

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Schuman.

ROLL CALL

Gretchen Dudney Mike Giller Jim Lamb
Christie Mathews-Leidal Ron Schuman
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:02 pm
Dan Schroder arrived at 7:02 pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the May 3, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the May 17, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

- 1) Small Vendor Crepe Cart (CL) PL-2016-0133, 13445 Highway 9

With no requests for call up, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented with the findings and conditions handed out at the meeting (Condition 19 was added concerning non-reflective materials).

FINAL HEARINGS:

- 1) McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use (MM) PL-2016-0048, 209 South Ridge Street
Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a new, mixed-use building consisting of a restaurant and apartment on Lot 5 of McAdoo Corner Subdivision. The total allowed density is subject to the McAdoo Corner Master Plan.

Changes since the April 19, 2016, Planning Commission Meeting:

1. Added exterior guardrail (upper level residence) to elevations with detail on plans.
2. L-1: made existing trees the correct size & what actually exists. Moved aspen tree.
3. A-1: added required snow stack and 326 square feet of heated sidewalk.
4. Revised color board with white and old oily stain only.
5. Revised colored elevations.
6. Detail for the metal porch posts and metal entry truss.

The proposal has complied with all absolute policies of the Development Code. One negative (-1) point and one positive (+1) point have been suggested under policy 33/R related to the snow melted areas and obtaining an IECC report showing an energy savings of 10% to 19%. Staff showed a passing score of zero (0) points.

The applicant and agent have worked with Staff closely to bring this proposal into compliance with the Development Code and the Handbooks of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts. Key design issues were discussed and the changes addressed with this submittal. Staff had no specific questions for the Commission with this final review. Planning Staff recommended approval of the presented point analysis for the McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use, PL-2016-0048, 209 South Ridge Street, showing a passing score of zero (0) points. Planning Staff also recommended approval of the McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use, PL-2016-0048, with the presented findings and conditions.

Applicants will be purchasing 2.1 parking spaces in the Parking District. All trees/landscaping is being kept on site. Landscaping can be provided over entire master plan area.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: The Points Table on page 25 says no positive or negative points? (Mr. Mosher: That should be corrected to positive one (+1) and negative one (-1). It is addressed correctly in the Staff report.)
- Ms. Leidal: I have listened to all minutes from last hearing, which I had to miss. I have concerns regarding the differentiation of new construction from old. I have some questions regarding the materials being used: vertical siding on primary structure; are we setting bad precedent? (Mr. Mosher: As a non-historic building, there are examples of corrugated metal on connectors (The Elk), metal siding on the primary facades on existing historic commercial buildings (The Theobald Building) and historic out buildings (the Brown Hotel Stable.) Policy for the South End Residential Historic District Character Area #3: “avoid elaborate details in woodwork” and this seems to go beyond. (Mr. Mosher: Handbook of Design Standards, New Construction, doesn’t necessarily need to have historic materials and detailing.) Also, there is some metal on west elevation. (Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for the Applicant: Only a small metal strip on lower portion a weathering base for the bay window area.) Also on the gables and on the deck. (Ms. Sutterley: Correction that deck no longer will have metal. Gable ends on west building would have metal; flat dull metal copper finish. Should be none on the east elevation. If objectionable we could replace.) This character area is simple wooden structures and she thinks there is too much metal. Concern about the materials and meeting Priority Policy 90 and 99 “Use materials that appear to be the same as those used historically”.
- Mr. Pringle: I also question about amount of metal. Four metal rods to make a post. This does not appear as wood. A single metal column would be more appropriate. Also metal tie rod and metal truss. We need compatible forms and materials.
- Ms. Dudney: The Handbook says “architecture that is compatible but distinguishable from historic for new construction”. The code talks about new buildings being able to be identified as new buildings. The metal detailing conveys a historic feeling that it is appropriate on a new structure and the mass, forms and other components are compatible with other structures on street. General standards for all new construction; nothing that prohibits it and the Character Area says painted wood and lap siding as primary. That is what is being used here. Whether they’ve used too much is a subjective determination.
- Mr. Lamb: I agree with Ms. Dudney. Not a huge deviation and I like it.
- Mr. Giller: In terms of differentiation and compatibility, its massing is compatible and materials follow guidelines and vertical siding is working. What’s interesting is the copper and brown/white is little more “punchy”. The small amount of metal in gables helps pull height down but I’m concerned a bit with the color of the metal on the building. Like the metal posts. In general, this is very compatible.

Applicant presentation: Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for the Applicant: Mr. Theobald’s Main Street Shops include metal columns and detailing. The east portion of this building is commercial and west has commercial on bottom floor. Horizontal siding would have been too much everywhere. Portions of the elements added to the primary building form that protrude out call for a change of orientation, like an addition, thus vertical siding proposed. Simplifying materials that they want to use white color which is a change from what is in your packet. Want to keep corrugated metal on connector. Helps break up massing of building. We have brought a color rendering for you to see tonight.

Mr. Jeremy Fischer, Applicant: Look at base detail of column: Similar to historic wooden forms, the bottom two feet have raised panel detail that makes it look like wood column. We’re emulating some wood details in steel. Includes some newer materials that help differentiate from historic buildings.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing for public comment.

Ms. Jan Radosevich, 213.5 South Ridge Street: Regarding the balcony facing southwest, no negative points for architectural compatibility? (Mr. Schuman asked that Mr. Mosher address this question.) (Mr. Mosher: In back of primary structure we allow upper level decks and have plenty of past precedent. Not a primary façade so we did not assign negative points.)

There was no further public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Final Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I support differentiating old from new and support the project.

Ms. Leidal: Concern about precedent with amount of metal being used on a residential character area building. With vertical rough siding on primary façade and all over the side, believe it is too much and not appropriate and doesn't meet Priority Policy 90 and Design Standard 99.

Mr. Giller: I like the design; it's compatible to the district and has some differentiation. Concerns about some of metal color.

Mr. Lamb: I read metal as accent only on the elevations. No problem with vertical siding. There are lots of examples of metal in the Historic District. I like the building.

Mr. Pringle: I wonder if the amount of metal in 3 or 4 different elevations is too much. More ornate buildings than what would have been there. We're supposed to emulate historic buildings with some differentiation. This is too much variation. West elevation along the back; the size of windows are larger than we have allowed in the past I think too. Stacked triple double hung windows. Need to be more critical when these get reviewed. Primary building materials should be horizontal lap siding. Disagree with vertical siding interpretation. Need to be more careful about what Code says.

Ms. Dudney: Per the Historic Guidelines; this project complies with the guidelines for new construction. The types of materials and percentage used seem to be disagreement points. Not our place to design these details but to analyze if they follow the Code; sees emphasis on differentiating new from old and supports project. Bystander would not be confused by this project.

Mr. Schuman: I agree with Ms. Leidal on Policies 90 and 99. A lot of issues are not clarified with this submittal or in the staff report. The metal, window sizes, details are all still to be determined. Feels project is not ready for presentation and was ill prepared. New information like colors, etc. came in late. This project feels too rushed.

Mr. Mosher reminded the Commission that a Point Analysis would have to pass and the Code dictated that a passing score or failing score determines the final decision. Point analysis vote must be unanimous. The Commission is always free to make a motion to change the point analysis before the final vote. If the change is supported by a majority vote, then that change must be approved unanimously by the Commission at the roll call vote.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis for the McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use, PL-2016-0048, 209 South Ridge Street, showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points. (Point analysis is correct in staff report, not in spreadsheet and they are buying 2.1 parking spaces instead of 3.1.) Ms. Dudney seconded and the motion was carried (4-3).

(Commission discussion regarding changing the Point Analysis ensued.)

Mr. Lamb made a motion to rescind the point analysis vote and Ms. Dudney seconded. The motion was carried (6-1).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to change point analysis as it doesn't meet policy 24/A, The Social Community, specific to policies of the South End Residential Character Area, and the policy on second story windows. Ms. Leidal seconded. The motion failed (3-4).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis for the McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use, PL-2016-0048, 209 South Ridge Street, showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points. (Point analysis is correct in staff report, not in spreadsheet and they are buying 2.1 parking spaces instead of 3.1.) Ms. Dudney seconded and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use, PL-2016-0048, 209 South Ridge Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Dudney seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1) Ice Arena Roof (CK) PL-2016-0143, 189 Boreas Pass Road

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a standing seam metal roof over the existing outdoor ice rink. Matches roof materials on main ice arena building front roof. The proposed structure will sit on the existing footings and re-use the existing fabric shades to reduce glare along the sides of the rink.

Staff recommended assigning negative one (-1) point under Policy 6/R, Building Height, and recommended positive three (+3) points under Policy 20/R, Recreation, for a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points. The application was found to meet all Absolute policies. Substantial precedent for renovations and enhancements are eligible for additional recreational policies. Recreation Center had positive six (+6) points in 1990 and in 1996, with addition to the building, it received positive six (+6) points. Others include the skate park. Kingdom Park has been awarded positive thirty-four (+34) points for recreation over time for different recreational projects. Also private: the half pipe was awarded positive points twice on Ski Hill. Also, positive points for lifts, alpine slide, all on same parcel.

No site disturbance is proposed.

This is a Town Project pursuant to the ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013). As a result, the Planning Commission was asked to identify any concerns with this project, and any code issues and make a recommendation to the Town Council.

Planning Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Outdoor Ice Rink Roof located at 189 Boreas Pass Road, PL-2016-0143, with a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points and the presented Findings.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing for public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Unbroken rooflines only have one multiplier.

Mr. Lamb: I like the idea the roof can work with future full enclosing of the ice rink.

Ms. Dudney made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Ice Arena Roof, PL-2016-0143, 189 Boreas Pass Road, with a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points and the presented findings. Mr. Lamb seconded and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Dudney made a motion to approve the findings for the Ice Arena Roof, PL-2016-0143, 189 Boreas Pass Road. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Puester: Regarding the Lance's West building discussed at last meeting, per Glen Morgan, Chief

Building Official, cementitious siding is not required until about above 35 feet so it is not an issue with that application as they move forward.

Ms. Dudney: Town Council Liason does not exist anymore. Council would like Chair of the Planning Commission to attend Council work sessions.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair