

# WHITEFISH ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 3, 2020

The meeting was called to order by Kathy Skemp at 8:18 AM

PRESENT: Shane Jacobs, Diane Kane, Paul McElroy, Kathy Skemp

ABSENT: Stacy Caldwell (sent comments via email), Shaun Lewis, +1 vacant position

STAFF: Wendy Compton-Ring

PUBLIC COMMENT: none.

MINUTES: The minutes from February 4, 2020 were unanimously approved.

## OLD BUSINESS

Lupfer Mixed-Use, unaddressed Lupfer Avenue, MT Creative (ARC 20-05) The Committee reviewed the drawings submitted. The 1<sup>st</sup> level material still needs to be priced out and they are hoping to the aged copper but will come back if the material is changed.

Diane – no questions

Shane – asked further questions about the materials

Paul – nothing further

Stacy – looks good

### Motion:

Diane – move to accept the materials based on the rendering

Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

Whitefish Starbucks, 6405 Highway 93 S, MT Creative (ARC 20-06) The applicant described the bike path/pedestrian connection and described the changes to the awning. Other changes to the project are the total building square footage – 7-feet additional to the south and a safety railing at the top of the retaining wall to the east. Staff directed the application to review the newly approved retaining wall standards to make sure this wall will still conform.

Shane – tension rods look good; questions about the fascia/soffit *colors will match at roof and canopy*

Stacy - Pedestrian access from Hwy 93 nicely addressed, other changes look good; No additional concerns  
Committee had further discussion about the retaining wall and railing – the Committee will want to see the railing once selected

**Motion:**

Shane – move to approve as submitted  
Diane – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

6191 Hwy 93 S – commercial project, MT Creative (ARC 20-02) Staff brought the submitted building plans to the meeting. The applicant described the outdoor lighting and showed the garage door style.

Shane – likes the door and the additional dark sky lighting option

**Motion:**

Shane – move to approved as submitted  
Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

**NEW BUSINESS**

Stumptown Inn, 800 Spokane Avenue, accessory structure, MT Creative (ARC 20-07)  
The applicant described the sauna – self-contained, electric for up to 6 people – and its location which is easily moveable to meet the Whitefish River buffer requirements.

Shane – questions about the wood finish *it will match the wood window boxes on the building*

Paul – asked how visible the sauna will be to the public *not really could add landscaping if needed*

Stacy - Seems like the biggest question is the zoning / location one. Other than that, no concerns

**Motion:**

Diane – move to approve as submitted with a suggestion for additional landscaping if needed, as viewed from hotel, river or street, once it is installed  
Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

127 Lupfer Avenue, Mixed-Use Bldg, Montana Creative (ARC 20-08) The applicant described the project, site plan, buildings and materials.

Shane – asked about the treatment of the concrete on the stem wall

Kathy – paint? *No*

Committee had discussion on material application on the building

Shane – eaves are pretty minimal

Kathy – likes how it looks like two separate buildings

Stacy - Significant improvement over current building, will be good add to the street; scale/mass seems very much in line with the block; simple design, but not out of keeping with the block

**Motion:**

Shane – move to approve subject to removing the belly band and bringing the metal parallel to the ground on the alley-side

Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

E 7<sup>th</sup> Street Condo, North Building, 1013 E 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Montana Creative (ARC 20-09) The applicant described the project and how they function with the access, parking, buildings, materials, colors, etc. He also described the differences between the two buildings.

Shane – likes the density of the project; exempt from ADA? *Yes*; likes the application of materials; especially the north building

Diane – questions about the garbage – *in the garage*

Shane – change in the building material application; would be nice for the south building

Paul – questions about the materials and their application

Kathy – likes the overall project; needs a bit more variety – the project has lap siding and board and batten, but is there something else? A gable treatment; different brackets; cedar accent?

Diane – likes the project and reduced density; likes windows in garages; would like variation in siding

Shane – likes the simplicity

Stacy - nice design; scale/mass: given the neighborhood is single family on one side, this could be a concern. Overall, I think the design does a nice job of fitting rowed townhouses into the space along with separated garages and yards, so that it is not just one big mass on the space. But think this should be an area of presentation/discussion. 2 stories and 34 feet height - seems reasonable/in line; parking in the rear of the units/middle of lot - I think is a nice way of keeping parking away from the street while also ensuring the building size is less intrusive; open green space: design guidelines suggest open green

space. Here, they have done that with individual spaces. Understands the appeal and think they've incorporated green space nicely in the design; variance across units: design guidelines ask for variance across units - don't see that here. However, I think the design of a series of townhouses with a similar front works visually

**Motion:**

Shane – move to approve, as submitted

Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

E 8<sup>th</sup> Street Condo, South Building, 1022 E 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Montana Creative (ARC 20-09)

Shane – would prefer the inverse of the material application on this building

**Motion:**

Shane – move to approve subject to the materials being inverse of the materials on the north building

Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed (3-1, Kathy voting in opposition as she wanted to see the project come back before the Committee)

**OTHER ITEMS**

The Committee discussed the level of detail that should be submitted for Arch Review and the difference between Design Development drawings and Construction Drawings.

Council Directed Amendments The City will be entering into contracts to help move the Arch Review Standards along. The Committee should look at the drafts to see if more amendments are necessary.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 AM