

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal	Jim Lamb	Ron Schuman - Absent
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard	
Dan Schroder	Lowell Moore	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the change below, the September 3, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

Mr. Gerard: One page 7, page 9 in the packet. Add: This view is buffered by a stand of pine trees.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the September 17, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Long Residence Solar, 213 S. French Street, PL-2019-0390

Mr. Schroder: About the graphic with huge green bubbles, I didn't know what those green bubbles are. (Mr. Giller: Trees.) So we are potentially blocking solar gain.

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

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. King House Relocation, Addition, Restoration, Garage, Accessory Apartment, and Landmarking; 300 N. French Street, PL-2019-0034

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to relocate the historic circa 1890's house approximately 5 ft. towards the interior of the lot, construct an approximately 100 sq. ft. addition, install a basement and concrete foundation, conduct a full restoration of the house, designate the house as a Local Landmark, relocate the historic secondary structure (cabin) further towards the interior of the lot and conduct a full restoration, construct a detached 2-car garage and accessory apartment with new driveway, expand the existing driveway, and install a new fence and landscaping. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Regarding Policy 22 (Relative), does the Commission agree two (2) additional trees (8' tall or 3" caliper) are required along the N. French St. right-of-way, otherwise negative two (-2) points are warranted?
2. Regarding Design Standards #60-62, does the Commission find that the total proposed fence height should be reduced to 3' or less, otherwise negative three (-3) points are warranted?
3. Regarding Priority Design Standard 71, does the Commission find that the plans should be revised to specify exposed original siding?
4. Does the Commission agree with staff's suggested point analysis?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Leidal: Can we go back to the site plan, I appreciate we are reducing the flare to the driveway, but we are also increasing the width by two feet. Did staff consider using pavers in the front yard? If not, would we put pavers in the right of way or concrete strips. (Chapin: I do recall discussing that with engineering, but can not recall why that was not required; we will look

at that again.) Thank you. Just to reduce the paving in the perceived front yard. Also had a question about how we are measuring the relocating of the house and cabin. A portion of the cabin and the house are going to move five feet, and then the south-eastern portions are moving more than five feet. Why aren't we measuring like we do building height or setbacks? Why are we not measuring every single portion of the structure that is being moved? (Mr. LaChance: In other words, taking a diagonal measurement?) Right, go to the south east of the cabin, see how moving that is more than five feet? (Mr. LaChance: Perhaps Janet can speak to that. I'll look at that while Janet is presenting and respond afterwards.)

Mr. Giller: I'm struck with how well landscaped and vegetated that lot is now. I find it odd that there is an 8' spruce in the front yard that wouldn't be affected by the move, and why isn't it shown? I don't think they've thought thorough their trees on there, they have a lot to work with... they could have really great landscaping if they selectively thin. (Mr. LaChance: We should have a more accurate tree inventory for the final hearing.)

Applicant: Janet Sutterley, architect for the King House:

First, I wanted to tell Chapin that that was a great staff report. Well organized and concise. Thanks Chapin. I did want to go through some of the commissioner comments from last time because some of these need to be revisited. One was on the window separation, I know we will get to that with comments, we weren't quite sure staff and myself... I thought the window separation was with regard to those three windows. I would like a little clarification on that, specifically I heard Ron say he would like to see 6" between windows. My interpretation was that we wanted to go to 6". I have a couple of pictures of a house right across from the post office that has two banks of windows with what looks like 6" in between. I want to pass this along. I think there is precedent for that, and because this is our secondary structure sitting toward the back of the lot, I thought 6" would be enough.

There was a comment from Steve about restoring the window right of the door. The owners don't want to do that. Christie was talking about paver strips in the front, they did not want to do that. The other one was about the fence running across lot 9, and they would like to keep the fence running across there. The other thing, Mike, that was added was the ghosting of the door, which is addressed on the elevations you have there.

Landscaping: Chapin and I talked and we need two trees along the front but I agree we need more tree information. We might be able to save one of the trees since we are moving the house back. On the Northwest corner I do not think the aspen trees can be saved because they are so close to the house. I think we should take a hard look at which ones can be saved.

Horizontal siding: We should pull the siding off and see what condition it is in... it would be great to be able to restore the siding that is there. Some places will need to be replaced, but we will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Fence: So we've had discussions about this before, and here again I'm bringing some photographs. Typically, the posts will extend a little higher than the fence. It's not the supporting structure of the fence or all portions of the fence. A lot of the gates are higher and have round arches on them. I'm passing around photos so you can have a look at the condition. I would like to be able to have a little ball cap that extends past the fence two or three inches. I think it looks a lot better this way.

To address the questions: Christie, I see what you are saying on the five foot dimensions, maybe the building either stays at the existing angle, but we need to look at this. Mike, I agree on the tree comments you had.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Leidal: We talked about the reveal last time on the siding, plans show 4.5 to 5 inches and you were going to bring it down to 4 inches. (Janet: Didn't we decide the range would be 4-4.5. I went and measured some other historic houses.) Can you show that here? (Janet: Changed it on different project but forgot to here. I will.)

Mr. Gerard: Why increase the driveway? (Janet: Request by the owner to make the driveway wider.)

Ms. Leidal: Did you measure these fences or just take pictures? (Janet: The point was to show how the caps stick up. I hate to lower the whole height of the fence just so the posts can have a cap.)

Mr. LaChance: I haven't put a scale on this in regards to the movement of the cabin, I do see that that distance between the profile of the existing location and the proposed location is greater on the northeast corner. For Final Hearing we can require all of those distances to be specified to ensure they are all less than 5 ft.

The hearing was opened for public comment. There were none and public comment was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: Trees: You are going to lose some, I agree with staff on the landscaping requirement. I agree with Janet on the fence, it would look kind of silly to have the post the same or lower than the fence. We are talking three inches. This is a good project.

Mr. Schroder: Talking about the trees, I think you should have a tree analysis done. I understand there isn't much across the right of way, and that the site plan doesn't represent the south side of the property, which is also right of way. 1 is floating. 2. Support posts a little higher. 3. I don't know if that is necessary to revise the plans. Add a note is a good way to go, we want to specify the original siding is exposed. 4. Agree.

Mr. Gerard: I liked the plan the last time it came in, I agree with Christie that we have to figure out what this movement is going to be. I still don't want to move it, less than five feet gets negative points, but it must be less than five feet. Chapin is right to get all corners measured before final hearing. I couldn't figure out the driveway and why it was drawn the way it was. I tried to find historical pictures, but I don't remember what the driveway was. I'm not in favor of the driveway being expanded 2'. I'm with Christie that they ought to be looking at pavers or something to maintain the appearance in the historic district. I don't think additional hardscape is warranted. Looking specifically at the four questions, 1. Some thinning and appropriate selection. 2. There is the fence and then there is the post. I think the more attractive post—not in favor of -3 points. 3. You will attempt to expose and restore the existing siding. 4. I agree in principal with the point analysis. It was a very good point analysis.

Ms. Leidal: Great project and I appreciate the improvements to the historic structure. I appreciate you addressing the siding. I still have a few concerns, including the paving in the front—would like to see pavers or concrete strips, not increasing the width of the driveway. 1. Need to know location of existing trees. Landscape plan with existing and proposed trees would be appreciated. I think two additional trees could easily fit on site. 3. Agree with rest of commissioners, -3 is not warranted for small increase in posts. 3. Yes, agree plans should specify original siding should be exposed and rehabilitated if possible. 4. Appreciate staff's analysis, and in regard to the point analysis, I just need more info about moving the historic structures and more info on the landscape plan. I suggest a Finding for Final Hearing in regards to how this Policy is being reviewed under Policy 9 Placement of Structures, and how this project is reducing the non-conformity.

Mr. Moore: I agree with my fellow Commissioners on the driveway. I want to see different material used and the existing width should stay where it is. Something other than concrete slab. 1. Landscape plan should account for existing trees and agree with staff on requirement for additional trees. 2. I agree with the proposed fence height, thanks for the pictures Janet. I would not give any negative points for that. 3. Appreciate that we can revisit the siding issue and agree with staff on requirement for exposing original siding. 4. Agree with the suggested point analysis.

Mr. Giller: Great project. I'm encouraged this has been in the applicant's family for generations. I think Janet's design corrects some of the last remodel's mistakes. Regarding the driveway, twelve feet is too wide. Brick pavers or something, but Steve is correct, we try very hard not to do that in the historical district. 1. Selective thinning rather than plopping three trees in the front

yard. 2. Posts can be taller than 3'. 3. I encourage you to do more selective demo and investigation to see what you are working with. Let's work with it. 4. I agree with the point analysis.

Ms. Sutterley asked about the windows. Any feedback on that issue?

Mr. Giller: 6" is adequate.

Mr. Gerard: If the original siding is to be exposed, I would be pushing for the window that was taken out, because there may be a place for it in the siding. I would ask them to re-think that window.

Mr. Schroder: Supportive of 6" as proposed.

Ms. Leidal: Appropriate as proposed.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with 6" spacing as appropriate.

Mr. Moore: Agree with spacing as proposed.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3 Employee Housing Change (aka East Building and/or Building 804), 1595 Ski Hill Rd, PL-2019-0359

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to revise the Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3 point analysis. Changes to the project affecting the point analysis include the elimination of employee housing, an addition of a public pedestrian easement, a reduction in outdoor fireplaces, a reduction in the quantity of landscaping and the addition of public art.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: May we speak to policy 33R, I think there is a small type-o. There are two 33R's, I think this is just energy conservation. Correct that. In point analysis on third page, you talk about a water source heat pump system, can you speak to that? (Mike Dudick, Applicant: Recirculation from the ice rink.) Great, glad to hear that. 40% savings, is that all of your heat for the building? (Ms. Puester: Should we wait for applicant questions?) Yeah. (Mr. Kulick: They have submitted a preliminary energy analysis prior to their building permit and will have to hit a 40% saving from baseline on the final analysis prepared by the engineer prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued as well.)

Applicant presenting: Mike Dudick: You've heard about this project quite a bit. I'll just sit down unless you have a burning desire to hear me talk.

Mr. Giller: Can we finish the energy question? Conceptually, a 40% savings for everything on just the heat pump is ambitious if not optimistic. (Mr. Kulick: I think the heat pump is just one component they wanted to highlight.) (Ms. Puester: The building in its entirety and its systems are put into the engineering model and analysis. Matt can speak to that further in detail.)

Matt Stais, Architect: The original memo talked about 40% savings of baseline systems. What we've done with these buildings is take the latent heat from things like the restaurant, ice rink, etc., and there is a sophisticated system that pulls the heat out of these places and exchanges heat into areas that need it. I wanted to point out we are also going through the green globes energy assessment, compared to the code minimum.

Mr. Giller: All of that makes sense, please clean up the language in the point analysis. Thank you.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Support as presented.

Mr. Gerard: We knew this was coming, I appreciate not trying to sneak in under old points. I'm never a fan of trying to crowd landscaping in just for the sake of crowding landscape. No problem

- with reducing landscaping. I wouldn't take away your two points for not over-landscaping. We know they aren't just ignoring employee housing, there is a substitute that is supported.
- Ms. Leidal: I agree with staff's review and point analysis and Mike's suggestion to clean up 33R in point analysis.
- Mr. Lamb: Good point that the employee housing is just being moved, and there is actually more. It is now a better project and I support it.
- Mr. Moore: I support the project and the point analysis and understand the employee housing.
- Mr. Giller: Great project, thank you, look forward to seeing this constructed.
- Mr. Schroder: My son thought the Ullr art was very cool.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to approve with a passing point analysis of 0 and the attached proposed findings, seconded by Mr. Schroder. The motion passed 6-0.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

- Mr. Gerard: I'm noticing the employee housing project off Airport Road is just about done. It might be nice to go look at this pre-meeting, walk around and look inside one of the units.
- Mr. Schroder: I like that it is different but still blends nicely. Question on Block 11 future development.
- Mr. Truckey: Council has put a hold on Block 11 for the time being. One reason is we have to find parking space which will be displaced by the parking structure construction. I was just in a meeting today where we interviewed three finalists who are going to develop housing on the north McCain tract. Town won't play developer role, but they'll be under our guidance. That is moving forward, and will be coming to you all for review. (Mr. Moore: Use shuttle busses once parking is displaced?) There are already busses and they will just have to use more of them.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47pm.

Mike Giller, Chair