Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting - Regular AGENDA

Tuesday, July 13, 2021 at 4:30 PM
Ketchum City Hall
480 East Avenue North, Ketchum, ID 83340

In recognition of the Coronavirus (COVID-19), members of the public may observe the meeting live on the City's website at ketchumidaho.org/meetings.

If you would like to comment on the agenda item, please submit your comment to participate@ketchumidaho.org by noon the day of the meeting. Comments will be provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

If you would like to provide comment on the agenda item in person, you may speak to the Commission when called upon but must leave the room after speaking and observe the meeting outside City Hall.

## CALL TO ORDER

COMMISSION REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE
CONSENT CALENDAR—ACTION ITEMS

1. Minutes of June 8, 2021

## PUBLIC HEARINGS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM STAFF - ACTION ITEMS

2. ACTION ITEM - Pioneer Pickleball Club Conditional Use Permit

Continued from May 25, 2021 and June 8, 2021.
To be continued to July 27, 2021.
3. ACTION ITEM - 780 N First Ave Multi-Use Building Pre-Design Review

STAFF REPORTS \& CITY COUNCIL MEETING UPDATE

## ADJOURNMENT

Any person needing special accommodations to participate in the meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office as soon as reasonably possible at 726-3841. All times indicated are estimated times, and items may be heard earlier or later than indicated on the agenda.

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting - Regular MINUTES

Tuesday, June 08, 2021 at 4:30 PM
Ketchum City Hall
480 East Avenue North, Ketchum, ID 83340

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 PM by Chairman Neil Morrow.

PRESENT<br>Chairman Neil Morrow<br>Vice-Chairman Mattie Mead<br>Commissioner Tim Carter<br>Commissioner Jennifer Cosgrove<br>Commissioner Brenda Moczygemba

COMMISSION REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE
There were no ex parte discussion disclosures.

## CONSENT CALENDAR—ACTION ITEMS

1. Minutes of May 25, 2021

Motion to approve the Minutes of May 25, 2021.
Motion made by Commissioner Cosgrove, Seconded by Commissioner Moczygemba.
Voting Yea: Chairman Morrow, Vice-Chairman Mead, Commissioner Carter, Commissioner Cosgrove, Commissioner Moczygemba
2. Reinheimer Ranch Field Daze Conditional Use Permit Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Decision

Motion to approve the Reinheimer Ranch Conditional Use Permit Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.
Motion made by Vice-Chairman Mead, Seconded by Commissioner Carter.
Voting Yea: Chairman Morrow, Vice-Chairman Mead, Commissioner Carter, Commissioner Cosgrove, Commissioner Moczygemba

## PUBLIC HEARINGS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM STAFF - ACTION ITEMS

3. ACTION ITEM - Pioneer Pickleball Club Conditional Use Permit. Continued from May 25, 2021.

Commissioner Moczygemba recused herself from this agenda item.
Director Frick reported to the Commission that the applicant did not have the parking agreement ready to be presented to the Commission. She noted the Club is not currently operating.

Motion to continue the Pioneer Pickleball Club Conditional Use Permit to July 13, 2021.
Motion made by Vice-Chairman Mead, Seconded by Commissioner Carter.
Voting Yea: Chairman Morrow, Vice-Chairman Mead, Commissioner Carter, Commissioner

## Cosgrove

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Moczygemba

## STAFF REPORTS \& CITY COUNCIL MEETING UPDATE

Public Comment:
Narda Pitkethly commented on Bluebird Village. She supported the project as she currently resides in rental housing and would love to have a rental unit in housing such as Bluebird Village.

Vice-Chair Mead asked about the next hearing date for Bluebird Village. Director Frick stated the applicants are in the re-design phase. The project will be scheduled when available.

Director Frick indicated the City Council met on affordable housing. Consideration was being made as to the following Zoning changes:

- to allow long-term RV parking on private property.
- eliminate minimum lot size or maximum density.
- mandatory ADU on projects over a certain square footage to provide rental unit for a local worker.
She indicated the Council was entertaining all ideas.
Chair Morrow urged Blaine County Housing to audit their affordable housing units that all renters meet the qualifications. He suggested workforce housing in larger homes with vacant ADU's. Perhaps the City could bond the renter.

Commissioner Carter asked about limiting short term rentals. Director Frick noted the City attorney was working to determine if the city can move forward with limiting Short Term Rentals.

Commissioner Cosgrove asked what the benefit was to not regulate short term rentals. Director Frick cited property rights and Real Estate interest vs availability of rental housing. In Idaho, cities cannot impose a city tax.

Vice-Chair Mead questioned how to inventory short term rentals and reach out to owners to change to long-term rental with incentives.

Brenda asked about the hole at Main St and River St. Director Frick noted the City attorney was working with the bond company to access funding for remediation. There was no current plan for the hole other than restoration. It may be partially filled in an amphitheater configuration.

The next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to be held July 13, 2021.

## ADJOURNMENT

Motion to Adjourn.
Motion made by Vice-Chairman Mead, Seconded by Commissioner Carter. Voting Yea: Chairman Morrow, Vice-Chairman Mead, Commissioner Carter, Commissioner Cosgrove, Commissioner Moczygemba

STAFF REPORT
KETCHUM PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 13, 2021

| PROJECT: | The Lofts at 780 |
| :--- | :--- |
| FILE NUMBER: | P $21-039$ |
| APPLICATION TYPE: | Preapplication Design Review |
| APPLICANT: | Daniel Hollis, HR Architects, LLC (Architect) |
| PROPERTY OWNER: | SV Ventures, LLC |
| REQUEST: | Preapplication Design Review for the development of a new, 11,423 square foot, <br> three-story multi-family building |
| LOCATION: | 780 N 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue - Ketchum Townsite: Block 33: Lot 5 |
| ZONING: | Community Core - Subdistrict 2 - Mixed Use (CC-2) |
| REVIEWER: | Morgan R. Landers, AICP - Senior Planner |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:


Figure 1: Conceptual Rendering of Project

The Applicant is proposing an 11,423 square foot three-story multi-family development known as the Lofts at 780 (the "project"), located at $780 \mathrm{~N} 1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (the "subject property"). The subject property is a vacant corner lot zoned Community Core -Subdistrict 2 - Mixed Use (CC-2) just south of the Mountain Rides facility, diagonal from the Hemingway School. As proposed, the project includes seven residential dwelling units. One dwelling unit on the ground floor, four on the second floor, and two on the third floor. Four of the dwelling units are less than 2,000 square feet, the remaining three are less than 750 square feet. Four parking spaces and one ADA parking space is required for the project. The project proposes four standard and one ADA alley loaded parking spaces. The project is proposing to take advantage of the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) bonus for Community Housing. Overall, staff believes the project to be in conformance with most requirements of the zoning code and most standards related to Design Review. The project must address code conformance issues related to wall height and setbacks prior to final Design Review. Additionally, staff believes the applicant could make improvements to the project in the following areas to fully conform to Design Review standards:

- Compatibility of Design - Materials and colors
- Architectural - Bulk and roof overhangs
- Landscaping - Buffering between uses and variety


## BACKGROUND:

The City of Ketchum received the application for Preapplication Design Review of the Lots at 780 on April 9, 2021. The application was deemed complete on June 14, 2021, after two reviews for completeness. Following receipt of the complete application, staff routed the application materials to all city departments for review. Department comments were provided to the applicant on June 29, 2021. Department comments and applicant response to comments can be found as Exhibit A to this staff report.

## CONFORMANCE WITH ZONING AND DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS:

Per Ketchum Municipal Code (KMC) §17.96.010.C - Preapplication Design Review, all new multi-family developments of five or more units require a preapplication design review by the Planning and Zoning Commission (the "Commission"). The purpose of preapplication review is to allow the commission to exchange ideas and give direction to the applicant on the "design concept" (KMC §17.96.010.C.2). The preapplication design review facilitates a discussion between the Planning \& Zoning Commission, developers and their design teams, and the community. This preliminary review allows the Commission to identify design issues, offer constructive feedback, and highlight opportunities where the project can further comply with the Design Review standards.

Before granting Design Review approval, the Planning \& Zoning Commission must determine that applications meet two criteria: (1) the project doesn't jeopardize the health, safety, or welfare of the public, and (2) the project conforms to all Design Review standards and zoning regulations (KMC §17.96.050.A).

## Conformance with Zoning Regulations

During department review, city staff reviewed the project for conformance with all applicable zoning code requirements including uses, dimensional limitations, signage, parking, development standards, and dark skies. The project follows applicable zoning code requirements. Below is an analysis of some key items of note.

## FAR for Community Housing

The 11,423 square-foot building has a total FAR of 2.07. The CC-2 district allows up to an FAR of 2.25, subject to design review approval, with the contribution of Community Housing. Based on the methodology outlined in KMC §17.124.040.2.a, the project must provide a minimum of 1,007 square feet of community housing. The project is proposing to meet the minimum requirements of the Community Housing provisions with a combination of cash-in-lieu and dedication of one community housing unit. The unit proposed for Community Housing is Unit \#203, a 425 square foot studio, resulting in a balance of 582 square feet subject to cash-in-lieu. At the current rate of $\$ 238 /$ square foot, the total cash-in-lieu payment will be $\$ 138,494.58$.

Although the KMC provides for a variety of options for satisfying the Community Housing requirement, the primary goal of this provision is to provide built units for the residents of Ketchum. Based on the proposed unit mix of the project, staff recommends the applicant consider the allocation of one additional unit of housing to satisfy the community housing requirement rather than cash-in-lieu. As proposed, there are two one-bedroom units just over 600 square feet. If the project were to allocate the studio apartment (\#203) and a one-bedroom unit (\#202), the total square footage of community housing would total 1,053 square feet. This would exceed the community housing requirement by 46 square feet. Staff acknowledges that this cannot be a requirement of the project but provides the suggestion for further consideration.

## Dark Skies and Illumination

The project proposes to have a back lit mural at the corner of $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave. and $8^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. The applicant has stated that the illumination produced by this feature was factored into the photometric calculations of the project. As this is an area of frequent wildlife migration, staff requested the applicant provide information as to the times of day the feature would be lit. Per KMC §17.132.030 - Lighting Standards, lights shall be on a timer and shall be turned off when not in use. Staff recommends the illumination be turned off between the hours of 10:30 pm to 6:00 am. Wildlife migration is most prevalent in the spring and fall. In September and April, daylight hours
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are approximately 7am to 8pm. Restricting the hours of the mural allows for the enjoyment of the feature by the public but avoids any impact to wildlife migrating through the neighborhood during the late evening or early hours of the morning.

Fences, Walls, and Hedges
Pursuant to KMC §17.124.130 - Fences, Walls, and Hedges, walls within 30 feet of the front lot line may not exceed four feet in height. For the project, $N 1^{\text {st }}$ Ave. is the front lot line. As shown on Sheet A3.2, the mural wall that extends south from the corner of the property, tapers in height and is below four feet. However, there is an entrance to the ground floor residential unit that requires the use of stairs. When calculating the height of the wall with the stair railing, the total height is approximately 5 feet 10 inches. Although having an entrance to the unit on the ground floor in this location is desirable from a streetscape standpoint, the code does not permit a wall and railing of this height. Staff recommends the applicant relocate the entry door to face the street and bring the stairs down to the street in front of the door. Additionally, as shown on Sheet L2, the landscaping proposed for the area along the lower patio is Peking Cotoneaster, which is a


Figure 2: Elevation Showing Wall Height hedge like plant that has the potential to grow 5-7 feet tall in its mature state. This landscape proposal seeks to create privacy for the grade level patio along $\mathrm{N} 1^{\text {st }}$ St. A more pedestrian friendly configuration is desired. See landscape comments in the Design Review section below for staff recommendations on use of the space and plant selection for this area.

## Setbacks

In the CC-2 district, building facades must be set back an average of 5 feet on the front and street sides of the building for corner lots. The intent of an "average" setback is to encourage undulation of the building, allowing for some portions of the building to extend to the lot line, while other portions are pushed back. The average is calculated by taking the length of the building façade at each floor and multiply that by 5 feet to establish the minimum square footage of setback for each floor. Based on the calculations provided by the applicant, the front setback on $N 1^{\text {st }}$ Ave. complies with setbacks, however, the street side setback on $8^{\text {th }}$ St. does not. Compliant setbacks must be demonstrated for final Design Review. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to bring the building into conformance on the $8^{\text {th }}$ St side to ensure the issue is addressed.

## Conformance with Design Review Improvements and Standards

During department review, city staff reviewed the project for conformance with all applicable design review improvements and standards outlined in KMC §17.96.060 - Improvements and Standards. Staff also review the project for conformance with KMC §17.96.070 - Community Core (CC) Projects. Finally, staff reviewed the project for conformance with all corresponding city code requirements related to right-of-way improvements including but not limited to sidewalks, street lighting, alleys, and on-street parking. Staff believes that either a requirement is not applicable due to the scope of the project, or requirements are met except for the following:

Standard: The project's materials, colors and signing shall be complementary with the townscape, surrounding neighborhoods and adjoining structures.

- The adjacent structures are one-story, structures of residential style with light colored materials, primarily horizontal vinyl/wood siding. Across 8th Street to the northwest and northeast are commercial type structures with flat roofs and light-colored materials of stucco and concrete. Staff believes the materials and colors of the proposed project are mostly compatible with the adjoining structures and the surrounding neighborhood, however, the proposed materials of "Grey Corrugated Metal" and "Traffic Black Stonewood Siding" are of a darker material than what is predominant in the area. Staff understands the importance of accent colors and materials, however, recommends the applicant consider adjusting the darker materials to a warmer tone or adjusting the


Figure 3: Conceptual Rendering of Project materials to a more natural/supple option to give a softer feeling to the structure that is more compatible with adjoining structures and the surrounding neighborhood. Staff also recommends the applicant adjust the materials utilized on the south elevation of the structure to a lighter material and one that employs less verticality as it dwarfs the adjoining structure. The applicant has stated that adjustment of the materials on the south side of the building is not necessary because of the landscaping on the adjacent property. Staff believes an adjustment would be beneficial as the trees are not always in full form through each season. Additionally, trees are


Figure 4: South Elevation of Building unfortunately not permanent. If those trees become unhealthy or require trimming/removal, the façade would be exposed.

- There is an opportunity to provide vibrancy to the project using color and material accents and/or the addition of playful public art on elements of the building. One example is the use of colors for window trim, railings, numbering, and entryways/doors. A second example relates to the proposed art treatment. The project proposes a back lit greyscale mountain mural along a section of the building, however, the introduction of colored murals that apply to more than just the corner would greatly enhance the building's connection to the school and provide vibrancy to the street where the materials along the streetscape are cold and stark. Along the 8th St. side of the building, the area which includes the screening of the parking, electrical meter location, and mechanical rooms creates a long stretch of dark materials that do not bring vibrancy to the streetscape or the surrounding neighborhood. This comment was provided to the applicant following department review. The applicant has declined to revise the materials per staff recommendation.


## Architectural - KMC §17.96.060.F and §17.96.070.B

Standard: Building walls shall provide undulation/relief, thus reducing the appearance of bulk and flatness.

- The building design provides for a variety of undulation and relief; however, staff does not believe that the bulk of the structure is being reduced through these elements. Although the building meets the setback requirements, the large decks of a consistent size protrude out, creating the feeling of a larger structure on the N 1st Ave side of the building. The roof form is also contributing to the building's bulk and mass. Particularly, where the roof structure anchors the corner. With the absence of more
prominent landscaping and softer materials, the building still carries a bulky appearance with a topheavy feeling from the street level. See below for additional comments on landscaping.

Standard: Roof overhangs shall not extend more than three feet ( $3^{\prime}$ ) over a public sidewalk. Roof overhangs that extend over the public sidewalk shall be approved by the Public Works Department.

- As shown on Sheet A3.2, the project proposes roof overhangs of three feet into the public right-of-way on $\mathrm{N} 1^{\text {st }}$ Ave. Although the code allows for overhangs of roofs up to 3 feet with approval by the Public Works Department, the overhang is also subject to design review. Staff encouraged the applicant to reconsider the roof overhang at the corner to reduce the perceived bulk and mass of the building by pedestrians. The project does achieve an appropriate roof form above the proposed decks, however, the


Figure 5: Conceptual Rendering of NW Corner corner element is very strong and creates a heavy feel of the building with the absence of softer colors or taller landscaping. The project proposes a metal horizontal treatment at the corner intended to break up the height, however, staff does not believe this achieves the goal effectively.

## Landscaping - KMC §17.96.060.I and §17.96.070.D

Standard: Landscaping is required for all projects.

- Although the proposed project has a landscaping plan, the landscaping is minimal. Additional landscaping is highly encouraged as discussed above in the review of architectural standards and below.

Standard: Landscaping shall provide a substantial buffer between land uses, including, but not limited to, structures, streets and parking lots. The development of landscaped public courtyards, including trees and shrubs where appropriate, shall be encouraged.

- The initial application did not provide a buffer between the structure and the street/sidewalk. Staff recommended the applicant address comments regarding bulk and mass with revisions to the landscape plan, which would also create a more welcoming environment for pedestrians. Staff also encouraged the applicant to consider a seating area for the public. Due to the proximity of the school, this site is optimal for creating a landscaped seating area with trees for parents and children to meet. The applicant revised the landscape plan to remove a private patio on $8^{\text {th }}$ St. and reduce the patio on N $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave, resulting in the addition of plants along both street frontages. This is an improvement; however, staff believes further improvements to the streetscape can be made.
- Staff recommended the applicant consider the adjustment of building setbacks to accommodate more ground level plants and trees within the project. The CC-1 and CC-2 districts have many examples of taller buildings with ground level trees and shrubs that creates a welcome environment for pedestrians. With an increase in building setback, the foundation/retaining walls along both street frontages would be setback and plants could be placed in front. Staff acknowledges this would require revisions to the Gross Floor Area of the building and potential revisions to the dimensions of the cantilevered decks, however, adjustments would make a significant positive impact on the pedestrian environment and the project's compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. No revisions were made in response to the comment. The building, as proposed, meets the setback requirements of the CC-2 zone district.
- Staff has been discouraging the placement of street trees in the right-of-way, due to challenges with snow removal in the winter. However, if a project is proposing snow melt for sidewalks, street trees can be placed within the right-of-way with certain conditions related to the installation. The project is
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proposing to snowmelt the sidewalks adjacent to the project, therefore, the installation of street trees could assist in addressing the comments above.

Standard: When a healthy and mature tree is removed from a site, it shall be replaced with a new tree. Replacement trees may occur on or off site.

- Per the site visit on June 24,2021 with the City Arborist, no replacement trees are required for the proposed project.


## Surface Parking Lots - KMC §17.96.070.E

Standard: Surface parking lots shall be accessed from off the alley and shall be fully screened from the street.

- The parking is accessed off the alley and is partially screened; however, the parking could be better screened in a way that not only meets the requirements of this standard but contributes to the project's conformance with the landscaping and architectural standards. Staff recommends the applicant consider screening with the integration of climbing vines/vegetation. This would add an interesting feature to the portion of the building that is mostly blank at the street level with no landscaping proposed and adequately screen the parking.


## Streets - KMC §17.96.090

Standard: All street designs shall be approved by the city engineer.

- The alley adjacent to the project does not meet the minimum width requirements for an alley and is therefore not maintained by the city. To address this issue, two options are available to the applicant. Decision on the course of action is not required at this time, however, desired option must be determined and reflected in the submittal for Final Design Review:
- Option \#1 - Improve the full width of the existing alley to the southern property boundary of 780 N 1st Street assuming a future 20 -foot improvement by off-setting the centerline of the designed improvements. This approach would require the applicant and future owners to maintain said portion of the alley that is improved until a future point in time when the full extent of the alley is improved per city standards. A maintenance agreement between the Homeowners Association and the City would be required to reflect the terms.
- Option \#2 - Improve the full extent of the alley from 8th Street to 7th Street for a full width of 20 feet. This approach would require the negotiation with adjacent property owners; however, the result would be an alley the City of Ketchum would maintain in perpetuity.


## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Commission provide feedback to the applicant on staff comments and recommendations, and additional areas of concern. As there are outstanding code conformance issues related to setbacks and wall height, the Commission may choose to move forward with one of two options:

- Request the applicant revise the plans to address code conformance issues and return for a second Preapplication Design Review meeting
- Provide direction to staff and the applicant on changes to the project and move to advance the Lofts at 780 to final Design Review.


## EXHIBITS:

A. Lofts at 780-Cover Letter and Response to Department Comments
B. Lofts at 780 - Design Review Application Materials
C. Lofts at 780 - Conceptual Rendering

## Exhibit A:

## Lofts at 780 - Cover Letter and Response to Department Comments

```
PO Box }1769\mathrm{ [post]
Sun Valley, ID }8335
220 River Street, East
Ketchum, ID }8334
v / 208.721.7160
```


## $1^{\text {st }}$ July 2021

## Morgan Landers

City of Ketchum - Design Review Committee
P.O. Box 2315

480 East Ave. N.
Ketchum, ID 83340
Dear Morgan / Design Review Commission,
We are excited to re-submit to you for "Pre-App Design review" our Multi-Family project ("The Lofts @ 780") located at $7801^{\text {st }}$ Avenue North, Ketchum. A 3 story, multi-residential structure, $11,423 \mathrm{sf}$, located opposite the Hemingway School entrance. All of the residential units will be available for market rate sales.

The programming of the building is as follows:

## Ground Level:

- Parking access from alley to the East.
- 9' - 10'-0" High Ceilings.
- Multiple Foyer/Entry Stairs for Upper Residential Units
- Mechanical Space
- (1) 3 Bedroom / 2 bathroom @ 1,975 square feet
- Outdoor Trash / Recycling area
- (3) car garage @ ranging from 232 SF to 310 SF.
- Storage lockers.
- Additionally, 4 car parking spaces including one ADA Van space.
- Landscaped Entry courtyard.

Second Level:

- Stair / elevator /Access Points to Residential Units
- (1) 4 bedroom, 4 bath unit, 1,988 square feet (\#201)
- (1) 1 bedroom, 1 bath unit, 628 square feet (\#202)
- (1) studio unit, approx. 452 square feet (\#203) (Possible affordable housing unit)
- (1) 1 bedroom, 1 bath unit, approx. 635 square feet (\#204)
- Balconies and Terraces for Residential Units
- Mechanical Space

Third Level:

- Stair / elevator /Access Points to Residential Units
- (1) 4 bedroom, 4 bath penthouse unit, 1,985 square feet (\#301)
- (1) 3 bedroom, 3 bath penthouse unit, 1,784 square feet (\#302)
- Balconies and Terraces for Residential Units
- Mechanical


## Roof Level:

- Outdoor mechanical area set at least 12 ' from any building edge.

We have proposed a mix of materials and colors that will hopefully enact a sense of vibrancy to this area of Ketchum. Key materials as per sample board images include a Stonewood siding/panel product connected to the building via a "rain-screen" detail. We have anchored the building by proposing the use of perorated / 12 gauge hot rolled steel panels. Where the building steps in along the Northern, and Western Facades, the exterior material is broken by using strips of the Stonewood siding as well as a mix of Stonewood paneling which is broken at window / door jambs, headers, sills and mullions.

We are proposing to also break up the building mass / scale by using 2 types of balcony / deck structures. One being a solid parapet condition with metal tube steel placed on top and then the other deck handrails will be a steel mesh system.

We look forward to conversing more about the project at the July $13^{\text {th }} \mathrm{P} \& Z$ meeting, please feel free to ask any questions or for additional information that will assist in approving this project to the next level. We are excited to work with you on this project, and we look forward to starting the next phase of the design process.

Sincerely,


Daniel Hollis, Principal

## CONTENTS:
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    Drawing List:
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A0.3 Exterior 3D Massing Model Views
A0.5 Construction Management Plan
A0.6 Material Samples / Color Board
C Topographical & Site Information (Galena Engineering)
C0.1 Cover Sheet
C1.0 Site Improvements Plan (Drainage)
C1.1 Signing, Pavement marking & Lighting Plan
C2.0 Drainage Details
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# 780 N First Avenue <br> Development Potential 

Legal - Lot 5, Block 33, $780 \mathrm{~N} 1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue
Parcel Size - 5,500 SF
Dimensions - 55' on First Avenue, 100' First Ave to Alleyway
Permissible Gross Density @ 2.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) = 12,375 SF

1. (A) $5,500 \mathrm{SF} x(\mathrm{H}) 2.25$ (per 17.124.040: FLOOR AREA RATIOS AND COMMUNITY HOUSING) $=12,375 \mathrm{SF}$
2. (M) 11,423 SF $-12,375 \mathrm{SF}=-\mathbf{9 5 2} \mathbf{S F}$

## Community Housing Requirement (net SF)

$20 \%$ of Gross FAR in excess of 1.0 FAR $\times 85 \%=10,310$ SF
Can be satisfied on-site, off-site, or by payment in lieu (currently set at $\$ 238 / \mathrm{SF}$ )
Project is proposed to be combination of payment in lieu and affordable housing onsite.
Parking Requirement
Residential - one space over 750 SF ( 4 spaces required, 1 ADA Space).
Project will provide 8 parking spaces, ( 4 more than required).
Maximum Building Height
42 Feet (Proposed 38'-8" north west roof)

## Setbacks

$1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue North - average of 5 feet. Minimum of 275 sf required, we are proposing 319 sf . Alley - 3 feet
South Side - 0' (we are proposing a 3'-0" setback until the garage which will be 0') $8^{\text {th }}$ Street - average of 5 feet. Minimum of 475 sf required, we are proposing 482 sf .

## RESPONSE TO CITY LETTER:

## Planning

- Setbacks - Based on Sheet A1.1, please provide a measurement demonstrating the area of setback along both streets and outline the area included in the measurement per the interpretation below. Per Section 17.12.040.B - Community Core Dimensional Standards, the setback for the project must be an average of 5 feet on the front ( N 1 st ) and an average of 5 feet on the street side (8th St). Per the attached interpretation of "Setback Average" there must be a minimum of $275 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(5 \times 55)$ of setback along N 1st Ave and a minimum of $475 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(5 \times 95)$ of setback along 8th St. Additionally, the porches identified at the ground floor are to be considered part of the building as outlined in the interpretation. If adequate setback cannot be accommodated with current design, adjustments to the design of the building must be made to conform to dimensional Standards.

The project is proposed to have an average setback along $8^{\text {th }}$ street of 482 sf and then 319 sf along the primary frontage of $1^{\text {st }}$ avenue. (See A1.1 B Site plan showing hatched area of setback.)

- Parking - Based on email communication from the applicant and the revised parking shown on Sheet A1.1 dated $6 / 11 / 21$, the project proposes 3 garage spaces, 4 surface parking spaces, and 1 surface accessible space. Please revised the cover letter, all site plans and floor plans to reflect the parking configuration. Per the KMC, the proposed project requires a minimum of 4 parking spaces and 1 accessible space.

Project to provide 3 garage spaces, 4 surface parking spaces and 1 surface accessible space as per A1.1 Site plan indicates.

- Illumination - Staff understands the corner art installation on the retaining wall to be a low-level back-lit element. Please confirm that the photometric plan took this light fixture into account. Additionally, please provide information on the times of day the illumination is intended to be activated.

Refer to Electrical drawings that show updated photometric study that indicates placeholders for two street lights for the project. Exact location of these street lights will be based on where the streets department would like them.

- Community Housing Cash-in-Lieu - The applicant is taking advantage of the FAR increase in exchange for community housing and has indicated the applicant intends to pay a cash-in-lieu. The current price per square foot for cash-in lieu is $\$ 238 /$ square foot. Based on current GFA on the submitted plans, the cash-in-lieu would be $\$ 239,644.58$. Staff will provide an updated number based on any changes to the project resulting from comments in this memo and additional design changes for Final Design Review.

With the new layout of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor showing 2 units in the place of the previous 2 bedroom unit, we are planning on having one affordable housing unit onsite (454 sf) which is a studio unit called \#203.

Improvements and Standards (17.96.060 and 17.96.070) - the following comments are based on the Improvements and Standards outlined in the KMC that pertain to planning issues.

- E. Compatibility of Design - Standards 2 and 3 under this section are not applicable to this project as the subject property is vacant with no landmarks or historic buildings/structures. Staff provides the following comments on Standard 1. Staff recommends the applicant make recommended adjustments, however, these are recommendations and not required prior to Pre-Design hearing with the Planning and Zoning Commission. o The adjacent structures are 1-story, structures of residential style with light colored
materials, primarily horizontal vinyl/wood siding. Across 8th Street to the northwest and northeast are commercial type structures with flat roofs and light-colored materials of stucco and concrete. Staff believes the materials and colors of the proposed project are mostly compatible with the adjoining structures and the surrounding neighborhood, however, the proposed materials of "Grey Corrugated Metal" and "Traffic Black Stonewood Siding" are of a darker material than what is predominant in the area. Staff understands the importance of accent colors and materials, however, recommends the applicant consider adjusting the darker materials to a warmer tone to give a softer feeling to the structure that is more compatible with adjoining structures and the surrounding neighborhood. Staff also recommends the applicant adjust the materials utilized on the south elevation of the structure to a lighter material and one that employs less verticality as it dwarfs the adjoining structure.

We can discuss more during the presentation but as the model shots show there are two massive (35'+) spruce trees on the SW corner of the site and then there is a row of 20'+ trees on the SE corner of the adjoining neighbor. This is part of natural context of the site.
o There is an opportunity to provide vibrancy to the project using color material accents and the addition of playful public art on elements of the building. One example is the use of colors for window trim or entryways/doors. A second example relates to the proposed art treatment. The project proposes a back lit greyscale mountain mural along a section of the building, however, the introduction of colored murals that extend to more than just the corner would greatly enhance the building's connection to the school and provide vibrancy to the street where the materials along the streetscape are cold and stark. Additionally, along the 8th St side of the building, the area which includes the screening of the parking, electrical meter location, and mechanical rooms creates a long stretch of dark materials that do not compliment the streetscape or the surrounding neighborhood. Staff has provided comments throughout this letter on streetscape and landscaping that an address these concerns. Per the comment above regarding setbacks, another consideration would be a reduction of the front setback of the building to allow for some pedestrian amenities.

## Addressed at time of presentation.

F. Architectural - staff believes the project conforms to the guidelines outlined in Standards 1-4, 7, and 8 of Section 17.96.060.F. Staff also believes that the project conforms to the guidelines outlined in Standards 1-5 of Section 17.96.070.B. Staff provides the following comments for consideration. Staff recommends the applicant make recommended adjustments, however, these are recommendations and not required prior to Pre-Design hearing with the Planning and Zoning Commission.
o 5 - The building design provides for a variety of undulation and relief; however, staff does not believe that the bulk and mass of the structure is being reduced through these elements. Although the building is setback, the large decks of a consistent size protrude out, creating the feeling of a larger structure. The roof form is also contributing to the building's bulk and mass. Particularly in the front as it anchors the corner. With the absence of more prominent landscaping and softer materials, the building still carries a bulky appearance with a top-heavy feeling from the street level. See below for additional comments on landscaping.

Addressed at time of presentation. Example of context that is considerably more top heavy is the Webb building immediately across the street on $8^{\text {th }}$. At a pedestrian level the roof is 38 ' above the sidewalk.
o 6 - Staff believes there are elements of the building that orients toward the primary frontage ( N 1st) with the anchor point of the glass windows at the corner and the location of ground floor patios. However, the building's primary entrance is at a mid-block on 8th Street. Staff recommends the applicant consider placing the entrance to the ground floor residential unit on N 1st connected to the patio for a more integrated orientation to N 1st Ave.

## Addressed at time of presentation

- Section 17.96.070.B - Architectural
o 1 - The building design addresses this standard, however, please see comments above on the materiality of the south elevation (interior side property line).


## Addressed at time of presentation

o 2 - The building design addresses the first portion of this standard. Please see the landscaping section below for comments on the second portion of the standard.

## Addressed at time of presentation

o 6 - Although the code allows for overhangs of roofs up to 3 feet with approval by the Public Works Department, the overhang is also subject to design review. Staff encourages the applicant to reconsider the roof overhangs considering comments above on massing of the building.

## Addressed at time of presentation

- G. Circulation Design - Standards 2 and 4 are not applicable to the project as there are no awnings or additional curb cuts proposed. Staff believes the proposed project conforms to standards 1,3 , and 5 with no additional comments. See comments from Streets below for comments on alley improvements.

See revised Civil that reflects what Morgan and I discussed, in regards to the alleyway design.

- H. Snow Storage - Staff understands that all sidewalks and pedestrian accessways are to be managed with proposed snow melt systems. Please describe how any snow accumulation within the parking area will be handled as shoveling snow into the alley is not permitted.

As per site plan and mechanical plans suggest, we are planning on snowmelting (boiler system) the hardscape on this project.

- l. Landscaping - Staff believes the proposed project meets standards 2 and 3. Staff recommends the applicant make recommended adjustments, however, these are recommendations and not required prior to Pre-Design hearing with the Planning and Zoning Commission. o 1 - Although the proposed project has a landscaping plan, the landscaping is minimal. Additional landscaping is highly encouraged as described in this letter.


## Refer to new landscape plan that shows additional landscaping on $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave and $8^{\text {th }}$ street.

o 4 - The proposed landscape plan does not provide a buffer between the structure and the street/sidewalk. Supplementing comments above regarding the setbacks of the building and the bulk/mass of the structure, additional landscaping could be implemented to buffer the pedestrian environment and lessen the appearance of the mass of the building. Due to the proximity of the school, this site is optimal for creating a landscaped seating area with trees for parents and children to meet.

Refer to new landscape plan that shows additional landscaping on $1^{\text {st }}$ Ave and $8^{\text {th }}$ street.

- Section 17.96.070.I - Landscaping - per the site visit on June 24, 2021 with the City Arborist, no replacement trees are required for the proposed project. Therefore, standards 1 and 3 of this section do not apply. If, as recommended, the applicant adds trees to the landscape plan, standard 2 will apply. No action is required prior to Pre-Design hearing with the Planning Commission.


## N/A

- J. Public Amenities - Staff acknowledges the proposed public amenities at the project site and recommends the addition of a trash receptacle due to the proximity of the school. Please see Streets and Engineering comment \#2 below regarding the permissible location of public amenities.

We are currently showing a bench seat and two bike rack locations. We would like to avoid placing a trash receptacle within our property line. We would be fine if it was on the city ROW just like the limelight project has.

- K. Underground Encroachments - These standards are not applicable as no below structures are proposed.


## N/A

- Section 17.96.070.C - Service Areas and Mechanical/Electrical Equipment -
o 1 - Please note that a letter from Clear Creek Disposal acknowledging the proposed refuse handling plan and confirming service to the property will be required with application for Final Design Review.

I will get this coming from Mike @ Clear Creek Disposal, he has reviewed both the 760 and 780 projects.
2 - Screening of electrical equipment is required. Please revise the plans to demonstrate how the electrical meters on the north side of the building will be screened.

We have enquiry into Cindi Bradshaw @ about screening options. Right now we are proposing the electrical meters to be enclosed behind perforated metal doors. But we need approval from Idaho Power as well on this option.

- Section 17.96.070.E - Surface Parking Lots - Standards 2 and 3 are not applicable to the project as the parking does not meet the threshold for parking lot landscaping. Staff provides the following comments for consideration:
o 1 - The parking is accessed off the alley and is partially screened; however, the parking could be better screened in a way that not only meets the requirements of this standard but contributes to the project's conformance with the landscaping and architectural standards. Staff recommends the applicant consider screening with the integration of climbing vines/vegetation. This would add an interesting feature to the portion of the building that is mostly blank at the street level with no landscaping proposed and adequately screen the parking.

Due to space constraints and parking requirements a planter bed with sufficient width for landscaping vines would not be able to be incorporated into the design. We are currently showing a perforated metal screen fence at the NE corner of the site.

- Section 17.96.070.F - Bicycle Parking - The proposed project conforms to standards 1-3 of this section. Please see Streets comment \#2 regarding location of bike rack.


## Streets and Engineering

Improvements and Standards (17.96.060 and 17.96.070)

- J. Public Amenities - Bike racks and other public amenities such as benches cannot be placed or encroach into the City's Right-of-Way.

See A1.1 Site plan and landscape plans that show our two locations for bike racks.

- D - Utilities - Please confirm the location of where the Idaho Power transformer is located for the project. Additionally, please confirm the project is accessing existing fiber optic cable within the downtown core. Response to these comments can be provided in written narrative, no updates to drawings are required at this time. Please note, for Final Design Review, service letters from all service providers will be required at the time of application submittal.
o 1 - The alley adjacent to the project does not meet the minimum width requirements for an alley and is therefore not maintained by the city. To address this issue, two options are available to the applicant. Decision on the course of action is not required at this time, however, desired option must be determined and reflected in the submittal for Final Design Review:

Option \#1 - Improve the full width of the existing alley to the southern property boundary of 780 N 1st Street assuming a future 20 -foot improvement by off-setting the centerline of the designed improvements. This approach would require the applicant and future owners to maintain said portion of the alley that is improved until a future point in time when the full extent of the alley is improved per city standards. A maintenance agreement between the Homeowners Association and the City would be required to reflect the terms.

Refer to Civil plans that originally showed how the proposed "non-conforming" alleyway width is being designed. We have offset the middle of the alleyway ROW 10' from the east property line of the proposed project and then made improvements based on that centerline of the alley even though alleyway will be only 17' wide. All snow removal in the alleyway will be done by the HOA. A maintenance agreement will be submitted at the time of final Plat.

Option \#2 - Improve the full extent of the alley from 8th Street to 7th Street for a full width of 20 feet. This approach would require the negotiation with adjacent property owners; however, the result would be an alley the City of Ketchum would maintain in perpetuity.

## This is not an option.

2 - Approval by the city engineer on the proposed Right-of-Way improvements will be conducted during Final Design Review.

- Section 17.96.070.A - Streets -

1 - Street trees are not required for this project, however, see the landscaping section of this memo for additional comments. Street lights are required per the City of Ketchum's "Right-of-Way and Lighting Standards" included as Attachment C to this letter. The standards outline the approach to streetlight placement and design based on illumination. Please revise the lighting plan to reflect the addition of the streetlights per the standards.

Refer to revised Photometric plan by Musgrove engineering.
2 - No street trees within the public right-of-way are required for this project. N/A
3 - Per comments above, these standards have been modified.

- B. - Sidewalks - Standards 2, 3, and 6 are not applicable to the project as a sidewalk is proposed and the proposed sidewalk is in conformance with KMC standards. Staff believes the project to be in conformance with Standards 1, 4, and 5.


## Utilities - Water and Sewer

- Section 17.96.070.C. - Drainage - Dry wells must comply with DEQ standards for separation from potable water. This will be verified during Final Design Review and no further action is necessary at this time.


## Refer to Civil Details.

- For Final Design submittal, plans must demonstrate how the building will be metered including the number of meters proposed. Irrigation must be on a separate meter. Each meter will trigger a connection fee.

Construction drawings will be submitted to show the above.

Fire
See Attachment A for Fire Department comments. No action is required at this time to address these comments.

## Exhibit B:

## Lofts at 780 - Preapplication <br> Design Review Application Materials
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| ROJECT DIRECTORY | PROJECT | TA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LEGAL OWNER OWNER'S ADDRESS | sv VEntures, llc 7801 st AVENUE KETCHUM, ID 83340 |
| contactaraltecr for | CODE | 2018 |
| trect | zoning | CC2: COMMUNITY CORE |
|  |  |  |
|  | front yard | 5 5'Average (1stave) |
| ceick | SIDE YARD | $0^{\prime}$ INTERIOR ( 5 ' AVERAGE $3^{\prime}$ (ALLEY) |
| ттастов |  |  |
| KEARNS MCGINNIS \& VANDENBERG BUILDERS 500 NORTH WASHINGTON SUITE 101 (COURIER) KETCHUM, ID 83340 P: 208.726 .4843 | htlimitation USE OCCUPANCY | 42' (PROPOSED 38-8") RESIDENTIAL: GROUP R-2 |
|  | CONST. TYPE | V-B (SPRRINLERED) |
| MURAR ENGINEERING \& DESIGN | CODE COMPLANCE: | IBC 2018 |
| 668 NORTH 9 th BOISE, ID 83702 |  | ${ }_{\text {IRC }}^{\text {IRCC }} 2018$ |
|  |  | CMEC 2018 |
| Cotwiche |  | (1PMC 2018 |
| coick | Provide requred | UNDER RLOOR VENTIM |
|  |  |  |
| HANICAL, ELECTRICAL \& PLUMBING ENGINEER MUSGROVE ENGINEERING | PROVIDE REQUIRED MOLD MITIGATION | under floor venting REQUIRED. |
|  | PROVIDE UNDER FL VENTILATION OF 1 AREA | OR (CRAWL SPACE) FM PER 150 SF OF FLOOR |
|  |  |  |
|  | Oor liveload: | 100 PSF, 40 PSF RESID |
| city |  | 100 PSF (SNOW LOAD) |
| mease | SEISMIC ZONE: WIND LOADS: |  |
| conperace |  | CATEGORY |
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& \text { CATEGORY I } \\
& \text { IMPOBTAMCE FACTO }
\end{aligned}
$$

area calculations
site area
PROPOSED ist LLR AREA
PROPOSED 2nd flR AREA PROPOSED 3rd LLR AREA Proposed deck / patio area
NET RESIIENTAL AREA
total gross residental area

| 5,500 SF |
| :--- |
| 3,55 SF |
| $3,951 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| 3,922 SF |
| $1,118 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| 9,553 SF |
| $11,423 \mathrm{SF}$ |
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
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|  | ExT |
|  | Stac |
|  | Exteror Materalis colors Sample boaid |
|  |  |
|  | com |
| A0.10 | 2nd floor Exting plan |
| ${ }_{\text {A0, }}^{40.11}$ | ata |
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| lan |  |
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FINISHED GREY METAL ROOF


BRONZE/BLACK COLORED DOORS AND WINDOWS


WESTERN RIB GRAPHITE CORRUGATED METAL

strata argentum neolith siding


NANTUCKET OAK STONEWOOD SIDING


GRAPHITE STONEWOOD SIDING
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2 EXTERIOR BUILDING ELEVATION-EAST


## 1 EXTERIOR BUILDING ELEVATION-SOUTH






( 1 WAL. WALL SECTIONS
A5.1 $\operatorname{schalE}$ 3 $1366^{\circ}=1.0^{\circ}$

(2 A WALL SECTIONS



(1) WALL DETAILS - KEY $\qquad$ -

(4) WALL DETAILS - DOOR JAMB RH

(A5.3 WALL DETAILS - LOUVER SILL $\qquad$ (0) WALL DETAILS - LOUVER HEADER


(Q) WALL DETAILS - LOUVER JAMB RH
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| ENERGY CODE COMPLIANCE <br> COMPLIANCE WTH THE LATEST ADOPTED EDTTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENERGY CONSERVATION CODE IS REQURED FOR THIS PROJECT．THESE NOTES COVER MANDATORY REQUIIEMENTS OF THE COOE．ADOITIONAL REQUIREMENTS ARE NOTED ON THE PROUECT．THESE NOTES COVER MANDATOY DRAWNGS AND NTHE SPECFIFCATONS． <br> MINMUM REQUREMENTS FOR SUPPLY AND RETURN DUCTWORK INSULATION： <br> 1．R－6：DUCTS LOCATED IN UNCONDITIONED SPACES（SPACE NEITHER HEATED NOR COOLED SUCH AS ABOVE CEILING SPACES， WALL SPACES，DUCT CHASES，SOFFITS，ATTICS，CRAWL SPACES，UNHEATED BASEMENTS，AND UNHEATED GARAGES） <br> 2．R－12：DUCTS LOCATED OUTSIDE OF THE BULLDNG＇S INSULATION ENVELOPE（SUCH AS ABOVE THE ATTIC INSULATION）． <br> TYPICAL INSULATION THCKKNESS REQUIRED TO MEET THESE REQUIREMENTS： <br> 1．FIBERGLASS DUCT WRAP：R－6，R－12． <br> 2．FIBERGLASS DUCT LINER：R－G，R－12 <br> CONTRACTOR SHALL L VERIFY WITH THE MANUFACTURER，THE R－VALLUES OF THE ACTUAL INSULATION USED．R－VALLUES SHALL BE <br> INSTALLED INSTALLED VALUES． <br> D．WHERE DUCTS USED FOR COOLING ARE EXTERNALLY INSULATED，THE INSULATION SHALL BE COVERED WTTH A VAPOR RETARDER <br>  <br> ALL DUCT JOINTS，SEAMS，AND CONNECTIONS SHALL BE FASTENED AND SEALED WITH WELDS，GASKETS，ADHESIVES， MASTIC－PLUS－EMBEDDED－FABRIC SYSTEMS，OR TAPES．TAPES AND MASTICS SHALL BE LISTED AND LABELED PER UL181A OR UL181B．DUCT TAPE IS NOT PERMITTED AS A SEALANT ON ANY METAL DUCTS．DUCT CONNECTIONS TO FLANGES OR EQUIPMENT SHALL BE SEALED AND MECHANICALLY FASTENED． shall be sealed and mechan icall fastened． <br> F．MINMUM ReQuIREMENTS（thCckness）For piping insulation shall be as follows： <br>  THE ABOVE INSULATIO IS BASED ON HAVING A CONDUCTVITY NOT EXCEEDING 0.27 Btu－INCHHOUR－FT2．FF． <br> G．DOMESTIC HOT WATER PIPING SYSTEMS SHALL BE INSULATED WTH ${ }^{1}$＂INSULATION HAVING A CONDUCTVITY NOT EXCEEDING 0.27 DOMESTIC WATER HEATERS WHCH ARE NOT PROVIDED WITH INTCGRAL HEAT TRAPS AND SERVE NONCIRCULATING SYSTEMS SHALL BE PROVIIED WITH HEAT TRAPS ON THE SUPPLY AND DISCHRRGE PPING AT THE WATER HEATER． DOMESTIC HOT WATER SYSTEMS WITH RECIRCULATION PUMPS OR ELECTRIC HEAT TRACE SHALL BE CONTROLLED WITH 7 －DAY TIME CLOCKS． clocks． AN OPERATIIG AND MAIITENANCE MAnUaL SHALL L BE PROVIDED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY．THE O\＆M 1．EQUIPMENT CAPACITY（INPUT \＆OUTPUT）． <br> 2．EQuipment operating and maintenance instructions． <br> 3．CONTROL SYYTEM MANTENANCE AND CALBRATION INFORMATION，INCLUDING WIRING DAGGAMS，SCHEMATICS，AND CONTROLSEQUENCES． 4．CONTROL SYSTEM SETTPONTS SHALL BE SHOWN ON CONTROL DRAWINGS，AT CONTROL DEVICES，OR IN PROGRAMMING COMMENT ON DCO SYSTEMS． 5．A Complete written narrative on how each mechancal system is intended to operate． |
| :---: |
|  |  |
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## Exhibit C:

## Lofts at 780 - Conceptual Rendering
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