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

PRESENT: Stacy Caldwell, Shane Jacobs, Diane Kane, Leslie Lowe, Paul McElroy, Tracy Rossi, Kathy Skemp

ABSENT: none

STAFF: Wendy Compton-Ring, Hilary Lindh

PUBLIC COMMENT: none.

MINUTES: The minutes from March 3, 2020 were unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

718 Edgewood Place, material change, Devin Stus (ARC 19-14) The applicant presented the requested material changes. Asphalt shingles originally approved for the roof, but the low slope of the roof requires a different material – a steel standing seam in light gray that is similar color to the asphalt. Since the building is three stories, the material will not be visible from the street.

Paul – not familiar with building, is it visible from viaduct? The building is a couple blocks away and could be visible from the viaduct. Roof is already installed. Does it stand out more driving?
Shane – there is already a similar corrugated light gray material on the building. This is a warranty issue, a standing seam roof is necessary. He has no problem with the change.
Diane – standing seam material color is okay with her.
Paul – windows are almond color? Yes. Desert tan is the fascia? Yes, and matches windows. How do we handle something after the fact? Wendy says it was at the designer’s risk to go ahead with installation before approval. Should the committee go look in the field? Devin shared some photos of the building under construction at the end of March. The roof material was not yet installed but the photos show that you cannot see the roof material from the ground. Paul is wondering how the beige fascia matches the roof color. No photos of the new roof are available, but a photo showing the windows and fascia were shown. The drip shows the roof color. Paul wants to see photos of the roof and fascia colors together.
Shane – the roof color is probably more compatible than the fascia. There is a photo of the back of the siding sample the committee was looking at previously that was confusing to them.
Leslie – from the viaduct, the bright fascia might highlight the roof from a distance. Might not know the effect until it’s done. She understands the difficulty of having to make
changes on site and unforeseen events. Devin shows photo of soffit fascia material, windows, and color swatch of roof.

Paul – fascia on metal roofs usually matches the roof color. Devin explained that different color was chosen due to the ARC comments from the initial approval.

Shane – is flashing also from Glacier Steel? Difficult to tell from swatches. Probably best to see a physical sample of both colors next to each other.

Paul – soffit to be done in same color as fascia? Yes. Wood siding stain color to match. Paul – doesn’t think the colors match and wants to see actual samples and worst-case scenario, might have to change the fascia, not the roof.

Shane agrees.

Tracy – also agrees.

Diane – agrees with Paul. Can’t imagine the committee said the gray and tan colors should go together. The flashing, wood, roof colors all need to be reviewed.

Kathy – need a photo of all the final colors for all the materials together.

Stacy – agrees it would be good to see together.

Leslie – should be easy enough to change CAD drawing to show true colors.

Paul – two physical colors needed. Maybe don’t put soffit up until the ARC meeting in May approves it. The fascia probably needs to go the roof color, soffit should complement.

Gray and tan together no good. Devin offers to make the changes now.

Kathy – we need to see the colors before approving those changes.

Wendy – want photos of all the updated materials, and an updated elevation drawing?

Paul – need to see all the colors of all materials together in a color board. Is the gray roof the color of the corrugated metal siding? No, the siding is a darker gray. The roof color is lighter based on the previous approval and discussion.

Motion:

Shane – moves to table until the colors are brought back

Diane – 2nd

Discussion: none

Vote: passed unanimously

Alta Views, façade change – Pod 3, Ken Huff (ARC 19-04B) The applicant presented the amendment changes. Two-thirds of projects are 2-BR units with loft, other third is 3-BR units with 18-foot ceilings. Over time, the developer realized they needed more 3-BR units. So they’ve been converting the 2-BR units to 3-BR by using the loft as a third bedroom. Now they know how many and where these conversions will happen, they were asked to come back and describe.

Tracy – the loft area becomes a third bedroom? Yes. The ceiling is raised.

Kathy – how much higher? It goes 4’ higher

Paul – anything showing the comparison of the original versus the conversion? Ken’s drawing shows both elevations. Paul thinks it doesn’t look quite as good. Ken doesn’t think the elevation drawing that shows just one unit is as useful as when they’re all together.
Paul – any way to also bring up the lower roof line higher so the gap between isn’t so much? And any way to change the windows to accommodate the additional height? Ken says it’s better on the inside to keep the windows close together, it feels airier than if you had the windows spread out. It’s not possible to adjust the height of the lower roof. The revised elevation for one building was approved a year ago and they built it as a model unit. They now want to do the remainder of the 2-BR units to these higher buildings, but need approval for all.
Kathy – asking for approval to do this on the northwest corner of the property, correct? Will come back for approvals for other parts of property? Yes. She would like to see a mix of the unit types for variety.
Paul – when the units are attached does the look improved? Yes, more than the single unit rendering. How many units attached, how many front doors? The raised lofts can go anywhere in the building groupings – end units, middle units, etc. The Committee reviewed photos of built units on Alta Views website.
Tracy – making top floor windows a little taller would help fill some of that extra space? They are pushing the limit of how big the vinyl window can go, so not much.
Paul – proposing for buildings with two front doors, so both sides would be high. Also 3- and 4- door attached? Ken, for this phase there are only 10 units with some triplexes – no quads. Has concerns about multiplying all the tall buildings throughout the project.
Kathy – only design changes he is asking for are height changes in this pod.
Paul – has some issue with roof lines and space between roof and windows. Can they put transom windows to fill some space? Ken can ask and see if it can be worked into budget. Have to be conscious of scope creep.
Diane – taller units don’t really stand out as you drive by. We should approve the 10 units only to get a feel for what it will look like on a larger scale, before deciding about the remainder of the project.
Paul – location of the proposed taller units? On JP Road behind bank.
Kathy – future locations would be near the original condos, and one other spot further east.
Stacy – with Diane on this. Doesn’t seem like this is a big shift and worth seeing the look of the additional 10 units for now.
Shane – nothing to add, would be comfortable with what Diane and Stacy are proposing.
Tracy – likes the idea of seeing something between top window and roofline.
Paul – since it’s so visible on JP Road he doesn’t like it.
Leslie – agrees with Paul and Tracy, there’s an awkwardness in the massing. Would like to see a transom or something to make transition more graceful. Prominent location along JP Road.
Kathy – this change won’t be facing JP Road, they are facing E-W, not N-S orientation, so wouldn’t be as visible as some think, right? Ken confirms that’s true of the whole project, the garages don’t face the main roads.
Shane – wouldn’t change the window elevations as you round the corners, leave them in place and then figure out how to balance the extra space with transoms.
Tracy – front side of revised elevation, why that one window was moved? Ken- a floor is inserted in that area, so the window needs to be moved up. The windows on the front are kept together because no extra floor in front – makes it feel like huge window.
Stacy – suggesting approval conditional on design changes?
Kathy – suggests they approve what’s proposed now but for future requests look at ways to improve the look with transom or other ideas.
Paul – wants the transom added now.

**Motion:**
Paul – move to approve with condition transoms added to rear elevation of all modified units
Tracy – 2nd

**Discussion:** Diane, suggest amending addition of transom to some, not all, of what’s requested right now to see affect to cost. Paul does not like the amendment. Wants transom for all. Wants uniformity, transom added to all. Stacy – would it be possible for develop to follow through? Ken would need to discuss with developer, builder, etc. whether it’s possible. These units are on hold for this approval, further delay may be a problem and cause builder to bail out. Stacy appreciates the concerns, but they’ve already had approval for one unit. Given market would be okay with ask for future consideration of transoms. Ken acknowledges that if they knew they were all going to change to this, they wouldn’t look like that.

**Vote:** Motion passes 5-2 (Diane, Kathy voting in opposition)

Carport, 59 Crestwood Drive, Cole Blackwell, (ARC 18-26) The applicant presented the amendment. An existing cottage had a townhouse added on and now a carport is proposed behind the original unit. There will still be parking in front of the townhouse. The carport will have a 10x20’ office enclosed; otherwise the carport will be open. The siding materials will match existing structures, mix of horizontal and vertical barnwood with some variable sizes. Rough sawn trim. Same soffit material as existing structures. Roofing is black, snap lock standing seam panels.

Shane – windows match? Yes, black and match existing.
Paul – existing driveway? Currently just in front of new unit, landscaping hasn’t yet been installed. Gravel for now, two pads one in front of each unit. They will do a Geotech material with grass so not a hard material. The preference is for all to park behind in the carport.
Kathy – ties in well with existing structures. Makes good use of back of site.
Diane – looks great, thinks it’s a good addition. When finished will look great.
Shane – no comment
Stacy – appreciates continuation of materials, will improve site
Paul – likes the use of Geotech material
Leslie – likes parking to the back, more people friendly
Tracy – agrees, like parking to back

**Motion:**
Paul – move to approve
Shane – 2nd
Discussion: none

Vote: passed unanimously

NEW BUSINESS

420 E 3rd Street, Toby Scott, Awning (ARC 20-11) The applicant described the project, building and materials. Intends to use the same colors for the awning as the building. Metal roof and wood posts. Awning will go around a city tree and lamppost with a cutout u-shape. Awning will provide shade, intercept rain and snow.

Diane – do you have a photo of just your building? Yes.
Kathy – how does awning affect upstairs balcony? It will be below it.
Tracy – how does the growth of the tree affect the cutout of the awning in the future? It won’t grow as big as the cutout, and the branches are above the height of the awning. A replacement tree would also have high branches.
Paul – drawings showing where posts go?
Leslie – do we have other examples of awnings with street trees? Wendy explained that on Central where most awning is there aren’t any street trees. The other example is the liquor store, which was grandfathered in with posts in the middle of the sidewalk. Leslie is trying to visualize how the awning and tree will work. Will the added moisture affect the tree? Wendy thinks we can work with City to determine what’s best for tree (which may be removed or replaced).
Paul – drawings showing relationship of posts, tree, etc.?
Kathy – consider a gutter to get water away from where people walk? Toby is not interested in a gutter.
Paul – does roof shed onto sidewalk? No. Paul thinks the awning would be a complement to the building. The posts are in line with the lamp and tree? Yes, eight feet from the wall as per City specifications. Open rafter? Yes, looked at Imagination Station example. Might bevel the corner toward the alley to avoid problems with liquor store delivery truck. Paul likes the Imagination Station details – they are important so don’t omit them. Frost proof foundation? Yes. Photo showing awning on this building? No. What’s the height of the awning at bottom? Attaches to building at about 10 feet, bottom of awning at 8’6”, exactly to specifications of City.
Diane – no problem with awning.
Tracy – likes proposal.
Leslie – likes it.
Kathy – can’t allow exposed concrete from sonotube? Otherwise looks good. Wendy reads regulations. Needs to be raised up to 8”.
Shane – likes accommodations for tree, light. Anything for building? Is it paint or stain? Building is painted and needs another coat of same color. Building and awning color will be same. Sonotubes need to be covered. Brackets should be either decorative or concealed. Take care of detail all the way through.

Motion:
Diane– move to approve
Stacy – 2nd

Discussion: none

Vote: passed unanimously

WF Manor, 1305 E 7th Street, façade change, Cole Blackwell (ARC 20-12) The applicant described the project, buildings and materials. Replacing siding material.

Paul – likes colors and product
Kathy – definite improvement
Diane – agrees it’s a much-needed improvement
Leslie – it’s much nicer
Leslie – any pictures showing one-story building attached. Yes. How will entry change?
Gables will have Acadia shake.
Tracy – thinks it looks great

Motion:
Paul – move to approve, as submitted
Diane – 2nd

Discussion: none

Vote: passed unanimously

City of Whitefish, 118 Edgewood Place, Carla Belski, WF Lake Decontamination Station (ARC 20-14) The applicant described the site plan, project, building and materials. Building donated by MT FWP, prefabricated. Can store decontamination unit in it on site, plus an office space and space to store tools.

Paul- where on lot will the building go?
Kathy – will the doors stay white? Yes, that is the current plan so they match windows.
Paul – not attractive, but a great service performed there. How funded? A grant by the DNRC. Any funding for landscaping? Carla said they will do the landscaping in-house.
Can the building be hidden better? Carla – could do some landscaping to hide it a bit more.
Leslie – if could break up the front face of the building a bit with some shrubs would be great. Carla - could also put the decontamination sign in the front. Jeff from Parks – they could also add some wainscoting and/or paint the doors.
Paul – very visible with lots of traffic. Painting the man doors would help.
Leslie – could the building be shifted south a bit so existing trees not impacted as much?
Provide as much natural screening as possible.
Paul – painting to blend into environment, add shrubs to screen. Jeff – front will be concrete, so shrubs up front tough, to south and east sides would be do-able.
Diane – agree with Paul, paint and shrubs to get it to blend in, add character.
Leslie – awning over man doors might help.
Tracy – likes idea of changing door color, wainscoting to add character.
Kathy – paint two man doors, move building to minimize effects to trees, add landscaping, might be enough.

Motion:
Stacy– move to approve with painting man doors to match roof, move building to minimize effects to trees, add landscaping
Paul – 2\textsuperscript{nd}

Discussion: none

Vote: passed unanimously

OTHER ITEMS
Council directed amendments: Wendy got photos for Old Town and will get more of other areas today – will share with Committee once ready. Keni is reviewing text amendment language. When pictures selected, will use InDesign to put it together in next few weeks.

The Core townhouses on Kalispell has some slight update changes. Do they need to come in? It’s a prominent location and they should come into the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM