

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Moore. The meeting was a virtual electronic meeting through the Zoom platform, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal	Ron Schuman	Jay Beckerman	Tanya Delahoz- Absent
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard	Lowell Moore	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The March 2, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes were approved with the change below:

Ms. Leidal: I said that the expiration date of the Development Permit in the Noble House Conditions of Approval should be referenced, not changed.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 16, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Gold Flake Residence (LS), 300 Wellington Rd., PL-2021-0049

Mr. Gerard: I have questions regarding the Gold Flake Residence.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to call up the Gold Flake Residence, seconded by Ms. Leidal. The motion passed 6 to 0 and the project was called up.

Mr. Sponable presented a proposal to demolish an existing residence and construct an 8,498 sq. ft. single family residence.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Gerard: On page 12 it states, "spa wing is not an accessory apartment". (Mr. Sponable: That was for clarification. It's labeled as a spa. Wing has a spa, bedroom, bridge over the driveway detail was added to the staff report to clarify that there is no kitchen so it is not an accessory apartment. It also has an interior connection). On page 44, the spa wing is called the guest house. Either we call it what it is or not. One 36" door away from closing off the spa wing to a second house. Clear to me that they intend this to be a second house. I know legal opinion would be this is not an ADU but want to go on record that this is an LLC, not a single owner and this will be a giant rental. At least 7½ baths, rather than 6. (Mr. Sponable: The guesthouse label was left on from an earlier iteration by the landscape architect; need to refer to the floor plan. It's compliant how code is written.)

Ms. Leidal: Is there a limitation in Policy 22 on irrigation? (Mr. Sponable: Limit on irrigated non-native grass or sod.) So we can irrigate native grass seed? (Mr. Sponable: To establish the seed yes). I agree with Steve that our ADU policy is not serving us how we want it to and hope it comes back to us.

Mr. Schuman: Agree but once you write it, they will try to figure out how to get around it.

Mr. Beckerman: On page 18, it appears that it is a circular driveway. (Mr. Sponable: That is the existing conditions which will be removed and will just have one driveway entrance as it is shown on the site plan).

Mr. Giller: Sheet 31, it appears to be open to below. If it was used as an ADU, would they see down? (Mr. Sponable: Yes. There are modifications they could make in the future to make it an ADU but a permit would be required to modify and with their design, would make it potentially more difficult to convert.)

Kevin Michelson, Architect: I can let you know that I never was told to make this able to be converted to an ADU.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve the Gold Flake Residence, seconded by Ms. Leidal. The motion passed 6 to 0.

2. The Brown Hotel Change of Use and Remodel (CL), 206 N. Ridge Street, PL-2021-0055

Ms. Liedal made a motion to call up the Brown Hotel Change of Use and Remodel, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed 6 to 0 and the project was called up.

Mr. LaChance added Finding #9 stating:

“9. Town Code 9-3-9: DESIGN STANDARDS FOR OFF STREET PARKING FACILITIES, I. Location, which states ‘all required off street parking spaces shall be provided on the same property as the residential units they are intended to serve.’, is found to be applicable and met due to the existing parking easement on the adjacent Lot 7A to the north, which provides space for four (4) 9’ x 18’ parking spaces and associated snow storage.”

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Beckerman: Support the project and added language.

Mr. Gerard: Support the project. Will solve noise and congestion issues, and quiet down the area.

Mr. Schuman: None.

Mr. Giller: Support the project. Like to see the mechanical area being cleaned up.

Ms. Leidal: Nothing additional. Support the project.

Mr. Moore: Support the project.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to approve the Brown Hotel Change of Use and Remodel with additional Finding #9 read into the record, seconded by Ms. Leidal. The motion passed 6 to 0.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Howe Residence Landmarking, Restoration and Garage Addition (CK), 106 S. French Street, PL-2020-0464
Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to locally landmark and rehabilitate an existing historic residence and add a garage with an accessory dwelling unit on the rear of the property. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. **Roof Design and Height** - Does the Commission believe the height and roof design of the proposed addition complies with Priority Policies 37, 80, 81 and 122?
2. **Rear Setback** – Does the Commission find the proposed eave encroachment of 6” into the rear absolute setback acceptable?
3. **Breezeway** - Does the Commission find the proposed roof structure meets the intent of the Priority Design Standard 80/A and qualify as a breezeway for positive two (+2) points?
4. Does the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Beckerman: None.

Mr. Gerard: How will this property be used with the basement area? (Mr. Kulick: The owners are currently living in the house and will have an ADU at the rear of the property.) Is the ADU

the new building? (Mr. Kulick: The ADU is the stairway and the floor above. The remainder of the house serves the primary unit. The owners have access to the garage through the basement, without needing to go outside.) Can you speak more to the parking requirements? (Mr. Kulick: Three spaces are required for the property. The owners will determine how the interior vs. exterior parking is awarded.) I count 4 bedrooms. Shouldn't there be 3 parking spaces for the primary residence and one more for the ADU? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, that is correct. It does appear that the existing parking is not sufficient based on the bedroom count on the floor plan so it would not meet that policy).

Mr. Schuman: None.

Mr. Giller: Would like to see how the overhang works within the setback. Drawing is incomplete. We are short a parking spot, that is an absolute policy.

Ms. Leidal: Plans are incomplete. I am concerned with the plans as shown. Don't know what historic preservation efforts are taking place. Height of existing residence is not shown. Railing and metal roof is not detailed. Is a list of historic preservation efforts included? (Mr. Kulick: Yes. Was provided previously. The changes have been detailed in the staff report.) Is this property in the Parking Service Area and then follows parking for square footage? (Mr. Kulick: It is not in the Parking Service Area and would go by bedroom count).

Mr. Gerard: I thought we were intending to complete an additional Preliminary Hearing, instead of a Final. (Mr. Kulick: In reviewing it, staff believed that it was eligible for a final. Staff found the plans to be sufficient.)

Mr. Giller: There is still a lack of information. Setbacks are not clearly shown.

Mr. Moore: None.

John and Amanda Jones, Property Owners:

The intent for us was to turn this into a single family home with an accessory apartment above the garage. The basement was intended for our child, no intention of using this as an investment property. We were not aware of the parking requirements. We believe that we are benefiting the town with the breezeway and parking adjustments. Would like to continue moving forward with this process while being in compliance with the regulations. We can commit to removing the guest bedroom on the lower level. Believe that we can make a few adjustments.

Lee Edwards, Architect:

We reconfigured the stairs to maintain the stairs of the existing building which left the original rooms intact. The space that was labeled as a bedroom is now a bedroom. The bedroom with no bathroom could be an office with the removal of the closets. Can do a condition stating that. abI don't like adding significant amount of paving on historic properties. Staff has a picture of the existing overhang on the east side of the garage and how it functions with the setback. Staff has a number of drawings that were not included in the packet. This is not a builders set of plans. I do not advise my clients to pay for that at this stage in the process. A structural engineer has been contacted to ensure the garage can be constructed at the proposed height. We are not touching anything on the historic house with this project. Will stay as is. Only change is the removal the element in the back, adding the breezeway. Historic foundation will also be added. Can lights will be used in the ceilings, overhang and above the porch.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: None. Comfortable with what has been presented.

Mr. Giller: None.

Ms. Leidal: Appreciate the revisions made since the last meeting. Policy 22 calls for Aspens to be 50% multi-stem. Is the Spruce being moved because of the gas line? (Mr. Edwards: The Spruce tree would be affected by the window well and solar gain would be negatively affected. The gas line must be physically relocated away from the window wells. No existing vegetation is proposed to be removed for the gas line installation.) What are the railing materials? (Mr.

Edwards: Two other historic properties, the Hearthstone and the house to the north, have very simple horizontal rail at the top and bottom. A couple of houses on French St. have similar railings. Comfortable that we are matching what would have been found.) Would still like more detail. Not all submittal requirements are met, especially for a Class A project.

Mr. Beckerman: Further explanation on Design Standard 23. How are we maintaining the significant character defining features? (Mr. Edwards: The north, south, and west elevations will remain as is. The east elevation will depend on what is found behind the non-historic part of the structure. But we will restore or replace it with historically appropriate materials.)

Mr. Gerard: None.

Mr. Moore: None .

Mr. Moore opened the hearing for public comment. No comments were heard and the public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Good example of what we want to see in the historic district. More data needed in the plans.

Mr. Giller: 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Incomplete set of drawings. No indications of materials. Would like the project to be continued.

Ms. Leidal: Would support a motion to continue. 1. No to policy 37 and 81. Understand that it has been allowed and will support it. 2. Yes. Suggest that finding be added. 3. Yes

Mr. Beckerman: 1. Yes 2. Don't understand when an absolute policy can be overruled by the Commission but do support it. 3. Yes 4. Look forward to seeing more comprehensive plans.

Mr. Gerard: Great project for the historic district. Current plans fail the parking code. I see a house, lock off and ADU. 1. Yes 2. Yes. Add finding. 3. Yes

Mr. Moore: 1. Yes. Good design. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Appreciate the changes made since the last meeting. Breezeway is better. A continuance seems to be the best solution at this time.

Mr. Giller made a motion to continue the Howe Residence Landmarking, Restoration and Garage Addition, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed 6 to 0.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

Mr. Truckey: Long code discussion around the amenity club ordinance. Council agreed with Planning Commission recommendations. Outstanding issue is around timeshares or interval ownerships. Chris Kulick will be taking the issue back next week for a work session. The second meeting in April will be about Walkable Main St and STRs. Council will discuss if they wish to further limit short term rentals. The finance department found that over 300 new licenses were issued over the past 14 months and 100 or so were likely workforce housing that is now an STR. Survey going out to the community for a possible tax ballot issue on STR's to support childcare and support for additional transit routes in underserved portions of the Town. (Mr. Schuman: What was the survey response to Walkable Main.) Overwhelmingly positive. Over 80% support. (Mr. Giller: Frisco will be doing Walkable Main.) (Mr. Beckerman: Since the council is dealing with STRs anyone in support of additional restrictions should write to the Council in support.)

2. Conference Sessions in Review

Ms. Puester: Some staff and Commissioners have attended the Saving Places Conference and the National Preservation conference. We received grants for those in attendance. Per the requirements of the grant, we will discuss and share what we learned from the sessions at the next meeting (4/6) so be prepared to discuss.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 pm.

Lowell Moore, Chair