The meeting was called to order by Kathy Skemp at 8:17 AM

PRESENT: Stacy Caldwell, Scott Freudenberg, Shane Jacobs, Diane Kane, Paul McElroy, Kathy Skemp

ABSENT: Shaun Lewis

STAFF: Wendy Compton-Ring

PUBLIC COMMENT: none.

MINUTES: The minutes from December 3, 2019 were unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Hunter & Co, minor amendment to façade change, 200 Wisconsin Ave (ARC 19-38) The applicant described the proposed changes to the awning on the north compared to what was approved in August 2019. The applicant is proposing to leave the north half of the awning versus installing a flat roof awning and using gooseneck lighting versus back lit lettering.

Scott – so the project is simply being reduced to the south half of the front yes
Paul – nice
Diane – looks nice
Shane – nice design

Motion:
Scott – move to accept the changes as submitted
Diane – 2nd

Discussion: none

Vote: passed unanimously

NEW BUSINESS

Archer, Duplex, 1980 Ridgecrest, Christine Bleyhl (ARC 19-61) The applicant described the project, location, site plan, materials

Shane – asked some material application questions; looks good
Stacy – asked questions about the landscaping and the existing vegetation. *There is a considerable amount of natural vegetation that will remain*
Scott – looks like a single-family residences
Stacy – matches what is existing

**Motion:**
Shane – move to as submitted
Stacy – 2nd

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

519 Skyles Place LLC, 519-525 Skyles Place, apartments, Mark T. Johnson (ARC 19-62) The applicant presented the project, location, context of the neighborhood, building, materials and landscaping. Garbage enclosure material will match the materials on the building. There was considerable Committee discussion and clarifications regarding the site plan, materials and other details.

Shane – good improvement to the site
Scott – no comments
Diane – north building, where the sidewalk goes by, consider privacy for the 1st floor renters along Skyles *landscaping is proposed along these areas.* Might consider some big trees between the sidewalk and the building to offer additional privacy
Kathy – any rules regarding window treatments? *Hasn’t been discussed yet.*
Paul – ensure landscaping is installed in front of the 1st floor patios for privacy; big improvement to the site
Stacy – agreed; no concerns; appreciates the parking being screened
Kathy – nice looking project
Stacy – likes how the metal is being used for the entrances
Diane – would really like to see something more than just turf in the grassy area; maybe some conifers
Paul – it would be nice to be in front of the patios for privacy

**Motion:**
Scott – move to approved with the agreed upon landscaping along Skyles between the building and the sidewalk
Paul – 2nd

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

Town Pump, 6045 Highway 93 S, gas station, CWG Architects (ARC 19-63) Described the project, neighborhood context, building, materials and outdoor lighting. The canopy was changed from the pre-ap – a board and batten look in the metal gray used on the
building with a flat roof. The Committee reviewed updated plans and had their questions answered from the applicant. No existing trees around the building, at the corner, will be retained; native vegetation at the northwest corner and the south side of the property will be retained.

Kathy – the amount of asphalt is excessive. The paving is necessary for traffic circulation, RV parking – concerned about safety for pedestrians and vehicle movements. Considered using any other materials besides asphalt? Looked as some concrete along with the asphalt
Paul – tallest portion of the retaining walls? 22-feet at the tallest point – eastern corner; would like to see what the retaining wall looks like and an image from that direction back toward the building; landscaping could reduce the width; need a railing at the top of the retaining wall and color will compliment the building
Shane – agrees
Scott – how does the drainage work with the tall retaining walls? Detain and release at a pre-development rate – won’t load the retaining wall; also, oil/water separator; still working with the City to learn more about the drainage in the area
Kathy – considered a pedestrian ‘path’ through the site? Not opposed to putting them in, they aren’t always used. It will help alert drivers.
Paul – still thinks it would be a better design to locate the building to the north side of the property; save on the retaining wall
Stacy – any landscaping within the parking lot to help separate the RV from the cars; add landscaping; turning movements didn’t work
Kathy – could add some additional landscaping along the private street (north property line) could help to reduce the retaining walls along that street
Shane – described a different stormwater design idea on the surface to help reduce the height of the retaining walls – rearrange the site a bit – add landscaping, etc.
Paul – there will be a lot of people coming from the east – including kids from the sports facility – how does a pedestrian get to the site? Could add a set of stairs halfway down the private road
Kathy – asked about the dry creek bed referenced on the landscaping plan vs the sod they described to the south entrance; not pleased with the parking located at the corner; would want to narrow the entrance onto Highway 40 as much as possible to prohibit left-hand turns into the site; dangerous situation
Shane – outdoor lighting – the wall mounted doesn’t appear to meet the dark sky regulations with the lights pointed up

The applicant is required to submit a building permit per their buy-sell with T Baur by January 13th and they fully expect to get a letter of incomplete application.

Paul – would like to see cross-section of the retaining wall; really important pedestrian access to the site from the east; nice building, but wishes the building was down the hill
Shane – the completeness of the packet was nice – thanks; green space, height of the wall; wrap the sidewalk around the frontage and connect to Highway 40 entrance; patio on the west side is nice – fencing/bike racks/furniture; likes the form-making and material application; wishes there were less faux windows; they will be real glass but
*can make it lighter* would like to also see the retaining wall and the proposed material; like the smaller sign package; sensitive to the site; does the site also need another sign at the corner when there is already one at each driveway? Redundant. The canopy is an improvement and a bit more of a complimentary to the building than the pre-ap; sidewalk width with all the exterior ‘stuff’ being sold needs to be wide; snow breaks on standing seam; up/down lighting doesn’t appear to be compliant

Diane – agrees

Scott – not sure he’s sold on the metal canopies – kind of industrial looking; still need more work on the site

Stacy – likes the pedestrian space on the west side; nice to continue discussing the canopies; the building looks nice; change the colors on the signage? concur on the site plan concerns noted; including the pedestrian connections

Kathy – re-iterate the canopies; the pattern doesn’t tie into the building; pathways for pedestrians – something different, not painted pathway; thinks the entrance on Highway 40 should be revised

**Motion:**
Scott – move to table and carefully consider the Committee comments
Paul – 2nd

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** passed unanimously

**OTHER ITEMS**

Staff handed out the 2019 Annual Report for the Committee. The Arch Review Committee has had a very busy year.

The Committee thanked Scott for his time on the Arch Review Committee, as he will be appointed to the Whitefish Planning Board. The ARC needs to find someone to fill Scott’s place – the Committee rules call for a licensed design professional.

**Council Directed Amendments** Kathy provided staff with a list of amendments. Staff is working with consultant to develop templates for the document and another consultant to look at drawings for the standards.

Meeting adjourned at 10:18 AM