

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 – Arrived at 5:42	Steve Gerard	
Dan Schroder	Gretchen Dudney	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the June 19, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the July 3, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Comments

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Harris Residence Addition and Accessory Apartment (CL), PL-2018-0233, 84 Marks Lane

Mr. Gerard: Has the HOA seen this plan yet? (Mr. LaChance: Can't recall. I'd have to look at my files to confirm) (Ms. Puester: Legally, we cannot require HOA approval.)

2. Climax Jerky Cart Renewal (CK), PL-2018-0243, 100 S. Main Street

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

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Yankee Peddler Building Change of Use and Remodel (CL), PL-2018-0099, 400 S. Main Street

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to change the use of the existing building from commercial retail to commercial restaurant, and to make exterior changes including adding a door and stair to upper floor, modifying the existing roof, modifying the front door threshold, adding a brick patio, adding a walkway and landscaping, and an interior remodel.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Leidal: Does the wood fence meet the historic preservation guidelines? (Mr. LaChance: Yes, it does. The proposed additional fence is an extension of the existing fence, and is proposed to match. The Handbook states that fences in the Historic District cannot be solid. The existing and proposed fence has gaps in between the pickets, so it meets the requirements.)

Mr. Shuman: Have they looked at using the dumpster on the Tannhauser property? (Mr. LaChance: I am not sure, so I might refer that question to the applicant. I have spoken with Public Works and I know the applicant is working out the details with them regarding using a Town Dumpster, but that has not been finalized.)

Mr. Matt Stais, Architect, Presented:

Most of the issues brought up by the Commission were with the landscaping so we made sure to address those issues. The front area will be taken back to lawn and the patio has been cut back. We have also increased shrubs and plantings to better screen the adjacent neighbors. I believe Mr. LaChance did a great job covering

all the changes we made and I don't have anything further to add. Thank you.

Public Comments:

Claudia Lubaszka, 401 S. Ridge Street Unit 19:

This is the first I have heard about the roof and parking. I was under the impression that you can't change the building if you are blocking others view. I have only one window facing Main Street. How high is the new structure going up? (Ms. Leidal: They are adding a porch on the back side but the height of the building will not change.) Will they use more parking between the buildings? (Ms. Leidal: No, they won't.) Where is the outdoor sitting area? (Ms. Leidal: Highlighted the area in question.) How late will the restaurant be open? (Ms. Dudney: We don't have a right to tell them they can't have a restaurant because it was originally zoned as commercial.) Are they taking the entire building or both buildings? (Ms. Dudney: No. Just the front.) Has everything been approved? (Ms. Leidal: Nothing has been approved yet, but this is the final meeting.) Thank you for your time and answering my questions.

Buck Finley, Realtor:

This building did have use of the Tannhauser dumpster in the past. I believe the property owners are in discussions with Tannhauser as to whether or not it will work.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Lamb: I think it is a good looking project and I support it.
- Mr. Schuman: I would have liked to see more landscaping but I realize it meets requirements.
- Mr. Giller: Staff gave a great presentation and staff and the applicant have been responsive to our concerns at the Preliminary Hearing, so I think that is why we are in agreement tonight. I support.
- Mr. Gerard: I am glad the walk way was reduced. I think that will help with sound buffering for the neighbors now. I thank Matt for all his consideration and changes. I would have like to see it remain a four square but understand the difficulties in doing that.
- Mr. Schroder: I agree with staff analysis and think that staff has done a great job presenting the project. I think the project is approvable.
- Ms. Dudney: I agree, and think the project is approvable.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve with the modified conditions handed out, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Ten Mile Room (JL), PL-2018-0071, 505 S. Park Ave

Ms. Puester presented for Mr. Lott, an application for construction of a 7,859 square foot replacement conference facility that connects to the adjacent Liftside Building conference areas. The applicant requested a few minor changes to the conditions of approval which staff was fine with. The new conditions of approval on your dias. The architect also sent over some additional clarification this afternoon which is on your dias outlining the percentages of material on each elevation in color. Staff had an issue with the CMU shown on the east elevation and although it is only a few feet away from the Liftside building, technically it would not meet code. The elevations you have in front of you also show the CMU changed to fiber cement board material which meets fire code. Most of the building is natural material of wood siding, beams and natural stone. The other main issue that staff had was the parking. None was proposed previously. The applicant has proposed that the parking runs with the Village hotel which the applicant also owns but is planning to sell. A condition has been added to require a covenant and lease to run with the two separate properties of the Ten Mile Room and Village Hotel.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: What would happen if they use the CMU shown? (Ms. Puester: Technically, it would get negative points for exceeding 25% in combination with the stucco shown. We give

negative points for the material used as well. The hallway connection elevation is where the CMU block is. If you did lean toward the CMU, I would recommend a special finding to not set precedent with the application, being that it is not visible and 2 feet from an adjacent building.)

Tim Losa, Architect, Presented:

That was a good overview from Ms. Puester. I'll address the last minute change on the siding. We have to have a firewall there. CMU is one way to construct the required fire wall. The other area is a courtyard with a fence on the front side. If we go with lap siding we have to have prefab walls so that is possible to drop in place. We also dropped the roof height on the west end. Other than that the building remains relatively similar. There was concern with using the reddish color so this picture shows the red we are trying to get to, matching the existing Village burnt red color. It is used mostly as a highlight color.

- Mr. Giller: Is the fiberboard wall still a firewall? (Mr. Losa: Yes. It is fire retardant material. It will have a wood texture on it but is nonflammable.)
- Ms. Dudney: Are these exterior walls visible? (Mr. Losa: They should not be visible.) So people may be standing out there smoking? (Mr. Losa: I guess. It is mostly used as back of the house space and will be blocked off by a gate.)
- Ms. Puester: You mentioned a gate, can you show where that is? We usually don't permit that in our code. (Mr. Losa - Pointed out where he thought the gate would be.) I would like to have staff review the gate separately to make sure it meets code.

The hearing was opened for Public Comment: No comments and the hearing was closed.

- Ms. Puester: I would like to add a condition of approval that the applicant submit a class D minor for approval for any gate (new #13).
- Mr. Schroder: Glad to see that we were able to address the parking issues appropriately for this application.
- Mr. Schuman: They solved the parking issue.
- Mr. Lamb: Good compromise to the issue.
- Mr. Gerard: Creative attempt at solving the problem with parking but it is really smoke and mirrors. We took space from the hotel and I see this setting up as a mess because they are short 18 spaces. I don't think we really solved the parking problem. The prior issues with the building have been solved and would support the CMU. I always believe safety comes first. I think they met all the other issues we had.
- Mr. Giller: What gives you a two hour rating on that wall? (Mr. Losa: The material under the wall surface is really how you create a fire wall. With fiber cement, it is made of nonflammable material and metal studs.)
- Ms. Dudney: I am not opposed to the CMU but I think the cementitious material would be better if it needs to look good on all sides and to avoid precedent. (Mr. Losa: We could use either material but we would prefer CMU.) I think it was originally the towns fault for the parking issues with buying the F lot which had the parking for the Village on it. I didn't hear about complaints when it was a conference center previously. I appreciate choosing a solution that would not become precedence by matching the other conference areas in town. I applaud the creative solution.
- Mr. Lamb: I don't have a firm opinion on the material. I don't think the hotel would ever collapse or get knocked down to make the CMU visible. If it did, they would build to their setback.
- Mr. Schuman: I am in favor of using the CMU.
- Ms. Puester: Would the CMU be less than 25% of the elevation? (Mr. Losa: It is about 30%. 15% CMU 15% stucco.) Can we have a show of hands in favor of fiber cement siding? (Four commissioners in support of fiber cement versus CMU). Ok, fiber cement it is.

Mr. Giller made a motion to approve the findings and conditions adding a new #13 regarding the date, seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed 6-1, with Mr. Gerard dissenting.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair