

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

### ROLL CALL

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

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The May 1, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved with the below changes.

On page 7 and 9 Mr. Schuman's name was spelled incorrectly.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the May 15, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Comment

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Tabb Residence Addition and Remodel (CK), PL-2018-0134, 141 Sawmill Rd.

Mr. Giller: Is the HERS rating for the addition or the entire house? (Mr. Kulick: I believe you look at the whole house.) What baseline do you use? (Mr. Kulick: The existing condition of the house. It is modeled through the HERS programs.) So do you model against a current home or an existing? (Mr. Kulick: The existing home.) What is the HERS requirement? (Mr. Kulick: Per their development agreement, they don't have to hit a target score to get one point, it is used as an educational tool in this case.) (Mr. Truckey: Then they can gain points based on the amount of the decrease in energy use.)

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

### PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Noble House Addition, Restoration, and Landmarking (CL) 213 S. Ridge Street, PL-2018-0069.

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal for the removal of a non-historic 1997 addition, the relocation of the house 5 ft. to the east, construction of a connector element, new addition and small "barn" on the west end of the property totaling 1,200 sq. ft. above ground, a new 601 sq. ft. basement, installation of a full foundation under the historic house and a new addition, and the local landmarking of the historic structure

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: I just looked it up and the HERS rating goes against a base case reference model home not the existing home.

Mr. Schuman: Does the HERS rating apply to the total project?

Mr. Giller: It looks like the base case home would get 100%. We should review the specifics on this issue offline. (Mr. Truckey: We will note your comment and look at this more before the next hearing.)

Mr. Schuman: What is the driveway and parking strips remedy? (Mr. LaChance: There is supposed to be a 30 inch grass strip between two concrete strips for the driveway, which were approved with a previous permit. Although the grass strip appears to be covered up with concrete, the applicant has stated that it is a temporary acrylic board material that can be easily removed. We will

- ensure it is removed before we issue the Building Permit.
- Ms. Leidal: There are five criteria that need to be met to allow projects to exceed 9 UPA. The connector is there to clearly define and separate the two main structures. It doesn't look like a connector to me. It is clearly not a gable roof. I don't think it meets policy 80 and we need more detail for the next meeting. Also, we will need more information on policy 158. (Mr. LaChance: Just to clarify, the applicant does not propose to construct more than 9 UPA, assuming the "barn" will meet the definition of nonliving areas.) What defines non-dwelling? (Mr. Truckey: There is stated criteria in the code regarding not exceeding five feet in height, having no windows, and not being "living space".) (Mr. LaChance: Living area is defined by the chief building inspector as an area with no drywall, minimal electric, no plumbing, and no finished floor. We reviewed "The Illustrated Book of Development Definitions" for definitions of living area, but could not find one. We can also do a Condition of Approval and Restrictive Covenant to make sure this is not living space.)
- Mr. Lamb: What is the barn proposed to be used for now? (Mr. LaChance: The applicant has stated that it will be a storage area with a heated concrete floor.)
- Ms. Leidal: Are the eaves on the existing building over 12'?' (Mr. LaChance: No)
- Mr. Giller: Is there a reason to move the structure forward? (Mr. LaChance: Yes, I believe the applicant is proposing to move the structure to free up more room for the addition in the rear.) Normally, you do not move a historic structure unless you are trying to save it. (Mr. LaChance: There is a new concrete foundation proposed, although it is not shown on the plans) A new foundation could be installed and the building remains in the existing location, correct? (Mr. LaChance: Yes, absolutely.) (Mr. Truckey: We did revise Policy 24/R back in 2013 so that you could move a historic structure but it incurs negative points.) Did you looked at in comparison to the three adjacent buildings? (Mr. LaChance: Yes. It currently is perfectly aligned with the only other historic building on block now, which is the McAdoo building.) That is a defining feature and shouldn't be offset from the other.
- Ms. Leidal: Do we have other houses that have been moved and can be used as past precedence? (Mr. Truckey: Yes, at least three other projects.) (Mr. Kulick: Staff recommended -10 points for the proposal to move the Walker House during its preliminary hearing.)
- Ms. Leidal: I would like to see more information regarding the connector and siding and Policy 165.
- Mr. Lamb: The landscaping does not show the spruce tree removal.

Janet Sutterley, Architect, Presented:

I have been out of town for two weeks, so I apologize for the missing information. I do not want to introduce anything new tonight, just go through the current questions. The material covering the 30" strip in the driveway is epoxy and we can get it out in 5 minutes. In the Character Area, there is a huge range of setbacks. The two most noticeable are the Lady Bug House and the Twist building. These buildings with a varied range of setbacks need to be looked at when considering the allowable range. We should not be looking at just historic buildings. The 1997 addition is non-historic, non-compliant and exceeds 50% of the house and does not have a connector. The historic house is sitting on rocks in the dirt with a cellar area. There is precedence in moving the house and the location change seems OK considering the variable setbacks of the neighboring buildings. The move would align it better with the Legends Restaurant building. Starting from the corner of Washington and Ridge streets, we are transitioning and the alignment is moving toward the sidewalk. The Twist Restaurant building is almost sitting on the sidewalk. Please consider these alignment issues. The historic buildings adjacent to the house were right on the street in the Sanborn map provided. The connector follows width and height rules. The gable roof form drops about three feet lower than the other buildings. The reason for that is to stay away from the historic building. So, it is a gable shape with a porch element to protect the door. That is a gable roof but also has a shed roof form. You can see the connector from the north and south. The width of the connector is within measurements but when you add the porch, it exceeds the measurement. Ms. Sutterley clarified the connector portion of the plan. (Ms. Leidal: I still do not think the porch complies with the rules on connectors.) (Mr. Giller:

Are you removing historic fabric on the west façade of the historic house?) No, the existing non-historic addition abuts the historic house along the historic western façade, so we will actually be restoring historic fabric when we removed the no-historic addition. We nicknamed this area the barn, but it is for storage, and could be a small garage. It will be treated like any other garage in the district. (Mr. Giller: You are required to drywall because there is living area above it.) I could eliminate the living area above it. (Mr. Giller: I would leave it up to staff to make sure the barn area does not become density. (Mr. Schroder: Our concern is the renegade apartment and making sure it does not become density.) We can try to make it look more like a garage. We have everything we need for question 1. I have a list of other houses that were moved. (Mr. Truckey: The question to consider is, there is a foundation there now but should you get positive points for the new foundation when you are required to install a foundation by the code anyway, when you move the house.) (Mr. Giller: Is the shed historic?) No, it is a Tuff Shed. (Mr. Truckey: Examples of points for moving a structure include The Hilliard house which received -3 for relocating the secondary structure, The Marvel House which received -10 for moving a primary structure 10 feet forward, and Enyeart which received negative points for moving a historic structure four feet.) (Mr. LaChance: I just wanted to clarify a few things after the applicant's presentation: 1) Per the Cultural Resource Survey for the Noble House, the 9'x9' shed at the rear of the property was installed in 1997, around the same time as the rear addition to the house. Planning would want the "barn" space to not be labeled as storage, not as a garage, because the 15' depth of the "barn" would not meet our minimum parking space length requirement of 18'. Per my discussion with the Chief Building Official, the "barn" area would only be considered nonliving space if it does not have dry wall.)

The public hearing was opened. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Lamb: Seems like there is still some flushing out to do. Seems strange that you would not be allowed to drywall a garage, especially if it is heated. This issue needs more discussion.

Question #1: The setback range was between 4 and 41 feet, so I feel this complies.

Question #2: It could get positive 3 points, because we are doing more than foundation.

Question #3: Meets landmarking criteria. Looking forward to seeing more detail.

Mr. Schuman:

Question #1: Yes, meets the range.

Question #2: I agree with staff. It already received 5 points in 1997.

Question #3: Yes, I agree with staff.

Question #4: I need more information on the landscaping.

Mr. Giller:

Question #1: I do have issues with setback.

Question #2: I agree with positive one point for historic preservation.

Question #3: Getting there.

Question #4: I support additional landscaping.

Mr. Schroder:

Question #1: It fits within the range and I support the 16 foot setback.

Question #2: I support +1 point for historic preservation.

Question #3: I support the landmarking.

Question #4: I support more landscaping.

Mr. Gerard:

How will you do the driveway and the snow stack? I have a problem with the connector, it looks like part of the house. The barn looks to me like two extra bedrooms. It will be turned into living space in time.

Question #1: Close call. I prefer you did not move the house, but it meets the definition.

Question #3: Meets land marking

Question #4: Supports more landscaping.

Ms. Leidal:

Question #1: I think it is in the range, but the range included commercial and residential structures. Not comparing apples to apples—different uses had different setbacks. Should not receive positive points for foundation since it is required with reclassification. Policy 24 allows structures to be moved so yes it complies. I think it is important to retain the front yard surface. I agree with one positive point. There should be a foundation under it.

Question #3: Yes on landmarking.

Question #4: Yes on landscaping with more clarification.

Please look at Design Standard 80A and the connector, Design Standard 36&37, and Design Standard 165 regarding materials.

**COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. Breckenridge Grand Vacations Sales Cabin (CK), PL-2018-0127, 1627 Ski Hill Rd.

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to move an existing sales center cabin from a location adjacent to the Shock Hill Gondola Station to a location at the base of Peak 8. Present to answer questions is Graham Frank of Breckenridge Grand Vacations.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schuman: Where will the utilities be? (Mr. Frank: The fence runs along this side and will tie into the only two openings. Mr. Frank showed where the utilities would tie in from the Building 3 construction site. There is no way for the general public to get into the utility areas.)

Mr. Schroder: Is the 9 extra square feet of density ok because Building 3 has not been completed? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, if both buildings were Co'd there would be an overage in density and either the cabin will have to be removed, commercial density will have to be reduced on building 3 or additional density will have to be purchased from Vail Resorts. We tried to leave the condition open ended.) (Mr. Frank: The Building 3 plaza will have to be completed with pavers to have access into the ticket office. This will necessitate removing the cabin prior to Building 3's CO.)

Mr. Schuman: I thought it would be either or? (Mr. Kulick: It could be either way if they modified the permit for Building 3.) (Mr. Frank: I am sure Vail Resorts will not allow it to sit in front of the ticket window.)

The public hearing was opened. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Gerard: It is a nice plan and it will be nice to see it moved off Shock Hill. No problems.

Mr. Schroder: Great reuse of the building.

Mr. Giller: No issues.

Mr. Schuman: Good plan but it definitely should not stay.

Mr. Lamb: Good project.

Ms. Leidal: I agree with the other Commissioners and the staff. It is a good project.

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

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary: No questions.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 pm.

---

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair