

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 (absent) | Ron Schuman |
| Mike Giller | Steve Gerard | |
| Dan Schroder | Lowell Moore | |

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the below changes, the October 16, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

Mr. Giller – change to read, house should be moved if to save out of necessity. Top of page 4

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the November 6, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

Lee Edwards Commented:

Parking is a detriment in the front yards within the Historic District. I would like it to be part of the code amendments we are making. Forcing a vehicle into the front yard is an eye sore within the Historic District and puts the structures out of context.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Climax Jerky Permit Modification (CK), 100 S. Main Street, PL-2018-0520
2. Gravity House Renovation/Conversion (CK), 605 S. Park Ave, PL-2018-0482

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

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Casey Residence (CK), 112 N. French Street, PL-2018-0262

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to rehabilitate, locally landmark, and add a connector and addition to existing historic residence on North French Street.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: There are small elevation numbers that I can't quite make out on the plan. Can you verify that it is two feet? (Mr. Kulick verified the numbers.) You call it a shed roof but it really looks like an unequal gable? (Mr. Kulick: From a staff level we do consider it a shed. But I do see your point.) It's not a shed roof so we shouldn't be calling it that. It could cause confusion. (Mr. Kulick: We will call it an unequal gable instead of shed and modify the staff report.)

Ms. Leidal: Can we wrap in a finding about portions of the out buildings being off-site? (Mr. Kulick: I have included why they got positive three points under Policy 24/A for historic preservation. They received positive points because the historic structures are in their historic locations, have a valid easement from the neighboring property and there is past precedent for awarding positive points to rehabilitated outbuildings that straddle property lines.) (Ms. Puester: We can include a finding so we don't lose track of it over time since it was processed separately with a Class D.) (Mr. Kulick: Would the applicant be opposed to a finding?) (Mr. Edwards: I have no opposition.)

Mr. Schuman: Did you decide if the points stay with the project? (Mr. Kulick: The points will stay with the

property as long as the development permits are vested.)

Lee Edwards, Architect, Presented:

The connector was reduced in height and the building became narrower. We brought the height down and the accessory apartment was a great suggestion.

- Mr. Kulick: I did receive an email from Lynn Hoffman President of the Longbranch HOA. Mr. Kulick distributed the email to the Commission. (Commission took a few minutes to read said email.)
- Ms. Puester: Ms. Puester read a proposed finding for the out buildings Ms. Matthews-Leidal requested, *The historic sheds located partially off of the property have been documented by a recorded easement to allow for the sheds to remain in their historic locations rather than relocated per Policy 24.* Also, when we do the handbook update we can clarify the roof forms accepted with connectors.
- Mr. Gerard: As I look at the plans with the change to add an apartment, this will have three potential separate living areas locked off. The historic house can be locked off, the new apartment could be locked off on the east, and then the connector could be locked off as well. I think this now could be set up as a triplex. I think it meets standards and point analysis but it could now be used as a high density property.
- Mr. Giller: Does it meet parking now with the apartment? (Mr. Kulick: It does. It hasn't changed despite the apartment. There are three spaces on site.)
- Mr. Schroder: We had asked for a number of corrections and you have responded well and met the code. I see no code reasons to not support the project. It has definitely come a long way.
- Mr. Giller: The project has come a long way from the first meeting and I support staff analysis.
- Mr. Schuman: I too support staff and thanks for the cooperation between staff and applicant.
- Mr. Moore: I didn't see any of the preliminary plans but the final looks really good. I support the project.
- Ms. Leidal: I support staff analysis and appreciate all the work by staff and applicant.

Mr. Giller motioned to approve with a passing point analysis of positive nine points and the new finding number 6. which was read into the record, seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Levy House Restoration and Landmarking (JL), 112 S. French Street, PL-2018-0496

Mr. Lott presented a proposal to relocate the house two feet to the north, restore the facades, add a new 900 sq. ft. basement, install a full foundation under the historic house, locally landmark the historic structure, and renovate the interior.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Giller: Do you have any historic photos of the house? (Mr. Lott: We have one. The picture was shown to the Commission.)
- Mr. Schroder: Does the easement shift with the house? (Mr. Lott: I assume no. I don't think they need to modify it, except maybe for the patio and landscaping.) The entrance through the property is through the Library parking lot? (Ms. Puester: That is a revocable easement and could be taken away at any time.) And we just won't worry about that?
- Ms. Leidal: Have we ever counted the density over a property line? Would staff be amendable to a lot line adjustment? (Ms. Puester: A lot line vacation would be the cleanest but resubdivision hasn't been proposed. If subdivided east and west, there would be no street access for the rear lot.

They wouldn't be able to do that legally.) (Mr. Lott: We will be looking into different options with the Town Attorney.) Did we allocate density with the BBC? (Ms. Puester: We did as part of the master plan. We would like to figure out the lot line/density allocation options with the Town Attorney.) Have we ever allocated points for landscaping off site? (Ms. Puester: We have seen some crossover, not sure if it was ever for points. We are presenting that to the Commission today as a question to get your feedback. The easement would have to be modified if the answer is yes to incorporate the landscaping on to the lot.)

Mr. Giller: There is new plant material shown outside of the existing easement? (Mr. Lott: Correct.)

Mr. Schroder: I am concerned about the crossover in landscaping. Legally if the tree falls and causes damage who is responsible? (Ms. Puester: We would have to have new easement language for the landscaping so that will be clarified and expanded to include the entirety of the area.)

Mr. Giller: I think the patio is fine it could be softened at the east side with landscaping there instead of the adjacent lot to buffer it.

Janet Sutterley, Architect, Presented:

Both lots are owned by the same family. They are currently in the same family. We explored splitting the lot front to back but the problem is the access. We would like to continue to pursue the access ideas and make the revocable easement to the Town parking lot permanent. The house as it stands is over density and mass so you could never add to the house. It is not possible. The lot split is very complicated. When they put the driveway in they also put in trees on the adjacent property. The foundation is sitting on a historic foundation on parts of the house. Some of the foundation is newer. We are doing more research to date the foundation. The original window is shown in the photo and there is a spot for a double hung. Now it is muddled together. The original three windows will be restored. In the rear we are changing the upper window to a door. The front window is assumed to have been the same as the side windows. We won't know for certain about all windows until we open up the walls. We haven't worked out details on the patio yet. We are not raising the floor elevation. The old wood shingles are under the metal roof but there is no telling what condition they are in until we pull the metal roof off. The biggest improvement is taking off the siding and going back to 4 1/2 inch beveled reveal. We are one point short of passing and will plan to make that up with the HERS rating.

Mr. Giller: Are you changing the size of the doors? (Ms. Sutterley: No, but changing a window to a door for an upper deck.)

Ms. Leidal: Why are you moving the house? (Ms. Sutterley: Since we are putting it on a foundation it makes sense to move it to the north set back line and increase the size of the yard to the south. It will barely be noticeable.)

Mr. Schuman: What are you not upgrading? (Ms. Sutterley: We are gutting the house and redoing everything.)

Public Comments:

Lee Edwards:

I encourage the rehab of the structure. I think the movement of the house should be encouraged to make the property more functional.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I do not support the proposed landscaping. The talk about offsite points concerns me. The front yard and patio should be reduced. We should be able to get to local landmarking. I do agree with the point analysis. It seems like there is an ulterior motive for the move. I don't think I am supportive of it if there is no real need.

Mr. Moore: I questioned tying the landscape to the easement. I think Ms. Puester answered that by changing the wording of the easement. I am supportive of the points. The front yard and patio is a work in progress so I don't have an assessment at this time. I still need more education about local landmarking to weigh in on the issue. My only big concern at this

- point is to understand who is responsible for the landscaping.
- Mr. Gerard: I think this property is a giant mess right now. The first thing they need to do is clean up the lot line and give them access through the back parking lot. I do not support the landscaping. It will cause problems in the future. I don't see any reason to move the house two feet. I am very opposed to the move. I will vote against the project if it is moved. Yes on landmarking. A great project but we are not there yet. (Ms. Puester: Moving the house is not an absolute fail per the code, it would receive negative points as has been assessed. We cannot fail a project under that policy.)
- Mr. Schroder: I am concerned about the landscaping being off-site. We understand we give points for off-site employee housing and I don't think it should go any further. There is not enough info on the yard and patio to make any decisions. Yes on the landmarking. I can't say at this time if the point analysis is supportable.
- Mr. Giller: I have real doubts about the landscaping. It is too early to assess the patio. Yes to landmarking. Point analysis yes with the change in landscaping to be on site in the front yard. Very happy to see this house restored.
- Ms. Leidal: I do not support the landscaping in the easement. Precedent could set unintentional consequences regardless of the family owning both lots. Need more information about the patio. I would like to see the fence moved on site. Yes on landmarking. I do not support the point analysis because of the landscaping points. I think the lot line adjustment should be modified east to west.

TOWN PROJECTS:

1. McCain Master Plan Modification (JL), TBD State Hwy 9, PL-2018-0457

Mr. Lott presented a proposal to modify the Master Plan for the McCain property to accommodate a future school parcel as well as make other modifications, including the new water treatment plant, service commercial, workforce housing, solar field, open space, snow storage, public school, and a Public Works storage area.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: The Mountain Top Children's Museum has an interest and the Peaks School has showed interest in the land and I wonder if there is a misunderstanding about the use of the land. (Mr. Truckey: I sent a letter to Mountain Top and explained the details of the land trade. Not sure if we have talked to the Peaks School.) (A man in the audience identified himself as a representative of the Peaks School and noted that he has been informed.) It was previously proposed to have green level mountain bike trails on it and I am also wondering if while it is sitting idle will it be available to the public? (Mr. Truckey: If we get it graded it may be possible but we won't put a significant amount of resources into it since it may eventually be developed.) 33% of the land is intended for Open Space. What if we chew away into the land mass and absorb that 33%. Will it be paid back? (Ms. Puester: We won't touch that river corridor and will maintain the 33% at a minimum always. You have that one-third plus the 150 feet buffer along the highway for 44% open space and then whatever happens on Tract 8 will be additional.)
- Ms. Leidal: Have you looked into the reports on wildlife crossing by the US Forest Service? (Mr. LaChance: The only area identified as a wildlife crossing by the Forest Service was farther north towards the river crossing under the Highway by Gold Hill/DNR.)

Public Comments:

Lee Edwards:

Great staff report. Got a lot of information in there and the 1/3 is set in stone. What is the mixed use in the Stan Miller project? (Mr. Kulick: Residential but some commercial. Over 80% residential I believe; the mixed use is along Stan Miller Drive). The parking is gone because it is going to Block 11. Does CMC own

up to Coyne Valley road? (Ms. Puester: Yes.) Why has the solar garden been downsized on McCain? Is that a new direction by Council? Why downsize after such a big push for solar. Why is the school site in the center when we have an education center already near the southern portion of the site. There will be a need to have a new river crossing. Can we look at using this road as a link to Peak 7 and close off the intersection of Coyne Valley and Hwy 9? Can we make the road more direct? We like to see functional open space. A strip here and there doesn't make a difference. The view up Coyne Valley is wonderful. Tract 8 housing rubs the wrong way. The river corridor is great. I still hold to the lake Breckenridge idea. Maybe this is the time the town could give the Boy and Girl Scouts some space here so they don't have to meet at Upper Blue Elementary? Does it go to Council after this meeting? (Ms. Puester: Yes, next week.) (Mr. Truckey: There are plans for a new river crossing on Coyne Valley Road.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Good plan. Meeting the 1/3 requirements for open space is good. Look forward to seeing it come to fruition.

Mr. Moore: I think it is a functional plan. There are things that still need to be addressed but a good plan.

Mr. Gerard: I think this design is the best use of what is out there. It is quality open space. I don't think the school district has any plan to build a school. Keeping it open to Coyne Valley is a good idea. I like that the southern part of McCain remaining as open space. I like the lake idea. It is a good plan but we know it will be modified and amended.

Mr. Schroder: I appreciate the public open house. I think it is good plan and support it as is and I think the lake will dry up on its own now although that is not popular.

Mr. Giller: I support the plan. It provides good space for growth and solving problems. The real open space is the river corridor which is very high quality open space and it is a good plan.

Ms. Leidal: I think the plan reflects many needs of the community and I support it.

Mr. Schuman motioned to recommend approval with a passing point analysis of zero, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

1. New Planning Commission Chair Election

Mr. Gerard made a motion to appoint Mr. Giller to Chair, seconded by Mr. Schroder. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Schuman made a motion to appoint Mr. Gerard to Vice Chair, seconded by Ms. Leidal. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

2. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair