

**KUNA DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING  
October 30, 2008**

**MINUTES**

---

The Design Review Board met in regular session October 30, 2008, Chairman D'Orazio presiding.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman D'Orazio calls the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL:** The following members were present D'Orazio, Rowe, Goicoechea, Hennis and Denton. Steven Hasson, Planning Director; Troy Behunin, Planner II and Maranda Schindel, Planner was also present. Committee Member Young was absent. Scott McIntosh was also present representing the Kuna Melba News.

Committee Member Hennis wanted to discuss the option to abstain from voting; he works for the same company that the applicant, Jessica Aguilar, husband works for. Hennis believes that he can make a nonbiased decision. Director Hasson explained to the Committee that the decision is laid upon the fellow Committee members to decide whether or not they feel Committee member Hennis is capable of making a nonbiased decision. They did not feel it to be an issue and continued forward.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA:**
4. **OLD BUSINESS:**
5. **NEW BUSINESS:**

**Public Meeting: 08-13-DR / 08-13-SUP – Walgreens**

*Mr. Behunin, Planner II presented the application to the Committee; explaining Staff's interpretation and recommendations of all aspects of the land uses pertaining to the parcel and which appointed body decides what. Conditions were not presented by Staff being that the Applicant provided a response letter commenting on each condition; during each item presented Staff will comment then.*

**Applicant: Jessica Aguilar, Pre-Development Project Manager-**

Ms. Aguilar presented the application by introducing response letter to Staff's Conditions of Approval, Exhibit 12; going through each item by importance.

#1: Applicant agrees to provide required documents as part of the building department plan review.

#3: Applicant has submitted new elevations with showing comparison to the original proposal. Applicant made a comment that corporate was looking to spend as little money on the "behind" area.

Mr. Behunin commented that the Youngs have been talking about continuing retail construction to the south. Staff doesn't want a "warehouse" look to set the standards for that area in the future.

- #5: Trash Receptacles: Ms. Aguilar stated that they will be providing wood totes on gates.  
Mr. Behunin commented that Kuna City Code states that no wood is permitted.  
Ms. Aguilar stated that past City's have had the same regulations and will find what was used in past developments and accommodate.
- #8: Mr. Behunin noted that within the Overlay District requires the sidewalk to be 10-feet wide; however, the sidewalks to the east and west of the proposed property has in the past been approved for a 8-foot sidewalk. So in keeping with the surrounding sidewalks, Staff is only requiring an 8-foot sidewalk for this development.
- #10: Ms. Aguilar stated that they were willing to provide the additional landscaped island within the parking lot; even though the Code stated the building square footage called for a minimum 60 parking stalls. With complying with Staff's request to provide for the landscape island it will eliminate a parking stall.  
However, Ms. Aguilar felt that providing a 3-inch caliper to all the trees when Code only requires 2-inch caliper is not something they are willing to provide.  
Mr. Behunin noted; Code has conflicting requirements, one stating there are a certain number of parking stalls required from a commercial establishment based off square footage and another stating that for every 14 parking stalls a landscaped island is required. Staff feels losing one parking stall is acceptable. Staff will also supply a waiver if needed, to allow fewer parking spaces then required in exchange for the island. The development is subject to a Special Use Permit (SUP); SUP's gives the City the opportunity to require the above and beyond requirements of City Code. With that being said, Mr. Behunin explained that Staff is requiring the 3-inch caliper because within a commercial use setting and in our gateway corner, the City would like a more mature canopy. A mature canopy equals a more mature landscaping.
- #12: Ms. Aguilar stated that the number of Evergreen trees Staff requires will not be acceptable to the Developer along Kuna Road/Avalon. Walgreens feel that providing so many evergreens will create a "wall" and wishes to provide Deciduous trees in replacement; they create less density and in the winter are bare. Ms. Aguilar noted; should they require the evergreens that Walgreens will need to be consulted and approve to move forward.  
Committee member Hennis asked what the landscape code states is the number of Evergreen trees and placement required.  
Mr. Behunin read the Code; *3 evergreen trees are required to be placed ever 100 linear feet of frontage.* The Applicant is allowed to group / place the trees in any which way they desire as long as they meet the minimum number of trees required by KCC 5-17-14.  
Committee member Hennis commented on working with the applicant by coming to some sort of compromise. Giving them the minimum caliper and they in return provide half of the required landscaping recommended by Staff.  
Committee Member Rocco asked that they move on through the letter and come back to landscaping for the time being.

Ms. Aguilar moved through the remaining items numbered 16-26 since the developer had no objections and will comply.

#2: Ms. Aguilar noted Staff's concern for the entrance and Wythe Creek Ct. centerlines to line up or have a maximum of 10-feet so as to prevent any traffic conflicts. Ms. Aguilar read the comments provided from their Traffic Engineer explaining the placement of the proposed entrance; going over the key notes of current Low Traffic Vol., Offsets, Intersection Sight-Distance, and Intersection Operation. Committee member Denton suggested the right in right out off Avalon like Bank of Cascades. Committee Member Rowe asked if moving the road to match the centerlines would reduce the number of parking; if it is that much of a difference. Mr. Behunin stated that even if a bridge is never built across Indian Creek there will still be more people/business/traffic from the south in the future. That even though through traffic volumes may be minimal now; it will not be in 100 years. This building is going to be here for a long time and the request to move the entrance to a safe distance, providing safety in the future, is not that unreasonable. Ms. Aguilar asked that the Committee and Staff wait for the ACHD report to come and since they are the authority over that roadway that the developer be allowed to base their decision off that. Mr. Hasson interrupts to explain the seriousness of this requirement by drawing it on the white board for the Committee to see. Drivers must be able to see each other when approaching any intersection and not create any "blind" spots – where people can only see you out of their peripheral vision they will not have enough response time should they pull out in front of each other. Also, Mr. Hasson added that ACHD is a joint authority with the City when deciding the roadway structure. Again, Ms. Aguilar asked that they be allowed to wait for the ACHD report to be presented and let the traffic engineers handle their assessments. She and members of City staff are not traffic engineers and they shouldn't encroach on their duties. Committee member D'Orazio stated he is comfortable and willing to lose a parking space to provide for the access. The access does not pose any conflicts for large trucks / vehicles to make that turn and feels it will still provide for good access into the property. Committee member Goicheachea felt that with current land use surrounding and future possibilities unknown that pushing the centerline to match up is a huge safety concern.

#14: Returning to the issue of the landscaping; Ms. Aguilar brought up the issue of landscaping within the ROW. After speaking with ITD employee, Pam Golden, she has found that they are not in practice of entering into agreement between developers. That perhaps ITD will allow the movement of the sidewalk into the ROW and shift the whole development, allowing the centerline to line up and by doing so will alleviate the issue of loosing any parking spaces.

#15: Ms. Aguilar stated, in discussions with Pam Golden in regards to providing proof of expansion to Avalon, Pam expressed their future plans

showed no development with Avalon Street; Avalon Road they consider that an area of Kuna not ITD.

Additional discussion of proposed landscaping: Currently there are no Evergreen trees proposed. Permitted within a Special Use, staff is allowed to require more than what the minimum requirements are. Committee member Rowe states, that putting in the required 14 Evergreen trees would be too much; it is a store not a park. Rowe likes the openness of Bank of the Cascades' landscaping. Committee member Goicheachea disagreed; feels that there wasn't enough landscaping provided at the Bank of Cascades and would like to see more landscaping provided with commercial developments. Hennis asked Staff if there was any way to come to a compromise. Rowe made mention that the Committee is responsible for setting the bar for what is required of Developers when coming into our City and that they must stick by it. All agreed. Ms. Aguilar asked, if Walgreens would provide the required number of trees if the Committee would allow for the 2-inch caliper rather than the 3-inch. Committee believed that to be a possibility.

Committee member D'Orazio moved the discussion to focus on the elevations proposed to the City by the Applicant. D'Orazio pulled out a copy of the elevations proposed and approved for the City of Eagle; asking why Eagle was proposed something so extravagant and Kuna is proposed something so "Generic".

Ms. Aguilar stated, "You will not get this at this location." It's like night and day comparing Eagle and Kuna. Eagle has higher home values, higher traffic counts and better economics and demographics; "No disrespect to Kuna, but Eagle is a big draw, and Kuna is still really a small community." Ms. Aguilar also informed the Committee that the Developer for this Walgreens is not the same Developer that proposed the elevations for Eagle's Walgreens. D'Orazio added to Ms. Aguilar's comment; that the Developer also didn't pay as much for the parcel in Kuna that was paid for in Eagle.

Committee member Hennis commented on the surrounding buildings developed by the Youngs. Mr. Behunin brought out pictures of the surrounding building design. Hennis suggested that they add complimenting textures, materials, colors, etc. to the elevations. D'Orazio said, "Make it pretty – it's too "industrial", too "warehouse" and plain." Suggesting adding colored stucco, tower/pitched roof, have relief with multiple colors, and have different veneer; perhaps have the canopies be burgundy, so as to match with the Youngs' buildings to the west. Ms. Aguilar stated that she will return after making for changes discussed; however as much as they are wanting Walgreens to fit in with it's surrounding, Walgreens still wants to "stand" out.

**Motioned was made to table application until November 13, 2008 with the following conditions:**

- **Meet with ITD and discuss the offset, moving store forward by moving sidewalk and buffer reduction; coordinate with meeting with Pam Golden and Steve.**
- **Provide alternate building elevations and show roof line over entrance tower.**
- **Reduce requirement of tree sizes to follow code.**
- **Remove the parking space so as provide for a landscape island.**

6. **DISCUSSION:**

**A. Design Review Board: Rocco D'Orazio will not be attending the November 13, 2008 meeting and wishes to receive all updated information via email.**

7. **ADJOURNMENT:**

**Motion is made by D'Orazio to adjourn. The motion is seconded by Hennis. All AYES, motion carries. The meeting is adjourned at 8:08 p.m.**