

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

### ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal  
Mike Giller  
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb  
Steve Gerard  
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the May 21, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 4, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Breckenridge Peaks Residence (CK), 210 S. Pine Street, PL-2019-0147

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

### PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

Prior to the hearing, Mr. Schuman noted that he knows the owner of the Collins Residence and the owner briefly mentioned to him he wanted to build a new home. Mr. Schuman said he remained impartial and the Commission agreed he should stay for the hearing.

1. Collins Residence (CK), 106 S. High Street, PL-2019-0068

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to remove a non-historic modular home and construct a new 4 bedroom, 5 bathroom single family residence with two car garage along South High Street. Janet Sutterley, Architect, was present.

The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Roof Design - Staff believes the rear module's roof design should be simplified into a more reminiscent roof style from the 19th century to better meet Priority Design Standard 121. Does the Commission Agree?
2. Windows and Doors - Staff recommends a reduction of glazing to the two square windows in the eave on the west façade of the front house, the horizontally oriented windows in the eave of the main house's north side, the horizontally oriented windows in the east eave of the rear house and the French Doors on the connector and rear house to comply with Design Standards 91, 95, 96, 128. Does the Commission support this recommendation?
3. Building Materials – Staff finds the proposed board formed, ribbed concrete is not an appropriate building material and therefore does not comply with Priority Design Standard 125. Does the Commission agree?
4. Connector - Staff finds the length of the proposed connector acceptable but finds the design needs to be simplified by eliminating the French Doors in order to comply with Priority Design Standard 80/A. Does the Commission agree?

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Ms. Leidal: You noted in the staff report that this is between two historic structures. Looking at the photos in the packet, have we analyzed the heights of those structures? (Mr. Kulick pulled up photos on the screen.) Also, roof eaves, I know you're getting close to two setbacks, the south and the rear, we can allow encroachments up to 18" into the setback. Where are we on the roofs? (Ms. Sutterley said she will answer during her presentation.)
- Mr. Giller: The stone retaining wall is within a couple of feet of the historic house. Did you consider that? (Mr. Kulick: I looked at it in terms of being at 4 feet and didn't draw attention under policy 7R. I can look into it in terms of how it will impact the historic house. Mr. Giller: I realize it's preliminary, but take a look at it and let us know.)
- Mr. Gerard: Is the driveway hardscape where the paving strips terminate? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, it is.)

Janet Sutterley, Architect, Presented:

There are three things I want to discuss; connectors, windows and roof forms. First I want to talk about your questions. Christie: to the north is Dave Tyler's house, the yellow house. We have elevations for the floors to make sure we were in the correct place and feel we are in scale with that with the front of the house stepping up to a story and a half. We also looked at street alignment and we feel like we looked at it a lot. We're a little lower than the floor elevation of the house to the south. In terms of the retaining wall, it starts at nothing and it's a pretty low wall (pointed on the plans). On the north side, where we are taking negative three points and going to a three foot setback, our roof overhangs and chimney will encroach into that. Then on the south side we are allowing the setback plus 6 inches for the overhang.

With respect to the connector, as Chris mentioned, it's a voluntary connector but we feel it's an important design feature. If we look at the south elevation, the proportions are correct for the mass in the back and front. In doing so, probably the main thing with the connector is a gable over the door, three doors shown, and as you noticed from the site plan it's far back and you can't see the connector unless you're in the driveway. The whole south elevation is the courtyard. It's not unlike the Christmas house (206 S. French St.) where the south side is open for light. (Photos were handed out of the Christmas house). It's a very similar connector situation.

In terms of windows, also on the handout is a horizontal window, which is historic in a historic opening. We looked at the horizontal windows we'd like to make them more like the historic ones. The ones on the East side we will change to vertical. So in terms of the front, I looked for examples of a similar scale and proportion of the westernmost front element and couldn't find any with two transoms above so we can fix that too. I think the Collins's main concern is having French doors off the bedroom in the back. We will propose a 2/3 light door with a balcony railing in front that would conceal the bottom three feet of the doors. They would really like that. They would also like a more interesting window in the back. They didn't want to have just double hung windows all over the house. We have examples around town of other windows that are angled. Recently the Ploss residence had glazing on the façade. I'd like to hear from you on thoughts on the windows.

The massing of the roof of the east building. This is where I actually disagree that it's too complicated. We have a large rectangle and most of it is built into the hill so you don't perceive that. I don't want to have a big barn roof that would be wide. The idea is to keep the east building as low, small scale, and proportional and the roof forms are a classic T shape roof. If you look at the west elevation, they wanted to do a straight wall to push the master over, but I think it looks better to have a step in the wall. The first roof element that gets introduced to address it is the low roof. It starts to step the mass in from those sides and I think it looks better. That's my strategy on the west side. On the south side, I disagree that it's too complicated, it's a basic gable. I'm starting to step the mass in so it's smaller. I like the steep pitch roof and felt it was proportionally correct. It will look like an outbuilding and the materials will present that as a different structure. It has one dormer. The reason I have a dormer is that we want light from the south side. I kept the plate lines lower and needed a dormer. On the east elevation, there was an easy fix to make the shed roof come down in a classic form. To me, it was a way to break up the massing and keep it small looking. I felt like if I fix that shed roof it's as much

as I'd like to do. In terms of the Priority Design Standard 121, as I go down the bullets on that policy, the roof shapes have a significant impact because they can be seen from higher elevations. This backs up to a hill and as viewed from the east it's not offensive. The second point, gables that were popular in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, these are similar to those used historically. Many gable roofs were accented with dormers and were used in limited numbers on buildings and we have only one.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Ms. Leidal: I wanted to know how many feet in height. (Ms. Sutterley: We can mark that up for the next meeting.)
- Ms. Leidal: You're proposing a Dutch lap siding and you told us that they used it in Eberlin. Our Design Standard 125 says 4", and your report says 4.5-5", can you get it as close to 4" as possible? (Ms. Sutterley: Yes, it just has a slightly different profile. To be better in compliance it would be good to go to a smaller.)
- Mr. Giller: Do you have a roof plan? (Ms. Sutterley: Not yet.)
- Mr. Gerard: What kind of material are you using in the outdoor area? (Ms. Sutterley: The owners are talking about stamped colored concrete.)
- Mr. Moore: On the connector, where the French doors are, what alternatives do you have there that are still operable? (Ms. Sutterley: A single door with two windows would be an option.)
- Mr. Schuman: Are there French doors on the east side too? Janet: Yes.
- Ms. Leidal: On the south elevation, the main story, it's a bedroom. Does staff have concern about the separation because windows are usually paired? Chris: No, not compared to others.

The hearing was opened for public comment. No public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Lamb: For the roof design, I disagree with staff. It's a complex roof and I think there's precedent and I didn't find it objectionable. Agree with (staff's interpretation) windows. Agree with building material. The connector, Janet said it's not visible from anywhere unless you're in the driveway. I always thought you can do your "sins" as long as they're not visible. No one will see the French door so I'm ok with it. It's a good start and a lot of things are already in the process of being fixed. (Mr. Kulick: What about the dormer of length of connector?) I'm ok with those.
- Mr. Moore: I would comment on the dormer on the connector. I'm not sure that was traditionally used, in my experience the connectors have been more simple than this. Is there some way to get it to look more traditional. The roof shape I agree, the East unit is appropriate and fits in. I think it's appropriate. Windows and doors I agree with staff.
- Mr. Schuman: Roof design is complicated and I echo the comments on the roof plan to see better. It looks busy and I think once I see a roof plan I might support but right now I believe staff is correct. Windows and doors, the two windows on the west are not appropriate. French doors in connector I echo Jim's thoughts. Diamond window isn't appropriate. The next set of plans we see will be more finished and we'll have a better idea of glazing. Building materials I agree with staff. Connector, this was submitted before the new standards so I think we need to stick with the old formula for connectors. That was the intent of getting this project in before the standards changed. It's a good start.
- Ms. Leidal: Thank you for saving the spruce tree on the south and using paver strips. It's a good looking building but we do need some revisions to comply with historic standards. The roof design is complex and I agree with staff. It's not meeting Policy 121. Windows and doors I agree with staff. I appreciate you working to meet those. Building materials, thank you for working to address concerns and reducing the reveal for the lap siding to come into compliance. Connector I'm fine with the length and it's appropriate. I agree with staff about the simple gable roof and the door. Great start.

- Mr. Schroder: I agree some simplifying could occur. Looking at the outbuilding, we talked about the garage portion but looking at the entire mass, it does step and I think that's part of the complication. I'm in support of the dormer because one is acceptable. Windows and doors, it was clear there is excessive void to solid, so we want to meet the policy. Building materials, some things need to change to meet the policy. The connector, the length is appropriate. The dormer on the connector isn't appropriate because the connector is meant to be simple.
- Mr. Gerard: I'd like to see the pavers extend further toward the garage. There's a lot of hardscape back there. Moving them back would maintain the look from the street rather than hardscape. There is a lot of glazing. I like the idea on the rear building with French doors. I don't like the triangle window. I agree with what the others say about the connector. I can live with one set of French doors but it is a busy area. Length of connector is fine. I'm with Dan, I like the dormer on the south elevation and you can get by with one. It seems functional. The north elevation gets busy and a roof line would let us see that better. We've talked about the horizontal windows, there are some historic ones but I think it could be too much. They look out of place. Building materials are going to be corrected so that will be fine. Great project.
- Mr. Giller: It's a handsome design and generally compatible. Chris's review was good. Roof massing is too complex, the design standards point to something simpler. I encourage you to simplify that. Windows and doors should be reduced. Connector, the length is ok. French doors are compatible. The retaining wall, I'd like to see the retaining wall more respective of the stone house. The compatibility with the houses on either side warrants simplification of this design to be compatible. The homes on Harris street look like this and are handsome, but looking at this design there's difference with the ones on either side. Good start and I look forward to the next submission.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)
2. Handbook of Design Standards Update

Mr. Truckey: Mike and Steve who are part of the group today, thank you. We wrapped up the work and it was really appreciated. We had some issues early on with push back, but we think we've reached a consensus. It's something that shows we've responded to the state, but considers and respects property and the community. Most of the consensus points stayed the same, we are allowing one module size addition on the back, but the thing we talked about today was mass bonus. The group decided on a maximum of 15% mass bonus with negative points associated. We also clarified on additions that the height can be half story taller than the principle structure. We did talk about connectors and had debate about the width and limiting vs. not limiting. We came up with a reasonable compromise. Most of the other recommendations stay the same.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Leidal: Thank you for all the hard work. Was a breezeway with one side open or both sides open for positive points? (Ms. Puester: Both sides.) Ms. Leidal: Are they eligible if they had one side open? Ms. Puester: I don't think it would pass. Ms. Leidal: When you modify the standards, can we draft something so we don't get the U-shape like we had on French street? Mr. Giller: Like a set back. Ms. Puester: We talked about it being substantial as viewed from the street, so it would need to be visually subordinate.

Mr. Truckey: I want to recognize how hard all the staff worked on all this.

Mr. Grosshuesch: As of July 5<sup>th</sup>, after 27 years in this job, I will be stepping down as Director of Community Development and transitioning to a half time position in the Town Manager's Office. Mark Truckey will be taking my place, and Julia Puester will be replacing Mark.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 pm.

---

Mike Giller, Chair