

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal
Mike Giller
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb
Steve Gerard
Gretchen Dudney

Ron Schuman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the change below, the August 21, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

Ms. Leidal – Please add a note to the Fowler Residence report that staff handed out new findings and conditions at the meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the September 4, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Public Comments

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. 319 N. French Street Remodel and Addition (CK), PL-2018-0367, 319 N. French Street
Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to rehabilitate, locally landmark, and add a connector to the existing historic residence on North French Street.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: Is there an assumption that the module is to be connected on a level grade? (Mr. Kulick: We couldn't find precedence where a one-story connector was used on this type of grade and this much elevation change. It is unusual.)
- Ms. Leidal: Is there mass bonus precedence like this in the past? (Mr. Kulick: We have never faced this mass question before. This is the first scenario asked of this situation. We have had one or two where we inadvertently assumed they were eligible for a 20% mass bonus in LUD 18.)
- Ms. Dudney: Why is there no mass bonus in LUD 18? (Mr. Kulick: There probably wasn't as much programming on-site in this area historically. In Policy 4R, the section in question has never been changed. (Mr. Grosshuesch: I think it has to do with the nature of the surviving historic structures character area being quite small.)
- Mr. Lamb: We talked about this before but I don't remember what we came up with.
- Ms. Puester: We have had subsequent conversations with the state since our discussions earlier this summer on the Land Use District 18 mass bonus work session. We will be looking at some revisions to the Handbook of Design Standards and code to address some of those conversations. However, either way, the section of the code has not changed and the Commission needs to review it under the current code. There are no pending changes at this time. Nore Winter has been contract to help us with some recommendations on the Handbook but that will be months from now. This current code is Policy 4R (Mass) that Suzanne is asking about.
- Mr. Schroder: This is not below ground right? Is it underground? (Mr. Kulick: They do have certain portions shown as below ground. Per our code there is a threshold for above and below. It is our opinion that mass should be based only on the above ground portion since mass is the

- total of above ground square footage.)
- Ms. Leidal: The code does allow duplexes in this district. This looks like a duplex. There is a wet bar, two kitchens, cubbies, a lock off area. What would change if it were a duplex? It would change the parking. Would it change mass or density? (Mr. Kulick: No, a duplex has the same 1,600 sq. ft. multiplier as single-family home. They haven't proposed it as a duplex (but a separate lock-off would incur additional fees).)
- Mr. Lamb: It looks like a lock off or mother in law unit. Just keep that in mind as we move forward.
- Ms. Dudney: What are the recommendations from staff on the connector? (Mr. Kulick: Sometimes there is some flexibility in Policy 80A. This is definitely a unique situation because of the steep grade and have no precedent for a one-story connector on a steep slope. The applicant agrees they still need to do some work on the connector. We would like to hear what the commissions thoughts are on the connector.)

Suzanne Allen-Sabo, Architect, presented:

We are working through alot of the problems but the big one is the square footage. The client had been looking at the property for some time. I talked to Mosh back when he was still working here and got the spreadsheet that he created for staff use and it was a 20% mass bonus across the board, in all land use districts. After Mosh left, staff then figured out that this was incorrect. The client purchased the property with that assumption. The way I understand the density bonus is that we get the 700 square feet underneath as a bonus. So we added it to the density we already have. That's how I came to my conclusion. I would love to hear your comments on the connector, but the mass is the main issue. (Mr. Schroder: From the street view this looks like a duplex. Is it a duplex?) They did include a caretaker apartment but that has been changed and the applicant doesn't want that anymore. If we have to cut 650 square feet from the design we will be doing a complete redesign. Keep in mind it is one of the smallest historic residences in Town. All of the drainage is into the building and that will have to be fixed. It is a challenge to keep the rest of the structure lower. (Mr. Giller: There is a shift on the site plan. Are you shifting the building?) Originally we were. Then it turned out we didn't need to shift it.

Public Comments:

Bill Tinker, Owner, 315 N. French Street:

It is quite large. I always envisioned the little house would be more centered on the site because it was over the north property line. The proposal doesn't look like a historical building on site. This has big gable roofs like a Shock Hill home and different finishes, too much glass, not a historic home. It appears like two different main buildings and it is shocking and odd. That is my personal opinion. I would like to make sure they preserve the existing buffer trees between the property.

Michael Bertaux, Owner, 317 N. French Street:

I am here primarily to protect my water line between the properties. I do have an easement to protect that line. I would have solved the problem of the property line by centering the building. It does look like two buildings. The proposed front chimney does not look historic at all. Reminds me of the Who's Next album. We hope to protect our landscaping as well. The neighbors on the north are out of town and they are concerned about the destruction of their trees during construction and would like those removed. If you move the house to the center, the connector problem goes away. Did staff suggest moving it? (Mr. Kulick – We asked them to keep the house in its original location.) If they are taking the whole house up why not let them move it. This is a survey issue from some time ago.

Bill Tinker added:

We spoke with Mosh years ago about developing this property. He told us we could move the historic structure but not rotate it and did not mention negative points. He stated the height could not be changed. That was Mosh's comments. If that were true it would take care of these problems. (Ms. Puester: The code changed a few years ago to give negative points when you move it. The preference is to keep the building in

its original space.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We have gotten several negative comments from the state about moving historic structures, especially when increasing mass.) Mosh also said that there were two additions since to the original building and the back section is not historical and you can get rid of that. I measured it at 278 sq. ft. What you get for developing that density was free density under the building. (Ms. Puester: Clarified that recently moving historic structures in Policy 24R and gave examples of the negative points that would be incurred.)

Suzanne Allen-Sabo: We thought about using two connectors. Because we are connecting the addition at the back it won't work.

Public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Given what is said about the mass I don't think I can interpret it any other way than what Mr. Kulick said. I think we have flexibility with the connector because you can't have only 1 ½ stories in this situation. I agree with staff on all other design issues.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with staff 100%. It is too high, and out of scale. It has too many windows. The site buffering has been taken care of. I agree with Gretchen on the mass.

Mr. Schuman: I agree with staff on points 1, 2, 3, and 4. The landscaping and buffering will change. There is a huge amount of program and it overwhelms the site. Not sure what we will see when it is not -48 points.

Mr. Giller: I think it is good that the addition is lower. I think the 2 foot inset on the north side of the connector should be met. The fifth item is the location. I support leaving the primary structure in the historic location. I agree with Mr. Kulick on the height, width, and scale. You need to reduce windows on the connector. The windows and doors makes it look like a modern design in the historic district. I look forward to the resubmission. I could be flexible on the connector height.

Mr. Schroder: I agree with staff on the height, width, and scale. We have used flexibility in the past on the connectors. I think we can let the connector remain taller because the slope is falling away. Another alternative is a bridge with air flowing underneath, which I don't think is appropriate at all. The design and material is out of character. The windows and doors allow too much void to solid. I look forward to seeing the modifications.

Mr. Gerard: I think the staff report is very thorough. The big problem is with the connector. The policy says it shall not exceed 1 story in height and that is a mandatory policy. I was thinking a bridge in the back or allowing it to come out the side would be a solution. Then it might not look as much like two buildings. Fitting this into the lot is a real challenge. I am concerned and think we shouldn't change the 1 story height requirement of the connector. I agree with staff on the mass and other points.

Ms. Leidal: I appreciate the thorough staff report. On issues 1-5 I agree with staff and agree with staff on the mass interpretation. I am willing to look at the connector if it is over one story, but would also appreciate any change to make it lower.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:34 pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair