

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm by Chair Schroder.

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no other changes, the June 20, 2017, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the July 5, 2017, Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- Lee Edwards, Property owner in the historic district: 5 Years ago a regulation was added to the historic codes that no additions could be taller than the original historic structure. I never knew why this change was adopted and I would like to revisit this and find an answer. (Mr. Schroder: I don't have an answer to that at this time but we can look into it and get back to you. Would that suffice?)
Mr. Edwards: Yes.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Porter Residence (CL) PL-2017-0244; 27 Peak Eight Court
- 2) Climax Jerky Wagon Small Vendor Cart Renewal (CK), PL-2017-0234; 100 S. Main Street

With no call ups, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch presented:

- Encroachment License Agreement ordinance was approved
- Goose Pasture Tarn spill way needs some expensive repairs
- A committee formed to make recommendations as to how the town could get to 100% renewable electrical energy is also recommending a goal for the entire community to get there as well. The committee reported out to the Town Council and recommended target dates of 2035 for the community, and 2025 for the Town. This topic will be discussed further at the August 8th Town Council meeting.
- Code committee recommendations reported to the Town Council
- Town Council budget retreat to be held on September 12.
- Bike race is Aug 11.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: May we attend the Telluride American Planning Association Conference? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, we encourage all to attend and we will cover your expenses.)

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Walker House Addition, Restoration and Landmarking (CK), PL-2017-0207; 213 Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to move the historic house no more than 10 feet, locally landmark the historic

property and add a one-car garage with a connector off the back of the house.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Giller: Are there site features that are historically significant? (Mr. Kulick: The narrow entrance which accesses to the alley. The picket fence is within design standards and the applicants have no intention of changing that. The trees have matured nicely.) Moving the house is ok and will not affect the settlement pattern, correct? (Mr. Kulick: Yes that is correct.)
- Ms. Dudney: I believe you are not supposed to remove historic windows and you didn't address what would be done with the existing historic window that will be impacted by the connector. The window has to be removed or altered to add the connector. We didn't allow the removal of a historic window on another one of Janet's projects. (Janet: It is a historic opening and we are covering it up with the connector. We did that on Tony and Annie Harris's house and it was ok because it was on the rear of the house.) (Mr. Kulick: We have taken the position in the past that if it can be reversed later it is ok. We will go back and look for precedent on other projects.)
- Mr. Giller: Look for other alternatives to enlarging the windows to meet code equivalency. (Mr. Kulick: There have been similar issues on previous buildings and our position is it is ok if it is required to meet life/safety issue requirements but to minimize the impact on the character of the building.) I would like to see you do what you can to save the historic windows.
- Ms. Leidal: Code 912 non conforming structure. I don't believe this building has had a fire or has been damaged so are we moving it just to move it? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We use a combination of code and precedence. The Atrium Building on French St is a precedent. It was over density and the change of use lessened the non-compliant over density condition, so we allowed the change. El Perdido was also over density condition and the change of use brought it more into conformance. We approved that one as well.) Mr. Kulick: The Randall out building was moved and so was an out-building that was part of the Judge Silverthorne House project, so we do have precedence for similar setback non-compliance issues.) What are the garage door materials? (Janet: We don't know yet, wood.)
- Mr. Schroder: Will you be removing anything when landscaping? (Mr. Kulick: The property is quite vegetated in areas but on the back easement it is down to dirt and scraggly grass and landscaping would help define the area.)
- Mr. Giller: How do you plan to meet the HERS index and is it 50% above a set standard or 50% above the current rating of the building? (Mr. Kulick: They need a 50% improvement over the current house score.)
- Mr. Schroder: Do you have a contingency plan if it doesn't pass the HERS rating? (Mr. Kulick: They will have an auditor to help insure that it can get the percentage needed. We have seen new construction fall below and the builder had to make additional changes to meet the score.)
- Mr. Giller: I think The HERS rating is a little too ambitious and I question how the 50% is assessed. I would suggest checking into that. I ask that you are careful in maintaining the historic nature of the house when considering design vs. energy efficiency.
- Ms. Leidal: If you move the building more than 10 ft. do you incur more negative points? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, -15 points would be assessed under Policy 24/R for moving a historic structure more than 10 ft.)
- Mr. Gerard: Is there any precedence for the town vacating alleys? (Mr. Kulick: The town has no desire to vacate the alley.)

Janet Sutterley, Architect, presented:

The house has been on and off the market. The problem with selling it is that it has no garage. I want to point out an error in the staff report, the height to the mean of the garage is wrong it is to the mean of the connector. Once we realized the addition on the side is historic we decided to keep it as is. The alley is un-maintained and I met with public works and it was decided not to vacate the alley. We are trying to do our best to have the connector within code. There is precedence for connectors on the rear of historic buildings that have altered an opening on

the original house. The residence was classically addressed off Lincoln Ave. The 12 ft. access easement was granted at some time but highly unlikely it could be reversed. The laundry cabin has one parking spot on the west side of the property but they have access to another spot south side. We will lose one tree from in front of garage with this design. We will have more details to the plan once there is a new owner. We wanted to move the home 10 ft. since there is additional density available and we wanted to make the garage as wide as possible to make it more proportional. We anticipate there will be two bedrooms on the upper floor.

Mr. Schuman: Some of the shutters seem to be inconsistent. (Ms. Sutterley: This plan shows that Mosh wanted them taken off.)

Public Comment:

Mr. Edwards: I use the walkway and riser stairs all the time to the alley and it is definitely used. I agree with staff to not vacate the alley. Was the decision to address the house off of Lincoln done to help with the setback issue?. If you alter the interior fabric you can't get state/federal tax credits. Please be aware of that. I thought the chief building inspector has the ability to not require changes to windows and rise and run on the stairs of historic buildings. It would be great to reuse the historic window that is affected by the connector.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: I support the project. I am concerned about meeting the HERS rating. Moving seems ok without additional side setback negative points if you maintain the historic settlement pattern.

Ms. Leidal: I appreciate you looking for precedents as they relate to setback points and historic windows. If the precedent is there, I will support staff. I don't support moving the house under the code section that talks about damage to the house. I agree with the landscaping proposed in the easment. I am concerned with losing historic fabric and windows. Good project.

Mr. Schuman: Good project. Some comments remind me of past discussion of preservation vs. livability. I think it is a good idea to renovate, clean up, and make this home livable. The issues of fabric and windows are second to cleaning up the property and I am confident they can be worked through. Love seeing another home landmarked.

Ms. Dudney: Shouldn't get any more negative points for moving that are associated with the side setback. I support land marking and support landscaping.

Mr. Gerard: I support the project. I support moving the building and no more additional points incurred with the relative side setback. I like the siding and the connector looks good. I ask that you please try to save the historic window. Be careful when deciding on the fabric and the window as not to lose any historic appeal.

Mr. Schroder: I support no more negative points associated with the side setback for moving the structure. Landscaping I support. I support land marking. I like the siding ideas and creating extra space above the garage.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Filing 4 Subdivision (CL), PL-2017-0149, TBD Bridge Street. Mr. LaChance presented a proposal, per the Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan, to subdivide a portion of the three lots into 12 salable lots, private alleys, public right-of-way including vehicular bridge, and private and public open space.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Leidal: Is the 50 ft right of way for a road? (Mr. LaChance: No, that is an existing utility easement for the Xcel Energy power lines.)

Ms. Dudney: I approve staff recommendations.

Ms. Leidal: I agree with staff.

Mr. Giller: I support.

Mr. Gerard: I support staff analysis. I respect the environmental sensitivity to lot 1 and 8 and support the lot line changes.

Mr. Schroder: I support redrawing of lot line and staff analysis.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Leidel. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

No Public Comments

OTHER MATTERS:

- No other matters

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54pm.

Dan Schroder, Chair