

## WHITEFISH ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 2, 2021

The meeting was called to order by Shane Jacobs at 8:15AM

PRESENT: Christine Bleyhl, Shane Jacobs, Diane Kane, Leslie Lowe, Paul McElroy, Tracy Rossi

ABSENT: Stacy Caldwell

STAFF: Wendy Compton-Ring, City Councilor, Ben Davis

PUBLIC COMMENT: none

MINUTES: The minutes from February 2, 2021 were unanimously approved.

### OLD BUSINESS

Whitefish Carwash, 6354 Hwy 93 S, removal of SE corner awning, John Constenius (ARC 19-40) John described the change to the building with the awning on the south side of the building and the reasoning for its removal including additional room needed for vehicle maneuvering and a reduction of the south sidewalk to an 18-inch curb.

Christine – was the building designed to include an awning? *No, it would be difficult to add an awning after the fact*

Leslie – asked for a summary of all the changes because it appears there were a number of changes as they are reviewing the building elevations; seems like a lot of changes compared to what was originally approved

Christine – is it feasible or even possible to add a 12” awning or an eyebrow *it thought it would look a little false but it seems possible* With four sided architecture it is an important part of the southern elevation – it appears it is missing a key element

Shane – agrees, it would help

Paul – it didn’t really bother him; doesn’t think a 12-inch would be very helpful to the building or the design

Diane – understands what everyone is saying; it’s only a curb and not a place to encourage the public to walk and she wants to make sure people don’t walk over there; doesn’t think a 12-inch awning would really be very helpful

Tracy – agrees with Diane; concerned the awning would appear to make it more inviting to the public when it really isn’t for the public; if it’s not for the public it shouldn’t be installed

Leslie – agrees; sorry to see the changes but understands the changes; there is a safety bollard to limit public access; disappointed in the overall look of it, but understands why

Paul – the roll up door is more of a bother than anything

**Motion:**

Diane – move to approve the changes

Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:**

Diane – noted all changes must be brought to the Committee before they are made

Leslie – anxious to see the landscaping

**Vote:** motion passes (5 -1, Bleyhl voting in opposition)

North Valley Food Bank, 251 Flathead Avenue, material change, Scott Elden, MT Creative (ARC 21-04) Ron Nash presented the material change for the wainscot for the addition; they found the stone material came back quite expensive and they want to use the roof material for the wainscot around the addition.

Paul – the only spot for the metal wainscot? *Correct – the only area and the columns will still be rock; it will appear as a ‘back-of-house’*

Shane – the elevation will face Baker Avenue and it seems like an odd transition; the last time we reviewed everyone was happy that the addition was going to complement the existing building

Paul – would almost prefer the wood to the ground similar to the east elevation than with the proposed metal material; the stone doesn't have to go all the way to the same height; would be better to see the stone on the north elevation (facing the front of the building) with just siding on the east and south elevations

**Motion:**

Christine – move to approve as discussed (stone wainscot on the north elevation and siding on the east and south elevations)

Paul – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** motion passes unanimously

34 Lupfer, material change, Matt Lawrance, MT Creative (ARC 20-05) Matt is working with the neighbor to the north re: snow coming off the roof, but they have realized they need materials that can take this abuse and are easier to maintain. He described the materials, color and their application to the north and south elevations. These materials will be able to take the abuse.

Christine – changes proposed look nice and consistent with downtown

Paul – harder to do this without the actual material samples

The Committee reviewed the previous side elevations with the board and batten versus the proposal

Paul – it is much better, but sure wishes we could see the materials

Diane – doesn't think it will be very visible on the north side; thinks it is a good solution

Tracy – likes the material change; it will hold up better; elevations will not be very visible  
Leslie – likes the change and likes the green – good to see a bit of color

**Motion:**

Tracy – move to approve as submitted  
Leslie – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** motion passes unanimously

**NEW BUSINESS**

North Valley Hospital, 1600 Hospital Way, addition, Joe Grabowski (ARC 21-06) The applicant described the building, materials, colors, and location of the project.

Christine – how has the EIFS held up over time; *it's taking some work to make it easier to maintain; not his first choice*

Leslie – any changes to the landscaping? *No, it is mostly surrounded by concrete and gravel, but there is a small area that will be impacted*

Shane – it is a small addition

Christine – looks fine; the application could be a bit more truncated to only represent what this Committee needs to review

Paul – looks fine

**Motion:**

Paul – move to approve as submitted  
Christine – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** motion passes unanimously

Riverwalk Condos, three buildings, JP Road & Arielle Way, Cushing Terrell (ARC 21-07)

The project was at pre-ap last meeting. The applicant reviewed the site plan and noted this is the final phase of the overall project. Noted the changes to the roof compared to the original phase. They are also adding carports to the site, the landscaping is matching the existing and bike parking is included. The applicant described the lighting, materials and colors. It appears some of the buildings are painted a different color and so the applicant has called out that the paint colors will match the adjacent buildings. They are going to work with the HOA to make ensure it all matches and the buildings have been recently updated.

Paul – is the architecture match the existing buildings; this is critical for the entire project to make sure it blends together

Shane – noted how the buildings are similar and different; agrees with the approach for painting; corner trim and window trim are the only items that vary between buildings

Paul – what is the HOA reviewing if it all matches; *not sure*

**Motion:**

Leslie – move to approve as submitted

Tracy – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:** none

**Vote:** motion passes unanimously

Watson Townhouse, 721 & 723 Icehouse Road, Moser Design (ARC 21-08) Described the project, the entrances and how it meets the garage-forward standards, materials and colors; They are proposing to change the posts to wood and they will go all the way to the deck which will be constructed with Trex decking (both the front and back decks); the front and rear porches will be covered with standing seam metal; landscaping will be determined once the final grading is done in order to complement the neighboring lots which are already constructed

Leslie – any retaining walls; *this will be determined once the final grading happens*; seems like the landscaping is an ‘add-on’ and will be designed while the project is happening; *it is a very tight space in between the townhouses*

Committee discussion about the grading and retaining walls

Paul – the elevations need to be cleaned up to match what we are approving

Christine – the lap siding all the way below grade is typically a different type of material; it’s a lot of horizontal; consider a different material *need to work with the abutting neighbors to see what works best; it will stop 6-inches from the final grade*

Diane – something else that comes out of the ground – not necessarily stone, but something else

Paul – drainage plan? *Not yet*

Leslie – would like to see a lot more indication of what is really happening with landscaping, drainage and retaining walls

The Committee discussed the 8-corner requirement in the Arch Review Standards and the new Townhouse/Duplex Standards that also requires a more fully developed landscaping plan

**Motion:**

Diane – move to table resubmit and have the applicant review the comments

Christine – 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Discussion:**

Diane – felt like this was more of a pre-ap

Paul – it will be a challenge to address the 8-corners and the garage-forward standards

**Vote:** motion passes unanimously

## **OTHER ITEMS**

Kyle Project, Pre-Ap, 1515 Highway 93 W, Fran Quiram, Cushing Terrell The architects described the project, location, site plan, open space/landscaping areas and possible materials

Leslie – please note the trees to be retained, identify the landscaping within the storm water pond

Diane – this is wonderful, have been wondering what the plans are for the area, very thoughtful concerning landscaping, vehicle parking and pedestrian friendliness – great!

Leslie – really likes the parking underground, likes the campus feel – like the large and smaller landscaping areas that can be a bit more intimate, likes the planting space idea for ground floor people, other thoughts – community garden? Excited about seeing this go forward

Tracy – likes where this is all going, pretty cool plan, really likes the underground parking and landscaping and how it all goes together

Paul – fencing? *Some around some of the private ‘front yard’ areas for the ground floor units within the courtyard area*; the view of Hwy 93 W will be most important as the vehicles drive by at 45 MPH and standing on the hwy in the front of the project

Leslie – appreciate site accessibility, critical with our aging demographics

Shane – giving the site back to the people is great; material selection/application is nice

Christine – thank you, nice job

Paul – save as many trees as possible

Would it be wise to do another pre-ap? The Committee thought that would be a good idea and we would welcome it.

Gemini Townhome, Pre-Ap, 617 Colorado Avenue & 716 Denver Street, Christine Bleyhl

The architect described the project, location, site plan, open space/landscaping areas and possible materials

Leslie – next submittal show what the retaining wall would look like; xerispace – how the space is identified and maintained. Visible corner, maintains those aesthetics – keep it looking like a designed space is important

Paul – needs to understand our authority because this design is quite different than what we generally see

Diane – likes it; meets the standards which are written generally

The Committee had a discussion about the design standards; role of the Committee; and how buildings complement the neighborhood

Tracy – noted some recent subdivisions in the area that do not blend well within themselves; however, this subdivision can blend within itself since the architect is involved in the design process

Shane – Whitefish going to continue to evolve; it is good to see additional types of design with variation and not everything designed to match what has already been approved as the Whitefish ‘look’; either this will help us move forward or will keep us static

## Other

ADU Design Standards – staff provided an update on ADUs (why we are looking at them and the feedback requested of the ARC)

Paul – ratio between footprint and height to avoid the ‘tower’ look

Christine – ADU could be the same size as the primary with a good design – especially from a massing perspective; materials don’t necessarily have to match the primary structure – there are creative ways for a project to have a different material that could complement the design of the primary structure; sub-note ‘g’ – maybe this should be the primary requirement of the standards; ‘must’ is just too absolute; questions about the rental requirement – what’s the purpose of that? ‘g’ is subjective and more arbitrary – thinks it’s good to give people more options; language doesn’t support

Paul – some of them can look pretty bad; doesn’t not necessarily want to add them to the list of items the ARC reviews, but maybe it’s not a bad idea

Shane – our current ARC allow for creativity, could be OK to have more bumper rails to help the Planning Department review the design; some of the more subjective items maybe the ARC review? However, we don’t require single-family go through ARC; likes the idea of an appeal process to the Arch Review Committee; should the ARC even get involved? When and if ‘break’ the rules – do we want faux historic or a modern take but complementary

Christine – suggested some cities that have addressed ADUs well: Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver BC, Minneapolis – shape and form are addressed versus materiality; suggested a diagram that are helpful

Paul – makes sense to review with ADU – now it is 2-units, just like a two-unit building; can be more challenging than a two-unit building; so many things that can go wrong

Christine - % of glazing per type of elevation that meets the scale of the bldg.

Meeting adjourned at 11:54 AM