

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Vice Chair Gerard.

### ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal  
Mike Giller - absent  
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb  
Steve Gerard  
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman

Vice Chair Gerard noted Mr. Giller's absence was due to the recent passing of his father.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 29, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the February 19, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

### WORK SESSIONS:

#### 1. Handbook of Design Standards

Mr. Truckey reviewed items to focus on for the second work session on the Handbook of Design Standards. The points from the January 2nd work session were briefly reviewed. The current items for tonight include Priority Policy 20/Rating System, Connectors, Period of Early Ski Area Focus/Period of Significance, Parking in Front Yards, and Landmarking.

Specific questions for the Commission are:

1. Is the Commission supportive of modifying Priority Policy 20 to be simplified by focusing on two categories, contributing and non-contributing, consistent with the National Register?
2. Does the Commission support the recommendation of limiting the width and length of connectors?
3. Does the Commission support having a Period of Significance (1860-1942) and new Period of Early Ski Area Focus (1960-50 year old + architectural significant structures) inside the Conservation District?
4. If the Commission agrees that front yard parking is an issue, does the Commission find that either additional negative points or prohibiting this through a priority policy is preferred?
5. Is the Commission comfortable with no change for now to the existing landmarking policy?

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schuman: The idea of going from five to three categories, that's where you're taking the subjectivity out of the rating drop. We've made choices in the past where we've lost some ratings. (Mr. Truckey: Yes, we want to get to a point where we are clear with the applicant regarding whether it is contributing or non-contributing).

Ms. Leidal: I was thinking if we only go to either contributing or non-contributing, I think that gives more wiggle room for the applicant to propose things we wouldn't be happy with. I'd hate to see something go from contributing to contributing with qualifications. I like the idea of having five categories. So it's clear that you can't slip a rating.

Mr. Grosshuesch: Policy 20 is also our demolition policy that keeps historic buildings from being demolished. We went down that road you're suggesting, but there's some problems. You'd have to have a set of criteria for each ranking and examples. We think it would be problematic to

administer and can be simplified. If you're complying with the standards you shouldn't be dropping rankings. We think there's projects that need to fail priority policies. We think that issues will be more clear and something we can administer at time of plan review.

- Ms. Leidal: Thank you, I appreciate that. You're saying there would only be two ratings, contributing and non-contributing? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes. We would leave the other categories in as explanation only. It helps you understand how we look at historic preservation activities.) Ms. Leidal: Where did the other categories come from? (Mr. Truckey: Nore [Winter] developed them for the Town in the early 1990s.) Ms. Leidal: When we get a history of a property in a staff report, where do those come from? (Mr. Kulick: I think Mike Mosher used to include those from his own interpretations.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We think it's redundant with the rest of the design standards we have.) Ms. Leidal: And as a priority policy it needs to be absolute. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Carl McWilliams gets his orders from the state, to base the historic resource surveys on SOI (Secretary of the Interior) standards. They only recognize contributing and non-contributing categories.)
- Mr. Gerard: We're saying that the state is on board with these classifications? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes.)
- Mr. Schuman: As I'm reading, what I see is less flexibility and we pride ourselves on flexible zoning. Seems like we're moving toward a yes or a no. For example, parking in front I think is terrible; but I like that there is a plus to having a flexible point system. I'm concerned about that. (Mr. Truckey: That's where we're looking for input from the Commission—regarding whether it should be a priority policy or just negative points.)
- Mr. Grosshuesch: We learn from the survey work as it's the latest interpretation from the state on how they want to see the SOI standards applied. We want to get as close to that as possible to compliance with the SOI standards. We're about heritage tourism. If people see that we're not respecting the SOI standards, then we lose credibility with that group of visitors. As a CLG, we said we would implement the Secretary of Interior's (SOI) standards. There's a tension between flexible zoning and the SOI standards, which aren't flexible.
- Ms. Leidal: Is this a big concern for SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office)? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, it is.) (Mr. Truckey: They identified more downgrades of historic structures than Carl [McWilliams] did.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: It's good for us to update our standards from time to time so we can stay consistent with the latest interpretations of the SOI standards.)
- Mr. Schroder: Is the parking in the front yards issue so important that we need to changes to a Priority policy? Would more points be a possible alternative? (Mr. Truckey: The way it's structured now, 3 negative points is fairly easy to overcome so we need to tighten it down.)
- Mr. Grosshuesch: The most important historic view is from the street. They didn't have cars in the front yards historically. It wouldn't be consistent with the character we're trying to protect.
- Mr. Gerard: As an example, there's properties east of the library where they have fenced the front yards into the right of way. Where would those properties fall? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Our take is that parallel parking would be ok because it would maintain the front yard and still get a sidewalk in. We are telling people if you're proposing a permit now, we would not want you to park in the front yard. If you have been doing it, (for a long time) and you are not proposing a development permit, we continue to grandfather it.) Ms. Leidal: So would they get a parking pass? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, a lot of them do. The way we issue those is by the number of spaces they are deficient with on-site parking. And it's not a reserved space, it's first come first served in approved locations. Ms. Leidal: Is it transferrable? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, but only to someone who registered their vehicle online.)
- Ms. Leidal: Can we discuss connectors a little? We are proposing a cap (in length and width) which I think is a good idea because we've granted a lot of waivers. I don't know if 8' and 12' are right, can you explain how that came about? If we're going to only allow additions at half a story over (the surviving historic building), can you help us understand that? (Mr. Kulick: Yes. We looked at some where they were meeting the intent but would have been too long.

We want to limit the height of the additions so we're not having them loom over the existing structure. Having a shorter, narrower connector would be adequate. Working with Nore and his staff we are suggesting getting away from having the living area in the connector, and more of a corridor. The suggested 12' maximum is our gut reaction to provide the separation we want without it being too substantial.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: And it puts more above ground density in the second structure as opposed to in the connector.) (Mr. Kulick: It might also incentivize a below-ground connection.) Ms. Leidal: Thank you, there's a lot to think about. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Keep in mind the concept behind the connectors was basically a compromise. In a pure form you wouldn't have connectors, you'd have a principal structure and a series of buildings in the back. Livability is a problem if you try to do that, so the compromise was the hyphen connectors, which over the years grew in width and height. What we're saying is go back to the original thought, and get the density in the rear part of the addition as opposed to in the connector, then you have two distinct structures, and less confusion over which is the historic resource.)

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Question 1: (Is the Commission supportive of modifying Priority Policy 20 to be simplified by focusing on two categories, contributing and non-contributing?) Mr. Lamb: I support. Mr. Schuman: I support. Mr. Moore: I support. Mr. Schroder: I support. Mr. Gerard: I support. Ms. Leidal: Support.
- Question 2: (Does the Commission support the recommendation of limiting the widths and length of connectors?) Mr. Schuman: I support. Mr. Lamb: Support. Mr. Moore: Support. Mr. Schroder: Support. Ms. Leidal: Support. Mr. Gerard: I support.
- Mr. Schroder: How short is short? Is there a minimum? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We would keep the ratio for the minimum, but cap it at 12'.)
- Question 3: (Does the Commission support having a new Period of Early Ski Area Focus inside the Conservation District?) Mr. Schroder: Support. Ms. Leidal: Support and I have some comments. I like the idea of adding the ski period to the standards. I think it will take more than a policy and bullet points. I suggest you create something like the standards booklet to go into more detail on what is expected. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Currently any structures in the historic district are regulated by the Handbook of Design Standards. If someone wants to do something new on a lot they are subject to the Handbook. We want to give building owners a way to comply.) Mr. Schuman: I agree, and is there some type of grandfathering period for owners to comply? How do you bring it in? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Right now, if you have a single family home built after 1942, they are subject to the same standards as surviving historic properties. They would have to comply. They currently have that available to them, but we're recognizing they need a different set of standards.) Mr. Lamb: I agree we need a second set of standards for structures in that period. Mr. Moore: I agree and think there needs to be something done, I like it and think it's appropriate. You'd come back with a new set of standards just for that? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, you would identify character defining features and try to preserve them.) Mr. Moore: I totally agree with that. Mr. Gerard: I too agree, I think we need to establish a new period of ski area focus. We're up against the national rules since they're coming up on 50 plus years old, so I think we need to do it, including for structures outside the Conservation District. (Mr. Truckey: Do the rest of you agree with Steve on making designation for early ski area focus outside the Conservation District as well?) Ms. Leidal: Yes. Mr. Schuman: I'd have to think about it. (Mr. Grosshuesch: I think we'll be more incentive based outside the historic district.) Mr. Gerard: We recently had a home outside the district be demo-ed so these things are going to happen. (Mr. Truckey: In Boulder County if you're proposing a demo, they have to review it first and can put a stay on it until they work with the landowner on potential ways to preserve the structure.) Mr. Schroder: There's an a-frame in the Weisshorn that fits into this. I'd be

interested in exploring outside the historic district. Mr. Gerard: We have a consensus of five yes, and one thinking.

Question 4: (Does Commission find that a priority policy or additional negative points should be assigned to parking in historic front yards?) Mr. Schuman: I think it's an issue and would like to see it done with points but am certainly willing to listen to what staff comes up with on this. Mr. Lamb: I would leave that one alone. Parking in the historic district is a disaster, but this will affect maybe 10 houses and not solve the problem at all. On a lot of the historic district there's no alleys. It's how it is and I don't see that implementing this will solve the problem. I don't think it will address it. Mr. Schuman: would it help if it affected 25 properties, not 10 like you mentioned? Mr. Lamb: Maybe, have to think about it. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We're concerned about conversions, where they don't propose to do anything to the house but they now want to park in the front yard.) Mr. Lamb: French Street is a good example, but if you eliminate the cars in the yard they will still be in the street. Mr. Schroder: I think what we want to envision is, almost like taking a picture from the sidewalk looking at the property, that's what we're looking for. Mr. Lamb: It's all bad parking, so I don't see one being worse than the other. Mr. Moore: I guess I agree with everything but this is a tough one. Our question is do we increase negative points or change the policy, -3 points is very easy to overcome, so that makes me think more negative points to discourage. (Mr. Kulick: We're really looking at preventing conversions with this policy, and are not intending to affect people who already have this. That's more the intent than trying to fix an issue, it's for future conversion.) Mr. Moore: I understand but, is that more points or how else do we deal with it? I would say more negative points. (Mr. Truckey: We have had situations recently where the minus three points were easily overcome with some landscaping and a HERS rating and thus parking was allowed in the front yard.

Ms. Leidal: I do think it's a problem. What resonated with me is that 3 points is easy. I support increasing the negative points and also specify that they have to minimize the hardscape used.

Mr. Schroder: I was leaning toward priority policy/variance but I don't think it's a good idea. This is important, and I'm leaning toward increasing points. Cars exist here now and I support accommodating both.

Mr. Gerard: My feeling before the meeting was leaning toward the priority policy/variance, and I'm still leaning that way. If we can keep one more car out of a yard we should do it. I think a variance allows them to give it a shot; and points still gives you wiggle room. My tally was 4 votes for points, one for nothing, and one for priority.

Mr. Truckey: We don't need to take comments on number 5.

Ms. Leidal: I have a question, the second bullet point, additions to new secondary structures, the first sentence contradicts the last unless I'm interpreting it differently. (Mr. Grosshuesch: I think the item third from the bottom we need to do some work on that when it comes back as an ordinance. The concept is they look visually subordinate. So if you're standing at the street looking at it, a half story higher is still visually subordinate.) Ms. Leidal: Maybe it should also take into consideration the volume, etc.

Mr. Schuman: If you're saying the secondary structure can only be 12 ft. back? Mr. Grosshuesch: We think a half story, or 6 feet.

Mr. Gerard opened the work session for public comment. There were no comments.

### **PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1. 319 N. French Street Remodel & Addition, 319 N. French Street, PL-2018-0367

Mr. Kulick presented, for a second Preliminary Hearing, a proposal to rehabilitate, locally landmark, and add a connector to an existing historic residence on North French Street. Based on the feedback from the first Preliminary Hearing on September 4, 2018, many changes are proposed including the southeastern portion of

the addition being set back more not to compete with the primary structure, changes to window design, removal of chimneys, removal of southeast porch, removal of decorative corbels, and changes to siding and stone. Rear glazing has been reduced by 43%. Building height, width, density and mass were all reduced, and the landscape plan was revised to include several Colorado Spruce and Cottonwood trees. Mr. Kulick showed several pages of plans with changes compared to the prior submittal. The Commission was asked to answer the 6 questions in the staff report.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Schroder: The west facing patio, does the deck continue concealed from view to the north? (Mr. Kulick: Yes.)
- Ms. Leidal: Thank you for all the changes. I appreciate them. Chris, you touched on materials; can you review them in more detail? I agree outbuildings were secondary and rustic, however there's living area here. Why is the addition not lap siding as the traditional material? (Mr. Kulick: In this case, with the primary structure being so small and having lap siding, we felt that the addition should resemble an outbuilding more so it didn't look like there are multiple primary structures.) Ms. Leidal: Could we look at policy numbers 90 and 145 next time? It talks about balancing materials that were found historically. (Mr. Kulick: We're saying the addition is a secondary structure. We've transitioned in the past 10 years or so to the additions have more rustic finishes.) Ms. Leidal: I know, I think that maybe we've gone too far and this can be a discussion next time.
- Mr. Gerard: What do we do about the windows in the rear of the historic structure as compared to what is planned in the renovation? (Mr. Kulick: (pointed out on photos of the house) By building codes they need to change the square window in the foundation to an egress window so we suggested it be a double hung window.) Mr. Gerard: We won't be surprised if that strange window was historic? (Mr. Kulick: The contractors did a very thorough assessment of historic fabric. The contractor went through a lot of the issues with staff.) Mr. Ploss, owner of property: I think that section of foundation was added in the 70s, is that correct Suzanne? (Suzanne: We don't know.)

Suzanne Allen Sabo, Architect, presented:

We have changed a lot since last time. The big topic of discussion was moving the building onto the site, but since the recent changes we decided to keep it in place, in an easement that's been platted recently. So I wanted to clarify that. We are willing to change the siding again if you prefer. Originally we had it broken up into more elements (Ms. Sabo pointed on plans). We are willing to do whatever we need in order for it to pass. We also had a surveyor look at heights of neighboring houses (Ms. Sabo showed a diagram with comparisons).

- Ms. Leidal: Vertical double hung design plays upon historic windows? Where are you getting that? (Ms. Sabo: Several local houses and this building as well has that.)

Mr. Gerard opened the hearing for public comment.

Public Comments:

Mr. Bill Tinker, owner of 315 N. French: I haven't seen the South elevation this evening, so I'd like to see it. (Mr. Kulick, presented the south elevation.) My general feeling about all the improvements from last meeting is over the top and I love it all. I think it fits in the neighborhood a lot better and good attention to detail. I have to say that on the building one over on the south side, the round house, I was a little surprised when the siding went up on the porch on facing the street. It was stated it would be 4 inch lap siding. And I think there was an assumption on what that meant. Other than that, obviously you don't care about the siding and I really don't either. I think it's an exceptional job by the design people. One thing – this lower portion is what will be there (pointed on plans)? The piece of decking on the west elevation, where is that? (Mr. Kulick pointed on plans.) Mr. Tinker asked for where the porch came out from the building. Mr. Tinker: I think it's a good use

of property and I wish them the best.

- Mr. Kulick: If there's more comments on materials they can be addressed with question 4 so the design team can address prior to the next meeting which will likely be a Final Hearing.
- Mr. Tinker: The upper windows in the historic element, should you get the free density for preserving, that's where those windows would be. What would go in there? (Ms. Sabo: Bedroom and bath.)
- Mr. Gerard: Windows in the lower section would be required per code.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Schuman: 1., yes I feel the SE addition meets. 2. Width and scale, yes. 3. Comfortable with connector. 4. I like the materials used. Definition of 145 I'm comfortable with. 5. I appreciate the efforts in doors and windows. 6. Landscaping, I would like to see less trees and maybe more shrubs. The trees will grow large and might overwhelm later. Less Aspens and maybe more bushes. Huge improvement from the last time we saw it, it fits in the location and I'm excited to see where it goes.
- Mr. Lamb: Agree. 1, the SE addition I agree; 2. agree, 3. connector I agree; 4. materials I like, 5. windows and doors I'm fine with and the glazing looks good; 6. landscaping I think is very generous, support positive points.
- Mr. Moore: 1. Agree, SE addition I agree, 2. width and scale is appropriate, 3. connector is doing what it's supposed to, and 4. I agree with the materials and it's to be commended. My only experience was a few weeks ago and I'm impressed. 5. Windows and doors is a better glazing plan, 6. landscaping is impressive and will look good and complies.
- Ms. Leidal: Appreciate the changes and it's beautiful. 1. & 2. I have concerns with scale and mass in relation to historic structure. I think we're hanging our hats on heights in the district rather than on site. I think there's past precedent sited that SHPO isn't happy with. I think the addition needs to stay on the same plane, not necessarily behind the connector, I don't think it's appropriate. Size, scale and width don't meet policies or the intent. Question 3, the connector is fine and materials are fine. 4, we have policies and I disagree with staff, I don't read the addition as outbuildings. Siding should have more refinement. I wonder if the metal siding exceeds 25%. If we are not going to invoke 25% non-natural material clause I think that we should grant a waiver if we are allowing metal. 6. I appreciate the landscaping plan and support.
- Mr. Schroder: 1, agree. 2. Width and scale, I support, 3. Connector complies, 4. materials comply, 5. windows and doors comply, 6. landscaping I support the positive points. I too would look forward to final. I wonder what the original residents would think.
- Mr. Gerard: 1. The SE addition, I still have some concerns about, as Christie expressed, what the intent of the design standards are, that addition should be placed no closer to the French Street side and the rear of the house. It is a great improvement over where we started. I don't know how it's going to look in real life. If you're going North on French street, you're going to see only part of the historic house because of the new design. 2. Width and scale I concur, 3. connector I agree but think we should have a special finding due to the slope of the land as functionally only one story and I appreciate the idea that you flattened the landscaping to take the big dip out of the connector. 4. Material I'm ok with, we need to make sure we're not exceeding 25 percent on metal. 5. Windows and doors I agree but want historic attention paid. I agree that the lower windows are necessary for safety. 6. Landscaping is good and I really like the landscape between the addition and the historic house and I think it's good. I think it's ready for final. Remarkable transformation from where we started.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)
2. Class D Majors Q4 2018 (Memo Only)
3. Class C Subdivisions Q4 2018 (Memo Only)

Mr. Truckey: Staff thought Saving Places conference was valuable.

Mr. Schuman: The venue was better.

Mr. Gerard: I thought it was the best of the three I've attended.

Mr. Grosshuesch: I'm going to talk to the person in charge of organizing the sessions for that conference and let them know I wish there was a review for things that come up on a regular basis to help staffs with those type of reviews. Mr. Gerard: I think that's a great idea.

Mr. Moore: Thank you so much for the opportunity to go. As a new commissioner it was so important to learn about historic preservation and how valuable it is here in the work we do.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 pm.

---

Steve Gerard, Vice Chair