

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Chair Mathews-Leidal.

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the below changes, the December 5, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes were approved:
Page 5, "All Commissioners agreed to all questions" Should be changed to yes to all with the exception of the question regarding design standard 76; Ms. Dudney did not agree.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With the changes below, the January 2, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda was approved:

- Lionheart BGV Peak 8 Hotel Work Session was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicants. Tentatively rescheduled for January 16.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. 36 Rounds Rd. SFH (CK) PL-2017-0644, 36 Rounds Rd.
2. Columbine Pool House (CL) PL-2017-0677, 770 Snowberry Lane

Mr. LaChance and Mr. Kulick and made a change to the Findings and Conditions to correct an error in dates.

The Consent Calendar was approved with revisions to the Findings and Conditions.

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Fireside Inn (CK) PL-2017-0642, 114 N. French Street

Mr. Kulick presented a work session exploring options for the current Fireside Inn Bed and Breakfast property at 114 N. French Street. Under consideration is converting the property into a single family home with an accessory apartment.

Mr. Kulick: Janet is here on behalf of the owners of the Fireside Inn. Looking at possibilities of what can be done with the property. We are currently looking at converting it to a single family home. (Mr. Kulick referenced a site plan for the commissioners.) Some of the main things to point out are a few liabilities. One is the barn that is split between properties, and moving the barn onto the property, to be used as a garage, could be a solution to their current on-site parking problems. Barn is proposed be moved completely on to the property, and staff has been in communication with Public Works about the drain and inlet that is in front of the driveway and they are ok with possibly locating a driveway in that location as long as drainage is maintained. Regarding the garage, we want to talk specifically about design standards 19 and 23, and get the commissioners input. Design Standard 23 states to "Avoid removing or altering any historic material or significant features" and specifically states "Preserve original facade materials". Design standard 19 highlights uses that require the least amount of change necessary. We think in general, that using the

outbuilding as a garage is a good reuse. Under Policy 23 staff is generally comfortable with one single-car garage door opening, but feels a two-car opening, or two separate doors, is a bit much and would likely earn negative points due to excessive alteration of historic fabric.

In the second part of the work session staff is requesting feedback on landmarking eligibility for the historic structures on the property. The applicants would like to know if solely the barn is eligible for landmarking and thus free basement density for an accessory apartment. Staff and the applicants agree the barn was built prior to 1886 based on Sanborn maps from 1886 to 1914 and the cultural research survey for the property. Previously, the Town has not landmarked a historic outbuilding on the same property as a historic main structure without landmarking the main structure as well. Based on the landmarking criteria of 9-11-3 of the Development Code, staff believes the historic home and barn are eligible for landmarking. However, staff does not support landmarking the barn without also landmarking the main house. We think -3 points would be earned for removing historic fabric for garage doors. We want to maintain a historic façade with fabric and have the applicant make up the negative points.

Ms. Sutterley: Nikki and Andy Harris are the owners, and are here as well. (Photos were passed out of the existing barn.) The barn is currently in bad shape. We realized that nobody can stabilize the barn because it's partially on the neighboring property. It was discussed if they could buy the chunk of neighbor's land, but that would be very complicated and best option is to move it completely onto the property. It would be an expensive proposition but the only means of access from the north. We think the best bet is to have more density under the barn if that was wanted, as the house would be difficult to construct a basement underneath. (References to the site plan were made; the connector portion of the house was discussed.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Lamb: Why would you consider not landmarking the house? (Mr. Kulick: I think it's because there was some question if the house was eligible which we find it is eligible.)
- Ms. Dudney: The barn is corrugated metal, so that's not the original material, correct? (Ms. Sutterley: We are unsure how old it is, but we are open to suggestions on the new siding.) Do you know if the original siding was wood? (Ms. Sutterley: We don't know, we are unsure what's under the corrugated metal.)
- Mr. Schuman: Was the barn in that location historically? (Ms. Sutterley: It pre-dates the Sanborn Maps in that location so yes.)
- Mr. Schuman: Is the intent for a one or two car garage door? (Ms. Sutterley: We are open to suggestions, would prefer two.) (Mr. Kulick: We are generally more lenient with outbuildings, but prefer one to save more historic material.)
- Mr. Schroder: The use as a garage is appropriate, but if we were to create additional penetrations we should save the historic fabric. Is that possible for historic preservation?
- Mr. Giller: I think it's a great re-use. The pair of single doors would be better than one large double door. What's most important is that it's well crafted. If the corrugated siding has been on long enough to gain significance, then we should keep it. But if it's past a period of significance we should look at going to original siding.
- Ms. Sutterley: In the future, you would not be able to access the garage from the east side.
- Mr. Kulick: Our preference for a garage would be minimizing the amount and size of penetrations.
- Mr. Schuman: So would the east side doors be inaccessible? Would you keep them? (Ms. Sutterley: We would keep them, but it would be a siding feature.)
- Mr. Lamb: I'd like to see the metal taken off and see what's under it. I have a hunch that it is an add-on. I like the idea of moving the barn. I think it is compliant with design standards 19 and 23. I would like to see a single 9 ft garage, a two car garage doesn't look historic. A two car door should warrant negative points. I like that the garage will fix the parking problem. It is a rough structure and this would improve it. I support the direction this is going. I'd like to see both buildings landmarked.

- Ms. Dudney: I agree with Jim. I believe the proposed openings are compliant. As staff suggested, two doors should get negative points. Both buildings are eligible for landmarking.
- Mr. Schuman: I agree with Gretchen. I believe the openings are compliant, and believe both are eligible for landmarking. I'd like to see one opening.
- Mr. Giller: I agree with the others and support staff recommendations. I believe two openings would be ok if crafted carefully. I would not landmark the barn only.
- Mr. Schroder: Plans are well put together. Making this move would be great for everyone. I believe putting openings for modern day use is ok and compliant. I think both buildings are eligible for landmarking.
- Mr. Gerard: I agree with the others. I prefer one entry rather than two. I think both buildings are eligible for historical landmarking. I don't see any reason why you couldn't do only the outbuilding if you wanted to. I think it is a good plan if the ultimate goal is to turn it into a SFR.
- Ms. Leidal: I support. I agree with staff's analysis to reuse the barn. I'd like to minimize the loss of fabric, and see a single opening. I believe both buildings are eligible for landmarking. I don't support landmarking only the barn by itself. I think it is a good reuse and preservation.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch gave a report on December 12 Town Council meeting:

- No call ups.
- Murals ordinance was approved on the second reading. It's a prohibition on the placement of murals in the historic district.
- Lionheart BGV project will be coming to you later so it's inappropriate to discuss it now.
- Council instructed staff to bring back discussion regarding additional roundabouts.
- The housing guidelines were adopted. New covenant now has a number of provisions giving the town the ability to make changes to the workforce housing covenants.
- TDR pricing was discussed and the council was supportive of increasing it.
- Breck Housing Authority met and approved the plat for Blue 52, the declarations, covenant and guidelines for HOA.
- Council asked staff to come back with discussions for new grocery store on McCain property with accompanying retail.
- Direction from council to bring back discussion on how we are handling retirement eligibility for deed restricted housing. We've had a request for a Blue 52 unit so we need to revisit it.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Hilliard House Restoration, Addition and Landmarking Second Preliminary Hearing (CK), PL-2017-0297, 110 S. Ridge Street.

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to restore, rehabilitate and build a full basement beneath historic house on property, removing all non-historic and non-conforming additions. Included in the proposal are plans to restore the historic shed, add a full basement, and add a market rate housing unit and a deed restricted employee housing unit. The historic house and shed are proposed to be locally landmarked. Also presenting was Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect.

Mr. Kulick: Since the first preliminary hearing, we have had a few updates. The first change is the building height. The height of the accessory unit is reduced. Previously we did not have much detail on the architecture. Janet has provided that detail and a color board. Based on comments of the commission, the applicants propose to remove the non-historic picture window and vertical window and replace them with three historically accurate double-hung windows as shown in photos from 1896. The proposed dormer on the market-rate housing unit has been eliminated. The density and mass of the project were lowered by 28 sq. ft. The rear house has gotten slightly narrower. Also added was a landscape plan. Market rate unit is referred to as Chicken Coop on the plans

(referenced the plans). Staff believes the height should be subordinate to the median height. The height of the market-rate unit was lowered to be both subordinate in height to the median height and also the from the historic home's USGS height. Following up on the subject of the market rate unit, we had some general questions on orientation of that building. We did research looking at other outbuildings, and found there was precedent for ridgelines that run parallel with the alley in the back. The placement is consistent with the build-to line of the alley. It is a classic design feature of the historic district. The orientation is similar to what you find in the historic district. There were questions about the façade width. It is a narrow building, 24 ft. wide. It is a small building in general. It is in proportion with other buildings in the area. We also looked at the primary façade, looking at how much of the front yard is taken by the Hilliard House connector and shed width and its 2 ft. less than the 50 foot max. We feel the design is compliant. The architectural character of the Hilliard House is interesting in that it is rustic with rough sawn siding. The applicants want to maintain the rustic appearance, and it doesn't make sense to add something more polished for the connectors or additions. We think they have done a good job of breaking up the modules and maintaining a complimentary rustic design. Looking at windows: They are proposing to remove the large divided light picture window and vertically oriented window and replace with more historically accurate windows. On the outbuilding, there is a fair bit of glazing; the design is similar to the out-building on Janet's own property. The proposed market-rate unit is more visible than Janet's own building because of the hillside but is pretty far back on the property. We want you to weigh in on Design Standards 95, 96 and 168 as well as the ridgeline Policy 8/A.

This being a mixed-use project, a fence proposed to separate the residential lawn from the commercial kitchen entry. As Design Standard 60 reads, fences may be allowed to outline the yard edge. This design being an internal yard does not comply with the literal intent of Design Standard 60. Talking further with Janet, there is a good reason for a fence to separate the yard from the commercial space. We would like the commission to weigh in on this. Site plan issues: looking at open space, it's a mixed use so the required open space is prorated. Since the previous meeting the amount of open space was reduced to 926 sq. ft.. This is below the suggested 1,002 sq. ft., so it should incur negative points. Additionally we think the proposed patio space should be cut in half, so the majority of the front property serves as yard space and comply with Design Standard 155. We think there is opportunity to have some additional plantings. Altogether, there is a lot of points; positive and negative. We think revisions to landscaping and yard will solve most of the point issues. (Mr. Kulick gave an overview of the negative and positive points that are recommended.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: On 24R, standards 171 and 172, are we double tapping them for -3 because of the difference in trees? (Mr. Kulick: I am reviewing them as separate policies, similar to how we review Design Standards 95 and 96 for windows.) My thought is wondering if a cottonwood would be fitting for that yard. I think shrubs/landscaping would fit better.

Mr. Lamb: I do not think evergreens will fit in the front yard. If you look at Fatty's, there are cottonwoods mixed in and they work. An evergreen would seem strange to me.

Ms. Leidal: Just to be clear, you mentioned staff finds standard 155 is not being met. In our Handbook under Policy 24, it calls for projects to be in substantial compliance. Are you saying by not meeting 155 it is failing to be in substantial compliance? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, the assumption is that it will be modified prior to the next hearing.)

Ms. Dudney: Why only + 6 points for the restoration? (Mr. Kulick: This is based on precedent from previous discussion. They are getting 9 technically, for primary building plus shed.) (Ms. Puester: This property received positive points in the past for preservation).

Ms. Sutterley presented:

First, I wanted to go over changes from the first preliminary hearing. The market rate residential ridge lowering was a priority. We changed the roof pitch, changed the floor elevation of the market rate residential unit by dropping it down, lowering the plate height an inch, reducing the width of the structure. We lowered the parking deck a couple inches. Took the west dormer off the market rate residential unit and replaced with a shed roof. We

reduced the above ground and overall density. We worked on several development issues, including grading and providing both neighbors to the north and south access. We want to provide access on both sides for Fatty's and Mountain Outfitters. We worked with both those owners to work out some issues. Landscape design: We are working with Norris Design. They will be here for the Final Hearing. I want to go over the South End Residential Character Area. It is a mish-mash of designs. Fatty's is more urban and there are some Aspen trees on their patio. Being sandwiched between the urban design of Fatty's and residential character of Mountain Outfitters with a giant front yard. We need to determine how to best blend the landscaping between the two sites we are in the middle of. The owners are concerned about maintaining the outdoor dining ledge with seating. We do not want to have a structured residential yard; we need more transition. Also, the site has a current mature cottonwood that will be preserved. Across the street from our site is the Breck Theatre that is built out to the sidewalk. The Robert White house has no trees in their yard. Making a smooth transition between the neighbors is important to us. We do not think evergreens are appropriate in the front; we could potentially put some in the back if needed. We want to landscape the south side area and soften the industrial look with some Aspens. In regards to the fence, we need to have separation between the commercial and residential areas. A small fence should not warrant negative points. (The proposed negative and positive points were reviewed.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Giller: Can you speak to the concrete deck? Did you consider softening that possibly by pulling it back and adding some landscaping?
- Ms. Leidal: On the west elevation, I appreciate you going back to the three windows. On the plans in the packet, there's a note pointing to "existing 1950s lower roof element" why are we keeping that? (Ms. Sutterley: Thought that last meeting it was determined that particular element could stay because it was compatible and earned historic merit in its own right.) Also, I'm not familiar with the shed; is it already corrugated metal? Does it have the same opening size? (Ms. Sutterley: Yes, the corrugated would be replaced but the existing framing and opening are the same.) Do you have details on railings yet? (Ms. Sutterley: A few details, but I will bring that to the final hearing.)
- Mr. Schroder: The cottonwood tree that exists, does that help with positive points? (Ms. Sutterley: Yes, it does help to save a mature tree.)
- Mr. Schuman: How did you solve the walkway with Mountain Outfitters? (Ms. Sutterley referenced the site plan to show the show how the access works.)

The hearing was opened to public comment.

Mr. Kent Willis, Attorney representing Russell and Tracy Bates, who own the property immediately east of the project: The owner's concern is mainly the height of the residential unit at the back. It will have serious impacts on them. (Mr. Willis passed out a printed letter.) My letter will address the details, but for tonight I want to address the height of the "chicken coop". That ridgeline runs north-south; while there are other outbuildings that are smaller and of lesser scale. Code requires the structure to be subordinate to the main structure, and I submit that it does not comply. I think the intent of the requirement is that there be a difference in the heights. (Mr. Willis referenced the site plan.) If you look at the west elevation, the applicant has shown the unit in a shaded fashion, but you can see that from the street that unit will look massive compared to the front building. I think there needs to be some consideration about this building. My suggestion would be to rotate it 90 degrees so it is oriented on an east-west axis. That would break up the ridgelines in both directions and make it look less imposing. The other thing that could be considered is to lower it half a grade into the ground. It is hard to see on the plans, but it looks to me there would still be a way to insert walkways and stairs for access. We think the plan needs to be reworked. In my opinion, it makes sense to not be as concerned about some of the other criteria. The biggest problem is still the height of the building.

Mr. Lee Edwards: Can you describe to me how this private unit will be in the ownership? Can it be subdivided into two separate ownerships? (Mr. Gerard: No.) (Mr. Kulick: This may need further research, but this is out of

the scope of the commission, not in this application.) (Ms. Sutterley: It is not for sale.) Doesn't Fatty's have an alley maintenance agreement? The patio will be destroyed and taken out good. I think this is a good example that something can go above the ridge of the existing structure. I think it does not need to be absolute. Shouldn't be so picky on this policy. I do not think a matter of 2 or 3 inches will be impactful; that's foolish.

Mr. Schuman: Are you anticipating another preliminary hearing? (Chris: It is subject to your feedback. I think we've had quite a bit of feedback to move forward, so there may not be a reason for another preliminary.) There's a lot of points that need to be worked through, so I might like to have another chance to work through those before final. (Chris: I have made a list of things already settled.) There are a lot of points, and the devil is in the details. (Chris: We do not want to reintroduce something we have gained consensus on.) (Ms. Puester: Ron, if you have any other concerns than the questions in the report, please let us know.) There is a lot of moving parts here and we want to be thorough.

Mr. Schuman: Question 1. I think the market rate unit does comply. In relation to the settlement pattern. Question 2. I think it complies. Question 3. I think the market rate housing unit does comply with 88 and 91. Question 4. The façade of the market rate unit does comply with standards 95 and 96. Question 5. I am comfortable with the design as it relates to the design standards. Question 6. I do not necessarily agree with the report on design standard 155 and points under 171 and 172. Question 7. I am not sure if I agree with the -3 points under design standard 60. I do like the concept Janet talked about with transitioning the property between the neighbors. The front patio can morph into something else; I like that concept. I have concerns about the alley, similar to what Lee discussed. If Fatty's were sold, and the new owner proposes a change, how would that affect this? I think it's a good project and you did a good job with the report.

Mr. Lamb: Questions 1-5. I am fine with. This is a mixed commercial/residential. Question 6. I agree with Janet's presentation about it serving as a transition. I do not think an evergreen would fit. Deciduous is more appropriate. The deck could be made greener with some plantings. The three windows really takes it back to original and I really like that. Being a mixed use, I do not know why we require open space. I disagree with requiring open space for the commercial element. Question 7. The fence should not earn -3 points because it serves a purpose. I think this is going in a good direction. The alley is what it is; there is no fixing it. I do not know if anything could potentially be done and it seems to function fairly well. I would like to see what you come back with. (Ms. Puester: We need to be sure we're following the code in terms of the open space.)

Mr. Giller: Questions: 1-yes, 2-yes, 3-yes, 4-yes, 5-I think this yard being paved up to the historic structure is an issue and landscape should resolve it. 6-agree for at least -3 points; 7-fence I could go either way; 8-design is quite good.

Mr. Schroder: Questions: 1-yes, 2-yes, 3-yes, 4-yes, 5-yes, 6,7,8 – I know the applicant is going to resolve these items and I look forward to seeing that addressed.

Mr. Gerard: Question 1. I think the staff has done a good job researching the pattern. At the last preliminary hearing I was on board with turning the building. I still agree with that but cannot use my personal view against the design standards. I sympathize with the Bates'. We have had time to think about how that affects them. Height-I do not agree with Mr. Edwards – we have to be picky. Yes, I think we comply with question 2. Question 3-yes, I agree. Question 4-yes. Question 5-I'm mixed; I agree that the solid concrete patio doesn't fit. Questions 6,7,8-I think we have to step this down and the plan to keep the dining shelf I think we need to do something to not create a harsh line. I prefer deciduous trees. With respect to the inside fence; it looks like a dog fence and I wonder if you can use plantings instead. I think this is an important project and it is getting close.

Ms. Dudney: Questions 1,2,3: Having to do with the Bates' concerns; we listened but the design has been changed since then. We have to comply with the development code. Once the examples of settlements were shown for north-south, I think we need to approve that. As far as height being subordinate, there is no option but to approve that as well. The façade width is compliant as well.

Question 4-agree. Question 5-agree. Question 6-I like Janet's idea of transitioning. Question 7 -I don't think there should be -3 points for the yard edge.

Ms. Leidal: As my fellow commissioners have said, I'm disappointed that the rear building was not re-oriented to east west. But we are bound by the code and have to evaluate the application in regards to code and design standards. Questions - 1,2,3-yes I agree. Question - 4-yes. Question-5-I'm comfortable with proposed materials, appreciate the three new windows. However I believe the 50s roof element need to be removed because they are not in our period of significance. I would like more info on the railings and fence. Question 6 - I'm concerned with the amount of hard surface in the front. I agree with staff on number 6. Question 7 - In regards to the fence, the town has policy 47 in development code that discourages fences throughout town. It states in the conservation district, that it needs to look at the historic guidelines. I don't think it should be allowed without points and we could create precedent. Shrubs could be used instead of a fence. Thank you for lowering the height.

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Puester asked the commission who was planning on going to Saving Places conference.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair