SUGAR CITY DESIGN REVIEW
MEETING MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING - THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2020

Meeting called to order by: Paul Jeppson
Pledge of Allegiance
Commissioners in attendance: Paul Jeppson, Steve Webster and Spencer Cook

Others in attendance: Quinton Owens representing the City as Building inspector and P & Z Administrator, Engineer Johnny Watson represented the applicants for the Sun-Glo Addition

Discussion on Sun-Glo Addition:

- Reviewed *SCC 8-4-7 Standards for Specific Design Areas*.
- Observed ingress, egress and traffic flow.
- Observed Lighting Plan for building itself with questions if lighting is adequate in parking area.
- Observed landscape plan and that it meets the 10% requirement for this zone.
- Johnny Watson presented additional material to represent landscaping in video.
- Observed roofing materials and verified that there will be no roof mounted equipment.
- After some discussion Design Review came up with four concerns.

1. Parking by code requires 200+ spaces.
   Additional documentation of equipment footprint and statements from the applicant that maximum employees would be in the seventies.
   Engineer documented eighty spaces with appropriate ADA spaces.
   Applicant acknowledges that there would be a maximum of eighty occupancy load.
   Logically we can see the need to make a minor code ordinance change to table on ***SCC 8-6-1.***

2. There was discussion of "Possible Nuisance Concerns".

3. Lights (Fine on Building / Employee Parking Lot (non-existent but may be covered by the lights on the north of the building). ***SCC 8.4.6 and 8.4.7B***
   Dark Sky Ordinance (Light Pollution is barely mentioned in Code.)

4. Smell / Need Regulatory Agencies approval (FDA, EPA, DEQ, and others) and Dick Dyer response as City Engineer (Ponds). Spencer brought up health issues. We did not talk about aquifer in Design Review, but in report to Planning and Zoning the next night it came up.

- Wall surface 30/70 requirement: ***SCC 8.4.7A*** Applicant has chosen not to implement the 30/70 requirement and will appeal with the landscaping plan consideration.
- Landscaping Plan was approved and meets requirements (encouragement to increase number of trees on eastern edge.) What will be the initial planted height? Evergreens are very appropriate. ***8-4-7B***
- Lighting Plan was approved with the stipulation to have adequate lighting in the parking area.
- Ingress and Egress was verified with the flow of transportation.
- Location of Snow Storage was demonstrated by Johnny Watson.
- Gravel / Paving: Engineer promised pavement up to building on the north. ***SSC 8.6.2N and other areas of SCC.*** Code requires more paving. Question on parking / staging. Hardscape / Softscape. Engineer suggested "yearly check" of maintenance

Motion made by: Spencer Cook to forward for continuation of review to Planning and Zoning:

1. Parking Consideration - Total space minus equipment would equal what mandates maximum of 80 spaces instead of the 200+ in City Code, documented by drawings and testimony that maximum number of employees would be in the 70's. Usage.
2. 30/70 Consideration - Applicant will appeal to Planning and Zoning (with the landscaping to include evergreen trees etc. to improve the view from the street / State Highway sides.
3. Nuisance Consideration - (Smell and Lighting) Check for regulatory signoff as well as City Engineer review for smell. (Verify ponds are not a health issue.)
4. Paving of Staging Area to be reviewed by P & Z / City Council on variation from City Code.
5. All other requirements of Design Review were observed to be met.

Engineer will verify paving all the way to building.

Motion seconded by: Steve Webster
All were in favor, motion carried

Planning and Zoning Commission needs to resolve some of the Sugar City Code issues and make recommendations before it is forwarded as an action item for City Council. Design Review is reviews compliance to Sugar City Code and State Statutes-Idaho Code.

Discussion on status Maupin Storage Request:
Checked on any updates or plans from Justin Maupin.

> 9/16 8:29 a.m. Email from Justin Maupin (Work in Process)
> Paul, good morning. I had hoped to have something solid to show you Quinton, and Dave. I have an idea of what I want it to look like when I'm done. I am still working with my father on the parcel next door and that is what I am waiting one to decide which way to go. It should be done by the end of 2020. That being said I am wondering if we could write up an agreement between the city of sugar city and myself that I would need to complete all soft and hardscapes and lighting within 24 months of signing? I would like to get a building permit in the works so as not to have the building sitting on the ground all winter and do concrete before its cold. Also feel free to stop by my office with any questions thanks in advance.
>
> Justin Maupin
> Owner/CFO

Discussion on status of Paul Jensen Building in the Business Park:
Checked on the status of application from Paul Jensen and incomplete plans that were promised earlier. Reference the letter from Quinton 9/16.
(Design Review is willing to meet on the same night as CC&R Review Committee meeting with adequate notification.)

Motion to adjourn the meeting: Steve Webster
Motion seconded by: Spencer Cook
All were in favor, motion carried