

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Vice Chair Leas.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Mark Leas	Allen Frechter - absent	Susan Propper
Tanya Delahoz	Ethan Guerra	Steve Gerard (arrived at 5:51pm)	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the December 6, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the January 3, 2023 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Meintz Detached Shop Addition (CC), 1031 Boreas Pass Rd.; PL-2022-0536

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

Mr. Leas: What qualifies this detached unit to be allowed under the Code since it has water service and technically qualifies as an ADU? (Mr. Kulick: Since the applicant was willing to sign a restrictive covenant that disallows the structure from being used as a short-term rental it is allowed under the Code.)

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Thomas Residence Addition and Remodel (SS), 314 Lincoln Ave.; PL-2022-0534

Ms. Szrek presented a proposal to locally landmark and rehabilitate and existing historic residence, construct a basement, interior remodel, and add a garage to the north of the primary structure. This preliminary hearing asks four questions of the Commission:

1. Historic Preservation - Staff believes the proposal positive three (+3) points for on-site historic preservation/restoration efforts of above average public benefit for a primary structure. Does the Commission agree?
2. Windows and Doors - Does the Commission agree the opening on the East side should remain a door and not be converted to a window?
3. Garage Building – Does the Commission have any feedback for the proposed garage design?
4. Local Landmarking – Does the Commission find the property is eligible for Local Landmarking?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Propper: No questions for staff.

Mr. Giller: The interior is a full renovation. This would reduce the integrity according to the State's Historic standards. (Mr. Truckey: The interior remodel will not affect the rating as a contributing structure to the Historic District). Did staff consider the suggestion of adding a door in the previous opening on the front elevation? There is precedent in the historic district for two front doors. We should not lose the historic half-light door on the front elevation which is likely historic and has gained integrity in its own right. The proposed garage meets the historic guidelines regarding mass, height, and

- proportionality. I would like the applicant to address the materials proposed for the garage.
- Mr. Gerard: Can you clarify the exterior deck on the garage? (Ms. Szrek: This is not a deck; it is a gabled roof overhang for the door.)
- Ms. Delahoz: The parking spaces and that agreement on the east side of the property will go away with this new project? (Ms. Szrek: Yes, those will go away.) Regarding the state's historic designation, can that change anything with our designation as a certified local government? (Mr. Truckey: No, and you will recall that when the representative from the State visited with us previously, she gave much deference to our judgement of issues such as landmarking because of our status as a Certified Local Government. I can't say whether the interior remodel would disqualify from State or Federal tax credits but it does not affect our landmarking process.)
- Mr. Guerra: One comment, the door on the west elevation would have to be a fixed door because it would otherwise open into a window well. Does the proposed garage style meet the historic district given the proposed modern materials, like the garage door? (Mr. Kulick: There is precedent for a garage door with minimal glazing in the historic district. That could be a comment to the applicant to propose a more historic looking garage door.)
- Mr. Leas: There is an encroachment on the east side, the retaining wall; will that go away? (Ms. Szrek: The ELA I am aware of is for the parking, so that additional encroachment is something we will look into prior to final hearing).

Applicant, Sonny Neely, J. Lee Neely Architecture:

The existing half-light front door will be preserved; it is historic. We will show the historic door on the elevations for the final hearing. We are suggesting the second front door opening become a window. (Mr. Giller: Work with staff to better document the former brick cuts that were changed from windows to doors. If it can be shown these were historically windows, they could be returned to windows.) We believe historically you can see on the east elevation the brick wainscot was cut to install a door where a window was previously, that was later patched over. We would like this to be returned to a window. Regarding the garage, the garage roof over the door is for snow and ice shedding. We could take out the diagonals of the garage door, place faux hardware, and have the appearance of one garage door. The corrugated metal detail of the gable is a nice detail. The colors will be coordinated with the existing residences. The roof of the garage will be the same as the roof on the primary structure. The stain of the proposed garage will be darker than the existing buildings. The windows will be aluminum clad bronze to not stand out. The trim will be painted or stained in a natural palette.

- Mr. Leas: How will you maintain the brick structure's integrity during construction? (Mr. Neely: It is a very technical undertaking. The current mortar of the existing foundation is very fragile. We will be strategically separating the brick from the existing river rock foundation and inserting a steel support to keep the brick in its exact location. A new interior foundation wall and supports will be installed to support the historic structure.)

Short discussion on technicalities of existing foundational and roof supports of the historic structure.

Public Comment:

Rick Ascher, 105 N Harris Street: My concern is this a primary residence? No one can live in the garage, correct? (Ms. Szrek: Correct). Is the other residence going to be short termed? Do they have the licenses for that? (Ms. Szrek: I would have to look into that). It becomes annoying. Are they allowed to have a hot tub? I have hot tubs surrounding me too. (Ms. Szrek: A hot tub isn't part of this application.) Those are just my concerns. Parking is for three vehicles. If they short term the green one and the big red house (Ms.

Szrek: All the required parking is now met on site). Okay. I like the way it looks. My concern is that anyone could live in the garage upstairs. When we first saw the deck, which is now a roof, I knew someone could live there. (Ms. Szrek: It's too small and no, the garage is not living space).

Lee Edwards, 103 N High Street: The previous owner had me redo the cabin on this property. This proposal is great, I love it. I have a couple questions which are specific to the project. When gutting the building, the State, I have done fourteen Federal tax credits in the Town, I don't know if the owner is planning to use Federal tax credits but that is just a thought. The slab of the garage is lower than the floor elevations of each of the buildings which could result in drainage into the garage. It could be beneficial to bring the slab elevation of the garage up to discourage drainage into the garage and lessen the slope of the driveway. A question for Staff: in terms of the historic guidelines, I was under the impression that only wood windows, not aluminum clad, were allowed in the historic district? That is just a question for staff. I do appreciate this project and that it does not decimate the front yard like the houses further west which have parking in the front yard.

- Mr. Neely: We did speak with Chris McGinnis in Engineering regarding the drainage and grade. We do have a kick-up to mitigate the drainage. The timber retaining wall that was off the property, the road was regraded after this construction and the historic fence goes directly to the ground.
- Mr. Guerra: I would like to see the garage door redesigned to fit more with the historic character. 1. Agree with staff's assessment of points. 2. I would like to revisit the question of windows and doors with more evidence from the applicant. 3. I have given my feedback regarding the garage door. 4. I do agree the property is eligible for landmarking.
- Ms. Delahoz: It is a nice project. The addition of the garage is nice to remove the cars off of Harris Street. 1. Agree 2. I appreciate the knowledge regarding the windows and doors. If there is evidence provided that the front door opening was a window or the side door opening was a window, we could allow that going forward. 3. A hinged garage door with hardware and no windows would be more appropriate in that area of the district. 4. I agree this project is eligible for landmarking.
- Mr. Gerard: This is a great project, and I am interested in seeing this property preserved. 1. I agree. 2. Because of the landmarking we should strive to achieve the highest level of historic integrity. We will look to more evidence regarding the closed-up door openings. 3. The windows in the garage make it look too modern. I agree it needs to be redesigned. The idea of the faux hinged doors is excellent. 4. I agree with the local landmarking.
- Mr. Giller: 1. Agree. Although, gutting the interior is disappointing. I would encourage reusing as much material as possible. 2. More evidence is needed to make a decision. 3. All the materials in the garage make it appear modern. 4. Yes, I concur with landmarking.
- Ms. Propper: 1. Agree the positive three points are appropriate. 2. I would look forward to getting some more information on the historic nature of the window and door openings. 3. The garage, I would defer to what others have said regarding the garage doors. 4. On the landmarking I agree.
- Mr. Leas: 1. I agree the three points are warranted. 2. I think we have had an extensive discussion on this. The applicant has made a persuasive point on the historic window and door openings. I think we need more information to make a definitive decision. 3. My comment on the garage, as I go around Breckenridge, most outbuildings were simple in the materials that were used. Perhaps we would be more comfortable if there was less variety of materials on the garage. Faux hardware and hinges could make a difference. 4. I support local landmarking and it is appropriate. I applaud the applicant for undertaking this project.

Mr. Gerard: There are likely historic milled materials, that should not be wasted. If those are not reused on this project, it would be nice for them to be made available to other restoration projects.

Mr. Truckey: Is this project ready to move to final hearing? All Commissioners nodded in agreement.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:14pm.

Mark Leas, Vice Chair