

# DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Albert Antelman, Chair  
 William Growdon, Vice-Chair  
 Anthony Tomasello, Member  
 Jack Kiesel, Member  
 Curtis Cormane, Member

Peter Gilli, Community Development Director  
 Neda Zayer, Assistant Community Development Director  
 Michael MacDonald, City Clerk

## REGULAR MEETING:

**WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17, 2022 – 6:00 P.M.**

**COMMUNITY MEETING ROOM, CITY HALL, 501 POLI STREET**

Chair Antelman called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

## ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Members Cormane, Kiesel, Tomasello, Vice-Chair Growdon and Chair Antelman

STAFF: Peter Gilli, Community Development Director  
 Levi Hill, Acting Planning Manager  
 Jamie Peltier, Principal Planner  
 Michael MacDonald, Recording Clerk

**PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS** – None

## CONSENT ITEM

### 1. **Approval of the Design Review Committee July 21, 2022 Meeting Minutes.**

**Recommendation:** Approve with a correction to the date of the agenda from July 20, 2022 to July 21, 2022.

Committee member Tomasello made a motion to approve the July 21, 2022 Meeting Minutes, with the correction staff recommended.

Vice-Chair Growdon seconded the motion.

Upon call of the roll the vote was as follows:

AYES: Committee members Tomasello, Vice-Chair Growdon and Chair Antelman  
 NOES: None  
 ABSTAIN: Committee members Cormane and Kiesel  
 ABSENT: None

Recording Clerk MacDonald declared the motion carried 3-0 with Committee members Cormane and Kiesel abstained.

## FORMAL ITEMS

### 2. PROJ-22-0118 - Extra Space Storage Design Review located at APN-084-0-104-075

Request for Major Design Review, Planned Development Permit, Use Permit, and Minor Variances for a proposed three-story 124,965 square foot personal storage facility on a 2.5-acre site in the Manufacturing Planned Development (MPD) zoning district with a land use designation of Industry.

**Recommendation:** That the Design Review Committee recommend the Community Development Director approve the Major Design Review and associated sign variance.

**Case Planner:** Erica Hong, Associate Planner  
**Applicant:** JSF Management, LLC

#### SPEAKERS:

**Staff:** Levi Hill, Acting Planning Manager

**Applicant:** None

**Members of Public:** None

**Emails:** [Public Comment](#)

**Documents:** None

**Ex-Parte Communication:** None

Committee member Tomasello made a motion to continue PROJ-22-0118 to the September 21, 2022 Design Review Committee Meeting at the request of the applicant.

Vice-Chair Growdon seconded the motion.

Upon call of the roll the vote was as follows:

**AYES:** Committee members Cormane, Kiesel, Tomasello Vice-Chair Growdon and Chair Antelman.

**NOES:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Recording Clerk MacDonald declared the motion carried 5-0.

**3. PROJ-22-0121- Maple Court Conceptual Design Review located at 290 Maple Court.**

Request for Conceptual Review for a 350-unit multifamily apartment complex with 4,900 square feet of commercial space on a 6.48-acre site in the Intermediate Commercial (C-1A) zoning district with a land use designation of Commerce.

**Recommendation:** That the Design Review Committee provide preliminary design feedback on building placement and massing and other design issues.

**Case Planner:** Kim Zuppiger, Contract Planner  
**Applicant:** JSF Management, LLC

**SPEAKERS:**

**Staff:** Peter Gilli, Community Development Director

**Applicant:** Keith McCloskey, KTG Architecture

**Members of Public:** Robert Vefler, Fred White, Lilith, Steve McCoughlin, Nancy Tomhaue, Jamie Ambargey, Judee Hainer, Chuck Eckberg, Jay Dupuy, Debra Dupuy, Anne Bradley, John Howard, Mariza Sullivan, Ursula Britton, Stephanie Caldwell, M.Laura Gulousen.

**Emails:** [public comment](#), [supplemental packet #1](#), [supplemental packet #2](#), [supplemental packet #3](#)

**Documents:** PowerPoint by Staff and Applicant

**Ex-Parte Communication:** None

The Design Review Committee provided the following comments on the proposed plans:

**General**

- If possible, include parking structures underground and have much more at grade pedestrian experience.
- Site design could have more of a grid approach type of orientation/organization for the structures.
- Commercial on Maple Street, not just specific to the plaza area. Could have a few units there that are more specific like day care, coffee shop, or restaurant on the corner would activate the corner and would be welcomed by the greater community.
- Review exit and entrance:
  - Entrance off of Maple Street and garage off of Maple Court.
  - If Maple Court is a public right-a-way, strongly recommend not vacating the access road or its easement. It should be designed as a standard public road with parking, sidewalks, and parkways. The streetscape will help it feel

more like a neighborhood, and better tie into the adjacent community and massing of the project.

- Provide a couple design concepts, plan A and plan B, to work through the design together.

### **Height and Massing**

- Design is aggressive mainly around the south building and interface with the adjacent neighborhood. Should be 4 stores at 40 feet back from property line and access to parking from this area.
- Massing increased internally pulling it back on the edges.
- It is more important to continue to reduce the massing on the neighborhood side even if that mean increasing the massing on the other side of project that isn't next to the neighborhood.

### **Building Design**

- Draws more from the commercial aspect of Mills than it does from adjacent neighborhood since the scale is so much greater than the typical one-story neighborhood.
- Feels institutionalized international style. Make it more residential in feel by breaking up the mass.
- Look at the eastern side of the building and see how it addresses the single-family neighborhood to the east which has a midcentury design with low-slung roofs and a lot of architectural detail.
- Doesn't feel like a neighborhood which would help it be more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. There could be opportunity to use alternative product types such as townhomes surrounding the structures and then stacked flats above. Make this feel more of a residential / mixed use community.
- Differentiation in the design, not so rhythmic and repetitive with additional varieties.

### **Landscaping and Open Space**

- Landscaping on all sides with the courtyards to soften, add shade, and not to be a solar collector.
- Appreciate the plaza spaces on the podiums. If possible, could connect to one another.
- Meandering from courtyard to courtyard rather than personal space would be beneficial for the whole project.
- Activation of the roof – for solar purposes, adding green space/landscaping, and people space opportunities. Don't just use it for equipment storage.

- Designate a small public space open to the public.

### **STAFF COMMUNICATION**

Special Design Review Committee meeting will be held August 31, 2022 at Poinsettia Pavilion to discuss the form-based code overlay.

Next Design Review Committee meeting will be held September 21, 2022

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further items on the agenda, meeting is adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

FINAL