaft extending to 43'-6" which is under the maximum height allowed of 45'.
- Hilary Patterson, Community Planning Director has reviewed and recommended approval of the applicant's F.A.R. request for the 34-unit loft project and have determined that they meet the required amenities under each of the requested development bonuses.
 - **Major Amenities:** Public Art or Water Feature (0.5); Public Space (0.5); The project qualifies for a total allowable F.A.R of 2.0
- The Community Planning Director also reviewed and recommended approval of the applicant's request for the requested F.A.R. Bonus request for the ten (10) townhome units for:
 - **Minor Amenities:** Upgraded Building Materials (0.2) The applicant proposed upgraded materials on the townhome buildings totaling a .2 F.A.R. The entire development (townhomes and condos) will all utilize the upgraded building materials, but the applicant did not need to pursue the bonus for the condo FAR.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation.

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina inquired where is the public access located. Ms. Stroud explained they met the code and the applicant is here to explain those amenities.

Chairman Messina Inquired if there were any setback requirements. Ms. Stroud explained that this is in the DOE there are no requirements.

Monte Miller, Applicant representative provided an overview of the project as stated in his narrative.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina noted that sidewalks will be provided and would that be considered part of the public access. Mr. Miller noted on the map where the public spaces will be including the seating areas that will be open to the public with a variety of plants that will be also added into that public space. Ms. Stroud explained part of the development bonuses are part of the infill overlay district for someone to increase their allowable floor area and read from the code what was allowed and added they don't have surface parking.

Chairman Messina inquired what type of lighting will be used on the sign. Mr. Miller explained will be using back lighting.

Commissioner Lemmon inquired how will the stormwater be handled. Mr. Miller explained that we are using a specific product which is a stormwater product used in urban areas designed with a series of vaults that are underground, backfilled with uncompacted soil with catch basins at all the drive aisles and dry piped to this product. These basins will be located under the trees which will help to provide water to the trees.

Tina Hough commented that they own Roosevelt Inn and any improvement on the lot will be great. She added that there are a couple things for the commission to consider the alley access where we have 15 parking spaces for our guests and if we have three guests arriving at the same time in the alley with garbage being picked up where we have a nook where our dumpster sits with the truck blocking the entire alley and provide directional traffic for the alley. Ms. Stroud suggested to contact our Engineering Depart who deals with traffic since this commission only looks at design. Ms. Hough suggested the commission to consider using more brick that will be similar to the other buildings instead of just paint and to provide security to the underground parking.

Jacquelyn Doyle stated she has concerns with the setback from the street to the building, which is a 10' requirement and the applicant is able to obtain a FAR for what is already a requirement. She added in the narrative it states the use of brick and stone on the building gets a bonus and questioned where on the building is the stone/brick located. She added looking at the design of the building it appears the applicant is trying to make as much money as they can by cutting corners that won't fit in with the surrounding area. She stated that she has concerns with snow removal and if this is approved it won't be a benefit to the community.

Chairman Messina inquired if staff can explain the things that this commission can consider. Ms. Stroud explained that snow removal, paving in the alley, trash removal etc. are items the commission cannot consider. She added that streets/engineering would be addressing paving the alley which will be done and Coeur d'Alene Garbage deals with trash pickup with the developer coordinating with them where it will be picked up. She explained the things the commission does consider is the location of the dumpster and design. She added that she met with Ms. Doyle earlier this week and stated her concerns so she contacted legal regarding bonus given for upgraded materials on the building and that legal stated that brick/stone on the building façade that faces the streets and that amenities isn't defined in the code. It's part of the design criteria and so the Planning Director can look at this to determine if this meets the description and example of what they can do. She added this decision was up to the Planning Director to determine if the proposed materials meet the intent of the brick/stone design guideline for the entire building who determined that these other upgraded materials could be used.

Commissioner Lemmon noted the townhomes across the street don't have any brick on them. Ms. Stroud explained that we would have to go back into the files when the project was approved with the understanding that the project across the street didn't have to go through the Design Review Commission.

Chairman Messina suggested that the commission review the FAR requirements.

Mr. Miller provided the following statements.

- He explained that this project is allowed by the various infill zones allowed to up to six FAR times the lot area and we aren't asking for enhanced building materials as a bonus on the lofts and the enhanced materials will be on the townhomes.
- He commented that the trash dumpster would be screened and come out during trash day and housed inside the building.
- He addressed parking that would be secure so people only having garage door openers would be able to access the parking area.
- He explained the public bonus is based on 2% of the building area which is 600 square feet of public space and they are providing 1200 square feet of public space, which is over what is required.

Public Comment closed.

Commissioner Lemmon stated staff looked at the materials to determine if they are qualified for the bonus. Ms. Stroud explained that if the description meets the intent the Planning Director isn't bound by brick/stone under the heading which could be upgraded materials as deemed appropriate. Mr. Miller explained originally, we had stone along the base and it didn't look good. Ms. Stroud stated as an example that the commission approved upgraded materials for The Lake Apartments -- there is no brick/stone on that building -- and the Sherman 5 East and West projects were approved for upgraded materials and those examples showed that brick/stone was not added but rather upgraded materials were used.

Commissioner Lemmon inquired if the upgraded materials are for just the two buildings on the side. Ms. Stroud replied that's correct.

The commission concurred that a second meeting wasn't needed.

Chairman Messina inquired about the paving of the alley referring to language in the packet where it states that the alley will be paved. Ms. Stroud said that isn't part of a Design Review requirement but she did talk with the Engineering Department before the meeting and the City Engineer sent back a confirmation that the alley will be paved.

Commissioner Priest inquired what group is responsible for alley management. Ms. Stroud stated that Streets/Engineering is who to talk about alley access and Coeur d'Alene Garbage would be able to tell what the requirements are for pick up times.

Motion by Lemmon, seconded by Periera, to approve Item DR-3-22 Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Lemmon	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Messina	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Pereira	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Priest	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 4-0 vote.

2. Applicant: Magnuson Properties Partnership
Location: 816 E. Sherman
Request: A proposed 12-unit three story apartment complex. Also included are two-duplex two-story structures. A total of 16 units are proposed and will be located in the C-17 zoning district.
(DR-4-22)

Ms. Stroud provided the following statements:

- Tim Wilson, Momentum Architecture on behalf of Magnuson Properties Partnership is requesting a First Meeting with the Design Review Commission for a 12-unit three story apartment building and two (2) duplex structures, totaling 16-units on a .49-acre site.
- The subject property is in the Infill Overlay District (DO-E) with the Commercial Limited (C-17L) zoning district as the underlying zoning district, and must adhere to the DO-E Guidelines and Standards.

- The subject property is located at 816 E. Sherman Avenue, with frontage on both Sherman Avenue and Front Street. There is an existing building on the site that was built in 1963. It has been used primarily for commercial office space.
- The applicant is proposing a 12-unit three story apartment building with approximately 14,764 SF of living area along Sherman Avenue, and two (2) duplex structures (two story) with approximately 4,384 SF along Front Street. There are a total of 16-residential units including thirteen (13) 1-bedroom units and three (3) 2-bedroom units. 21 surface parking stalls will be provided for the apartment project. Garages will be provided for the duplex units.
- The proposed project replaces an older commercial office building which will be demolished. The maximum height allowed in the DO-E in the commercial zone is 38'. The height of the proposed apartment project is 38'. The maximum height of the duplexes is 24' 11". The subject property is in the DO-E (Downtown Overlay East) zoning district, and must adhere to the Infill Overlay Design Guidelines and Standards.

The project summary includes an F.A.R. bonus allowed for the following:

- Streetscape features - Bench seating, pedestrian scale lighting along primary building entrance along Sherman Avenue. Special paving- 'stamped concrete/pavers' provided at building entrances to the building façade.
- Upgraded building materials – Stone veneer masonry provided along patio walls and deck façade along Sherman Avenue.
- The applicant has requested a Design Departure for the Design Guideline requiring a minimum slope of 4:12 pitch and has requested the approval of a combination of varying sloped roofs ranging from 2 5/12, 3/12, 4/12, 6/12 and a few parapets for the proposed apartment complex and duplex structures.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Lemmon inquired if the requirement for the roof pitch is just for the DOE. Ms. Stroud answered that is correct. Commissioner Priest asked if there was a rationale for the roof pitch criteria. Commissioner Lemmon explained originally, they wanted to match all the architecture and through the years that has changed for different roof pitches. Ms. Stroud cited this as something the commission needs to look at in a future workshop for some changes.

Tim Wilson, applicant representative provided an overview of the project including the design guidelines for the project and discussed the materials used for the project.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Chairman Messina inquired if a fence will be provided on the side of the existing house. Mr. Wilson explained that we don't have plans for a fence at that location stated but will mention it to the owner if that could be a consideration. Chairman Messina inquired if there will be additional buffering added between the building and the residential homes to shield headlights etc. Mr. Wilson explained that we have a recessed entries with a covered porch and that there are some massive trees on Front Street. Ms. Stroud explained that buffering isn't a code requirement but it is required to retain the character of an existing structure by providing plants to provide screening.

Commissioner Lemmon inquired what are the materials used on the building. Mr. Wilson explained that when

reviewing this with staff we had a weathered barn wood look which was changed to a color. Ms. Stroud explained that the Planning Director makes the recommendation if the proposed materials meet the level of brick/stone and if there is something the commission needs to be added, that is up to the commission. Commissioner Lemmon stated that weathered wood is appropriate without adding color.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Lemmon stated he likes the parking that is in the middle and the roof pitch is fine.

Commissioner Priest questioned if there are any limitations on the homeowner next door for building a fence on their property. Ms. Stroud stated that is correct, there are no limitations.

Motion by Periera, seconded by Lemmon, to approve Item DR-4-22. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Lemmon	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Messina	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Pereira	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Priest	Voted	Aye


Motion to approve carried by a 4-0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:


Motion by Lemmon, seconded by Priest, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant



STAFF REPORT



**DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

FROM: TAMI STROUD, PLANNER
DATE: NOVEMBER 9, 2023
SUBJECT: DR-3-22 – REQUEST FOR A ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE APPROVED DESIGN
LOCATION: THE GARDEN LOFTS, A 34-UNIT CONDOMINIUM BUILDING, AND TWO SEPARATE TOWNHOME STRUCTURES CONSISTING OF 5-UNITS EACH IN THE DOWNTOWN OVERLAY NORTH (DO-N) DISTRICT AND DC (DOWNTOWN CORE) ZONING DISTRICT.

APPLICANT / OWNER:
512 North 1st, LLC
840 Santa Fe Drive
Denver, CO 80204

DECISION POINT:
A request from 512 North 1st, LLC for a one-year extension of an approved design of a 34-unit condominium building with a structured parking garage and two 5-unit townhome structures.

PRIOR ACTION:
On October 27, 2022, the Design Review Commission approved the design of a 34-unit condominium building with a structured parking garage and two 5-unit townhome structures.

AERIAL PHOTO:



SITE MAP:



SECTION 17.09.345.C: LAPSE OF APPROVAL

Unless a different termination date is prescribed, the design approval shall terminate one year from the effective date of its granting unless substantial development or actual commencement of authorized activities has occurred. However; such period of time may be extended by the Design Review Commission for one year, without public notice, upon written request filed at any time before the approval has expired and upon a showing of unusual hardship not caused by the owner or applicant.

On October 25, 2023, staff received a request from 512 North 1st, LLC for a one-year extension of the approved design. See attached letter.

COMMISSION ALTERNATIVES:

The Commission may, by motion, grant a one-year extension of the approved design of a 34-unit condominium building with a structured parking garage and two 5-unit townhome structures. The property is located in the Downtown Overlay North (DO-N) District and DC (Downtown Core) zoning district. If approved, the design approval is valid through October 27, 2024.

The Commission must base their approval upon the applicant showing unusual hardship not caused by the owner or applicant.

The Commission may, by motion, deny the one-year extension. If denied, approval of the design for the project expires.

A decorative border composed of a grid of purple diamonds in various shades, surrounding a central light purple rectangular area.

**APPLICANT'S
NARRATIVE**

October 25, 2023

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner
City of Coeur d'Alene Planning Department

Tami:

I am writing this letter to request an extension for our Design Review Commission approval on our Garden Development in Coeur d'Alene at 512 N 1st St.

We received our approval from the DRC on Oct 27, 2022 (11/11/22 with 15 day waiting period). We proceeded to work our way through planning and on June 29th received notice our plans for the townhome portion of the project were approved and ready to be picked up. Followed by the Condo portion being approved and ready for pick up on August 2nd. Based on how the project was designed and the layout on the property, we need to build inside out starting with the condos. The earliest time we could have started was after the August 2nd permit approval.

We were concurrently working through the spring with multiple Construction Companies to get bids for the construction of the project. Unfortunately, we have found that building costs are still very elevated accompanied by the fact that since our DRC Approval there have been many interest rate hikes driving the cost of a loan through the roof. These two factors are preventing us from breaking ground at this given moment. This is why we are requesting an extension due to these hardships. We are continuing to work diligently to find the right builder and are confident we can start the project once the time is right.

Sincerely,

Joseph Klopfenstein

