

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Chair Schroder.

### ROLL CALL

Christie Leidal	Gretchen Dudney	Jim Lamb
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard	Ron Schuman
Dan Schroder		

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the April 18, 2017, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the May 2, 2017, Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- Ms. Suzanne Allen-Sabo: Within the Historic District, height regulations and guidelines work well for flat lots but it is tricky when the lots are steeply sloped. Maybe it is possible to allow some leeway for the degree of slope.
- Ms. Janet Sutterley: Over the years we are fine tuning regulations and guidelines, but today I still don't understand what we want our additions to historic buildings to look like. Do we want new additions that look like old buildings? There is a lack of definition in the regulations and I feel it is a subject we should give some thought.

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Shock Hill Overlook Duplex Lot 9 (MM) PL-2017-0096, 10 & 6 West Point Lode
- 2) Paull Residence (CL) PL-2017-0100, 71 Rounds Road
- 3) Pilon Residence (CL) PL-2017-0101, 206 Stillson Placer Terrace

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: Can you speak to the high amount of glazing on the west facing side of the Pilon Residence? (Mr. LaChance: It is not subject to Policy 8A (Ridgeline and Hillside Development). Policy 5 (Architectural Compatibility) specifies a maximum amount of non-natural material allowed per façade, but glazing (glass) is not subject to that threshold. (Mr. Truckey: Solid to void ratio is not a regulation outside of historic district.) (Mr. LaChance: There is a change on the Pilon Residence from passing score of positive one (+1) point to passing score of zero (0) points due to a projected HERS certificate that we received this week which showed a lesser efficiency that we had anticipated, so I have provided you tonight with updated copies of the staff report, findings and conditions, and point analysis.)

With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

### TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch:

- Broken Compass site sale agreement approved for first reading.
- Snack Bar & Deli issue discussed. Town Council supported the proposal to merge the two categories of restaurants and Snack Bars and Delis into one
- Open Space: Sawlog and Wonderful open space parcels purchase approved.
- Parking and Transit: Six bus shelters will be put in place, and will be reviewed as a town project process development permit application. The Planning Commission will see them in advance.
- Housing: Soon to open for occupancy, 26 unit Huron Landing affordable rental housing development

has a website advertising the project and provides access for the public to enter into a lottery for the project apartments.

- Term limits for Boards and Commissions: the Planning Commission will be set to 12 years maximum years of service. More information to come on how that will work for seated commissioners.
- Block 11 and McCain property review: Council asked to leave skier parking on Block 11. They no longer want us to reserve a site for a reservoir. They are looking for total number of housing units, and want service commercial on one of the properties. (Mr. Schuman: Did they ask for a specific number on the service commercial?) No specific number was requested.
- Reviewed the water plant and made a change to the land use points and offset it with landscaping. They will relocate bike bath to the north side of the plant. (Mr. Truckey: We don't have to have a passing point analysis for town projects, although it is preferred that we do. It is up to the Council's discretion to approve a town project.) (Mr. Schroder: Title 14 has a chapter dedicated to Town Projects.) The Council can approve a project that doesn't comply with the Code. The water plant is an unusual situation because of the equipment in the building.)

### **FINAL HEARINGS:**

1) Lincoln Grill (CK) PL-2017-0030, 112 Lincoln Avenue

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a two-story building with a basement containing a total of 2,678 sq. ft. of restaurant space.

Changes since the March 21, 2017, Preliminary Hearing:

- 1) Landscaping: The applicant has revised the landscape plan to have a buffer of spruce trees behind the building to provide screening from the adjacent parking lot.
- 2) Colored Architectural Rendering: At the request of the Commission, the applicant has provided a detailed colored rendering.
- 3) Full Size Plans: The applicant has provided full size plans for the meeting.

Point Analysis (Section:9-1-17-3): Staff believes that all absolute policies have been met and that the proposal warrants the following points for a total passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point.

Negative points are incurred for:

- Policy 21/R Open Space: Negative three (-3) points because only 6.9% of the site (195 sq. ft.) is designed as open space.

Positive points are awarded for:

- Policy 16/R Internal Circulation: Positive three (+3) points for providing a public mid-block crossing.
- Policy 18/R Parking: Positive one (+1) point because the onsite parking is accessed from shared access points.

The applicant has 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. However, staff welcomed any comments and questions.

The Planning Department recommended the Commission approve the Lincoln Grill, PL-2017-0030, at 112 Lincoln Avenue, showing a passing score of positive one (+1) point along with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Jon Gunson, Custom Mountain Architects, Architect and Applicant: I would like to explain that the rivets are bolts. They are functional, not just decorative. I am happy to paint those black. I

feel I have made a sincere effort to meet your requests. Based on your feedback I have made changes to the windows, stone, solid to void ratio, height of the building, reduce cornice width, reduced the size of cornice openings by over 50%. I have responded favorably to your ideas and changes. Not all, however, because I want to retain an architecture of today rather than imitation of historic architecture. This keeps our new building from competing with historic buildings and our visitors will appreciate that. (Mr. Giller: Thanks for the color rendering.) (Ms. Leidal: Is there steel or wood around the windows?) The only metal is shown in black, the grey is wood trim and lap siding. So yes, everything else is wood. (Mr. Giller: Are the window frames wood or metal?) Actually they are not grey they are painted black but they are wood. I assure you they are wood. (Mr. Kulick: We did go through and check the chroma and they all are in compliance with the Code.)

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Lee Edwards: Is the Town doing a parking improvement on the lot? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Town is not moving forward with a structure on the Courthouse Lot at this time.) (Mr. Kulick: There is an improvement agreement that gives him credit for three existing parking spaces if we ever construct a structure on that lot.)

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

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Lamb: You did respond well to our comments. The building will fit in the neighborhood. I think it is silly to have to assign negative three (-3) points to a lot in the historic core for not meeting the minimum open space requirement, but that is what the Code requires so we have to uphold it. We are happy with the project.

Mr. Giller: I support.

Mr. Gerard: Design standards are clearly met by this building. It is a thought provoking building and blends nicely. I agree with staff.

Ms. Leidal: I support.

Mr. Schroder: I support.

Ms. Dudney: I concur.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve the Lincoln Grill, PL-2017-0030, 112 Lincoln Avenue, showing a passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point and with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Gerard seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2) Satellite Place Subdivision (CL) PL-2017-0054, 1730 Airport Road

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to subdivide Breckenridge Airport Subdivision, Block 5, Lot 4 into three separate lots, creating the Satellite Place Subdivision with access from Fraction Road. The Fraction Road right of way will also be platted with this subdivision.

Changes since the April 18, 2017, Preliminary Hearing:

- 1) The bearing shown on the north boundary of the provided survey has been corrected.
- 2) The lot line dimension on the west side of proposed lot Lot 3 was previously called out as "93.04" on the provided survey, and has been corrected to "94.04."
- 3) The lot numbers have been modified from "Lot 4A, Lot 4B, Lot 4C" to "Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 3" on the proposed plat, plat notes, and survey. Staff has reflected this change in the staff report.
- 4) Proposed plat note #5 has been updated to include a reference to a reception number for the Satellite Place Subdivision Declarations.
- 5) Proposed plat note #4 has been updated to clarify that the "*no portions of* [The 10' Snow Stack and Utility Easement] *may be used for storage of snow from Lots 1, 2 or 3.*" per Commissioner Mathews-Leidal's comment at the Preliminary Hearing (easement runs along Airport Road).

This subdivision proposal is in general compliance with the Subdivision Standards. Staff did not have any concerns with this application or any questions for the Commission. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Satellite Place Subdivision (PL-2017-0054), located at 1730 Airport Road, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schroder: Regarding the tree requirement, are they supposed to be divided a certain way among the lots? (Mr. LaChance: The Subdivision Standards specify a number of trees for the original lot based on the lineal frontage along the road. It does not specify whether or not those trees must be divided equally among the new lots, but staff would take any recommendations that the Planning Commission may have.) I would hope that the applicant has some flexibility because the new lots are fairly small and it may be difficult to divide the required trees equally among the new lots.

Mr. Gerard: It is a good way to get diversity into the area.

Mr. Giller: I support.

Ms. Leidal: I support.

Mr. Lamb: This is a straight forward project. I support staff. The trees will be nice and it needs to be flexible where they go.

Mr. Schuman: I support staff recommendation.

Ms. Dudney: I support staff recommendation.

Mr. Giller made a motion to approve the Satellite Place Subdivision, PL-2017-0054, 1730 Airport Road, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

**PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1) Searle Restoration/Addition/Landmarking (MM) PL-2017-0070, 300 East Washington Avenue

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to restore and locally landmark the historic house, remove the non-historic structures, add a full basement beneath the historic portion of the house, build a new addition with garage including an accessory apartment.

The last review was a worksession to discuss:

1. Determine official "front yard" and related setbacks from that determination;
  - a. (The front yard was determined to be from Washington Avenue as it is addressed and historically located.)
2. Obtain Commission feedback on façade widths for this Character Area;
  - a. Facades widths were generally acceptable. However, the depth dimension of the offset to define the façade with was questioned by some Commissioners.
3. Obtain Commission feedback on connector and general massing of a proposed addition;
  - a. Some of the Commissioners felt the massing of the addition overwhelmed the smaller historic structure. Understanding the restrictions of the property, some Commissioners felt the mass would be large but could be reduced.
4. The location of a third parking space for a proposed accessory apartment.
  - a. The impacts of adding the accessory apartment negatively affects the primary façade with the added outdoor parking space.

Changes from the August 16, 2016, Work Session:

1. The massing along the east side of the property was slightly reduced.

- a. The garage shed was reduced 12-inches in height.
- b. The overall height of the addition was reduced 18-inches.
2. There are 2 new windows proposed in the east wall of the historic building.
3. A landscaping plan is included.
4. Additional detailing on all elevations are provided.
5. The historic house is shown 12-inches higher to correct drainage concerns.

Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Based on the landmarking criteria, the historic house may be landmarked by meeting only one criteria in each of the 3 columns. However, staff believes by adding the windows to the historic structure (a priority policy) it will fail to meet the criteria listed as "The property retains original design features, materials and/or character". Did the Commission support this property for local landmarking status?
2. Staff suggested negative four (-4) points under policy 7/R, Site and Environmental Design, for minimal to no buffering along the north and east property lines. Did the Commission concur?
3. Staff did not support the removal of historic fabric or the change to the primary façade with the additions of windows on the east side of the historic building as it does not comply with Priority Policy 76 & 20. Did the Commission agree?
4. The drawings show a concrete patio and no plantings at the connector as seen from the ROW. Staff believes that added landscaping here could to reduce the perceived scale where larger building masses would abruptly contrast the historic scale of the area. Did the Commission concur?
5. The connector facing the Washington Avenue ROW is showing a pair of French doors flanked by double hung windows. Staff believes that this design fails section 6 of Absolute Policy 80A, Connectors and Design Standard 96. Did the Commission concur?
6. Did the Commission believe the perceived scale of the building respects the scale of the nearby historic structures?

The Planning Department recommended this proposal return for a second review.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for the Applicant: Describe the removal of the non-historic additions and reviewed the comments from the work session. Plans show a reduction of the massing along the east, new addition, portion of the building. Explained the materials and color assignments to break the building into four masses.

We will make the porch deck as low profile as possible because we are raising the house 12-inches. At the west elevation there is a kink in the ridgeline of the roof and we will correct that. Non-historic windows will be matching historic windows. Back portion of the roof is being removed and replaced with a more compatible material and squared up. We will be removing the back three feet of the building that is non-historic.

My notes from the work session said that we determined that Washington is the front, and 5 out of 6 Commissioners were good with the façade width. (Mr. Lamb was absent.) The consensus on massing was that needs to be smaller and lower. (Ms. Sutterley showed a sketch of her reductions in massing and explained the height changes of the buildings.) I brought a letter from one of the neighbors saying they are very excited about the project and am presenting the letter to the Commissioners. The living part of the addition is similar to other buildings but what stepped up the massing is the barn structure/garage with living space above. It will be dark rough oiled stain and it will look like a barn. Living space is lap siding. There is a real contrast between the two pieces. The connector will be a third option. The barn outbuilding structures around town are tall, some two stories; it is typical in the neighborhood. (Mr. Mosher noted: When you have a connector, the out building can be larger than the living structure per code.) Policy 80 and massing talks about change in scale. I want to point out there is 70 feet between historic structure and east portion garage and should be considered in the massing discussion. I believe the added windows on the east side of the historic house are not on the primary façade. The addition of these windows will help for ventilation. The historic windows are not adequate for ventilation and it is

very difficult to open them. Also, I submitted a similar project to the state for tax credits; one window wasn't approved due to being on the primary façade. The state was ok with non primary facade window additions. I believe that Policy 20 doesn't necessarily apply. I believe that there will be no reduction in its rating. How does Policy 80A apply to the connector? The roof cricket can only be the width of a single door and I would like to hear your interpretation. I think the connector is appropriate and the issue is the solid to void ratio with the French doors and windows. Policy 96 solid to void ratio; the connector is not a historic element it is a modern element and should not be subject to this. Why are we getting negative points for the landscaping? We are doing things for positive points. The plans show that we are preserving a specimen tree. The plans show that the Aspen are large. Buffering the window wells with some shrubs. The north side is practical and realistic. There is little space to add any trees. The trees off the east property line are huge trees. They are not going anywhere. We don't need more trees there. Makes more sense to screen the garage area with the single spruce placed at the property corner. Throughout the report, we have negative connotation about the added accessory unit. The entire unit is below ground except the door. The impact is the extra outdoor parking space. Not sure why the accessory unit is getting a bad rap. (Ms. Sutterley presented the Commission with photos of the site.) The proposed parking is better than what is there now. We are at 8.4 units per acre of above ground density.

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Barbara Gibbs: The south side trees are bunched because they look more natural and to leave a sunny open portion in the yard for a vegetable and flower garden and allow for solar gain. We are getting negative three points for not planting a cottonwood. Other projects did not get negative for the cottonwood and I don't understand it. I will not plant any cottonwoods. New construction should take advantage of solar gain, ventilation and the new windows in the historic wall will help.

Chair Schroder opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: Can you give us more info on changes to siding and fabric? (Ms. Sutterley: Siding is in good shape. The front entry is not a historic door and will be replaced. The historic windows will be preserved minus one non-historic window. The porch will be preserved. The decking is concrete and will be replaced with wood.)

Ms. Leidal: Policy 80A about connectors? Did we look at every detail of the policy? (Mr. Mosher: During the worksession, this was discussed. There is Commission flexibility on the length. Placement of landscaping can add to the visual separation of the masses.) Garage needs a 20-foot setback; can you meet the 20 feet? (Mr. Mosher: It won't meet the 20-feet and still have a garage as the site is not very deep. There may be a variance.) (Ms. Sutterley: Is there negative four (-4) points or negative seven (-7) points for landscaping?) (Mr. Mosher: Explained and cleared the confusion on point assignment. No points were awarded under Policy 22/R Landscaping. Negative four (-4) points were incurred under Policy 7/R for site buffering and negative three (-3) under Policy 24/R for not providing any cottonwoods as suggested in the Historic Guidelines)

Mr. Lamb: Do you not like cottonwoods? Allergic? (Ms. Gibbs: No. They are a messy tree and I don't like them.)

Mr. Schuman: What was said in a worksession is open flow and you can't hold us literally to our worksession comments. We didn't have a complete plan in front of us then. Now we can discuss in greater detail. (Ms. Sutterley: I wasn't taking things literally but rather taking it seriously.)

Mr. Giller: I support the project. It is a very important contributing structure. The rehab work should be a faithful rehabilitation. One concern is the shingle style for roofing; also the wood deck and added windows on the east side of the historic structure. Compatibility is important. The new structure is busier than the historic house and the solid to void ratio is much different. I support the project but it is a bit big and busy.

Mr. Lamb: I am opposed to adding new windows into the historic house. On the site buffering I do not

support negative four (-4) points. It's OK. I like the landscaping and don't understand negative four (-4) points. The amount of glazing makes it complicated. Too much window on the upper portion. Support allowing the accessory unit.

Mr. Schuman: This property needs this renovation. I like the project but it still needs to meet code. I am not supportive of the applicant providing new material that was not included in the packet for staff to review first.

Mr. Schroder: Great that there is 70 feet from barn to historical structure. Mass works for me, and so does the breaking up of the mass with the finishes and colors. Connector is too busy and is not supposed to be its' own mass. Landscaping and site buffering is difficult and the program is appropriate and doesn't warrant negative points.

Ms. Leidal: Thank you for the changes. We are on the right path. Many of the modifications are not in compliance with the Code. Too much glazing and it needs to be simplified.

Mr. Gerard: The connector looks like an "Iowa Breezeway" and it needs to be scaled back. Agree with Mr. Giller towards the faithfulness to historic concept and the windows will compromise the historical structure. I recognize it is a complicated structure. I am ok with massing, but it needs to be simplified a bit. Landscaping needs to meet code and you could do more with the north side. I don't agree with negative four (-4) points. This is a historic gem and it needs to be preserved.

Ms. Dudney: I like the new massing and elevations. We have to comply with the code and I feel you buffered enough and the code says cottonwoods are encouraged not required. No way around negative points for the material. Connector is absolute and I like the way it looks. Great looking project and a huge improvement over what is there.

*Commissioner final comments and answers to List of Questions:*

Ms. Dudney:

- 1) I support.
- 2) I do not agree with negative four (-4); I would have with zero (0).
- 3) I agree with staff. Fails.
- 4) I do not concur.
- 5) Yes, the connector fails.
- 6) I agree.

Mr. Lamb:

- 1) I do not support.
- 2) I do not agree.
- 3) I do not support removal of historic fabric. Fails.
- 4) I have no issue.
- 5) The connector fails.
- 6) I am good with the scale.

Mr. Schuman:

- 1) Yes but do not add windows.
- 2) Negative four (-4) is too much.
- 3) I agree removal will compromise and fail.
- 4) I do not agree we need more landscaping.
- 5) I agree. It fails.
- 6) The scale is off; too much program.

Ms. Leidal:

- 1) I agree with Mr. Schuman; I only support the landmarking if no windows are added.
- 2) Negative four (-4) is a lot of points, but you could add shrubs.
- 3) I agree. Fails
- 4) Yes add landscaping.
- 5) Does not meet policy.

6) Scale is fine.

Mr. Giller:

- 1) Yes.
- 2) Negative four (-4) is too much.
- 3) Yes - fails.
- 4) Yes.
- 5) Yes.
- 6) Close - The scale is off.

Mr. Gerard

- 1) Yes.
- 2) Landscaping needs changing.
- 3) I do not support adding windows.
- 4) Can do better.
- 5) Scale it down.
- 6) Scale is ok.

Mr. Schroder

- 1) Yes.
- 2) I do not support.
- 3) I do not support adding windows.
- 4) No more landscaping.
- 5) It needs to be simpler.
- 6) The scale fits.

Mr. Schroder called a 5-minute break at 8:20 pm. The Commission reconvened at 8:25pm.

**COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1) Gold Pan Saloon Modification (MM) PL-2017-0069, 103 North Main Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to remove 187 square feet of non-historic area and expand the existing kitchen. A historic roof form will be restored and paving and landscaping added to the west side of the property.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): As submitted, this proposal has met all Absolute Policies in the Development Code and has not been awarded any positive or negative points under any applicable Relative Policies. The project passes with a score of zero (0) points.

Overall, staff welcomed the improvements to the back of this important site; specifically, reintroducing most of the original small addition that is shown on the Sanborn Maps.

Staff asked the Commission if they were supportive of continuing the exterior finishes from the existing north elevation around the corner to a portion of the west elevation. Staff also welcomed any Commissioner comments on any part of the application. Mr. Mosher noted a correction to the area calculations - the existing building is over density and over mass.

The Planning Department recommended approval of the Gold Pan Saloon/Restaurant Restoration and Addition, showing a passing score of zero (0) points, along with the attached Findings and Conditions.

Chair Schroder opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: Can you speak to the stair railing material? (Ms. Sutterley: It has not been decided yet; wood



