

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 pm by Chair Leas.

### ROLL CALL

|              |                             |                                |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Mike Giller  | Mark Leas                   | Allen Frechter - <b>remote</b> |
| Ethan Guerra | Elaine Gort - <b>remote</b> | Susan Propper                  |

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the April 16, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Kulick: Is there anything being removed from the Consent Calendar, Ellie?  
Ms. Muncy: There is a change to the agenda, the Edel Residence is being removed.

With the above changes, the May 7, 2024 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No public comment

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Edel Residence (EM), 206 Morning Star Drive, PL-2024-0087 (**Removed from Agenda**)
2. 135 Hamilton Court Residence (EM), 135 Hamilton Court, PL-2024-0091
3. Blazing Saddles Exterior Refinish (CC), 110 S. Park Avenue, PL-2024-0109
4. The Burrow Residence (SVC), 71 Sunrise Point Drive, PL-2024-0092

Mr. Leas made a motion to call up Blazing Saddles Exterior Refinish (CC), 110 S. Park Avenue, PL-2024-0091, seconded by Mr. Giller. The motion was passed 6 to 0 and the project was called up.

Mr. Cross gave a brief presentation on the exterior remodel proposed for the Blazing Saddles property.

### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Leas: I know we have discussed the alternate use of siding and discussed various types of siding and we were comfortable approving the Hardie board horizontal lap siding. That product is included in this application, but we never discussed or approved the use of Hardie vertical board and batten system. I was surprised when I looked at the regulations and saw it just specifies Hardie siding. We need to specify in this case because Hardie produces a number of different products. We should clarify what we will allow and what we will not allow because Hardie could produce another product that is not compatible with Breckenridge. (Mr. Kulick: We could possibly say that a different product doesn't meet the architectural requirements under section A of Policy 5R, but it would meet the requirements under Section B.) (Mr. Truckey: The Code does not specifically reference Hardie but does talk about fiber cement siding.) I have problems with the documentation on this project. There are very few details. The existing material is nailed directly to the framing over the insulation. What will happen on this project other than doing the Hardie siding? This is a glorified paint job, and the applicant owes the Town a better explanation of the project. There are architects who could help the applicant with a better detail in the proposal. I understand that this is not in the Historic District, but the building is in a prominent location and deserves a better proposal. (Mr. Kulick: A lot of the information you are requesting is under the purview of the Building Department review. This is a similar amount of information that is

given for other projects.) I think the project is deficient and should provide more information.

Mr. Giller: Is there a proposal on the signage? (Mr. Cross: There are no proposed changes to the signage. Existing signage may be existing non-conforming.) (Mr. Kulick: The existing businesses likely have compliant signage updated in the past 10 years. The frontage of the building would allow for larger signs here. I would agree that the signs are likely compliant.) If you think the signs are compliant, I will leave it to staff to review.

No public comment.

Ms. Propper made a motion to approve the project, seconded by Mr. Guerra. The motion passed and the project was approved 6 to 0.

Mr. Frechter: There is a typo on the 135 Hamilton Ct Residence Staff Report, Ellie. The summary point analysis has positive three (+3) points for EV, and it should be plus two (+2). (Ms. Muncy: That is correct; it should be positive two (+2) points. Additionally, the density calculation for residence is incorrect and the house will be 7,445 square feet; however that property is not limited in density.)

Mr. Kulick: We will take record of those corrections and update the staff report for accuracy in the property file.

With no additional call ups, the other Consent Calendar items were approved as presented.

#### **COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. Wildwood Lodge Condos Remodel and Variance Request (EM), 120 Sawmill Rd., PL-2024-0097

Ms. Muncy presented a proposal to remodel the existing condo building, including an exterior façade renovation, reconfigured parking area, replacement of the hot tub area, minor roof form change, remodel of the interior entryway, and foundation replacement. The applicant also requests a variance from the required amount of parking to provide a total of 41 parking spaces, 8 more than currently provided.

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Leas: Can you explain what is happening with the trash enclosure? (Ms. Muncy: There is an existing provision within the Code, if an opening of at least twelve inches (12”) in height is added to the structure, it does not count as density because it is no longer fully enclosed. This is a provision specifically for trash enclosures even if the property does not have remaining density. As part of this project, they are increasing the size of the enclosure to include recycling.)

Ms. Gort: Can you explain where the new parking spaces will be? (Ms. Muncy: The existing parking spaces are being reconfigured for the additional parking spaces. There will be a few trees that need to be removed. They are straightening the zig-zag parking area to add more spaces.)

No Public Comment.

Ms. Propper made a motion to approve the Wildwood Lodge Condos Remodel and Variance Request, seconded by Mr. Giller. The motion passed 6 to 0.

#### **PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1. Cammett House Addition, Restoration, and ADU (SVC), 203 S. French Street, PL-2024-0064

Ms. Crump presented a proposal to construct an addition of 186 square feet above ground to the rear of the primary historic residence, complete an exterior rehabilitation, full interior remodel, and basement addition. Exterior rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic garage into a deed-restricted accessory dwelling unit with full interior remodel and basement addition.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Frechter: The gable window on the East elevation, what is the difference in dimensions? (Ms. Crump: The applicant can answer specifically, but I believe the new window is several inches wider. And to clarify, they are proposing to change the windows on the west elevation, not the east.)
- Ms. Gort: I have the same question; how big were the windows? And how much bigger are the window openings changing? (Ms. Crump: The change in size is several inches. It is not significant, but it is a change to the historic opening.) For the door that is being enlarged, there is no existing historic door in that opening, correct? (Ms. Crump: The opening is historic, the existing door is not.) I do think having the larger opening would make it easier for people to get in and out. (Ms. Crump: It is not a failing policy to make the door wider, it is just negative points. But it is a failing policy for the historic windows dimensions to be changed.) Is there a procedure for this? Do they just have to make them smaller? (Ms. The window standards are an Absolute Policy, so they are not allowed to change the historic openings.) We are doing negative six points for removal of historic fabric for the sky lights? These points don't include the removed fabric from the windows? (Ms. Crump: Correct, the window opening on the rear façade was not taken into consideration for Policy 23: Removal of Historic Fabric. We would not want to double-dip and give them twice the negative points for the same thing under different policies.)
- Ms. Propper: I have two questions. 1) Landscaping. I understand that it is May, but still winter. When I went by the house, it does look barren. As opposed to the picture in the packet, I did not see anything else against the house. It seemed very barren. I am not in agreement that there is no landscaping needed. I would like to see more than what currently exists. It seems kind of stark. 2) The second question is about parking. There were three cars in the driveway, and it was full. It was not clear how the drive could fit four (4) spaces with the amount of space that exists there. (Ms. Crump: Parking spaces must be 18' x 9'; they are proposing to pave the driveway and move it slightly towards the south which allows for additional parking. One parking space is shifted north and the others are tandem spaces behind, directly abutting each other, they do fit on the site plan. It will be tight.) That looks tight. I will have comments on Design Standard 127.
- Mr. Giller: I hit on landscaping too. To clarify, Janet has aspens proposed, but during the process for the new foundation you are going to lose most of the plants that might remain. I suggest staff and Janet have a conversation about some landscaping or replacement of what is lost.
- Mr. Guerra: Great report. I have no questions.
- Mr. Leas: This is a complex project and you hit all the topics. The building directly on the property line, is that the typical placement? (Ms. Crump: They did not have modern survey techniques. This is a combined lot so the lot lines might have changed over time. The properties to the north and south also have structures directly on or abutting the property line.) (Mr. Kulick: We often see a lot of secondary buildings sitting on or just off of the property line. We are supportive of requiring an encroachment license agreement. I believe the most recent is the Ploss Residence. We advocated for the historic secondary structure to remain although it encroaches. If there was vehicle access behind, we would want them to bring it into compliance. Since there isn't vehicle access, we are supportive of keeping it in place.) Where I built in DC and

Maryland, the older buildings had alleys in the district. The text mentions an Encroachment License. Where I came from, we would simply ask for a variance as a recordation on the property into the future. Help me understand what an Encroachment License does. (Mr. Truckey: An Encroachment License Agreement allows a property owner to encroach onto public property, rights of way, etc.; we do it routinely.) (Mr. Kulick: It is a recorded document between the Property Owner and the Town that goes with the title.)

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect: Thank you to Chris and Sarah on this project. This is a very complicated project. The property owner has had this property for a couple of years. They are wanting to provide employee housing. This is a part-time residence for them. This is different than your typical shed. I want to elaborate on the openings. The openings on the east elevation, if you look at the historic photograph, we are trying to replicate the original window. It is currently a double-hung, it is not historic, probably added when a loft was added to the half story. We are trying to match the original window exactly. We can identify where the historic openings are when we do investigative research and some strategic demolition. [On the rear] the owner has expressed a desire to make the large window. The lower windows, the historic sides and head would be maintained, but we wanted to make a taller window back there. I did not realize that is a failing policy so we are not going to change the openings. We do have to put in new windows, but they would be the same dimensions as the existing. I did want to go over the openings on the secondary structure. There are a few dilemmas because this is an outbuilding and there are very few openings. There is a mismatch of stuff. I did bring photos because you cannot really see the shed in the historic photo in the packet. The north side of the shed needs operable windows for the residential part of the secondary structure. My idea for the front of the shed, we have the two historic garage doors opening and my idea was to use the openings (because the garage doors themselves are not historic) and recess the front wall plane but have that recessed so the garage door openings read clearly. Then we really accentuate with windows and corrugated siding where the garage doors were. There are five photos. These should help you see the exact condition of the shed. We do have to replace the siding on the shed; we cannot save that siding. The main house we can preserve the siding, with minimal replacements. We would replace the all siding materials on the shed, resembling what was originally there. I want to talk about the list of staff recommendations to keep this organized. Item 1, six points, we are doing all new with major restoration in their current locations. We appreciate that. Item #2 on staff recommendations, a long list of items and discusses Design Standard #23. That is about the negative six points for the removal of historic fabric, and we have to do that for the livability aspect of the shed and providing the housing unit. The enclosure of the historic door opening on the secondary structure. If you look at the photo that has the kayak, the door on the 4x4 bump out, which is added on storage, we would be happy to maintain that as a siding feature. The door would no longer be operable, but we would keep there for the story of the structure. You can see the mismatch things on the shed. The south elevation window of the shed looks like. It is a conglomeration of things that they did collect. The south side on the picture shows one window. I hope that gives a little more information on the current condition of the shed and what the existing openings look like. The one historic door on the shed, we could do that. I am down to the one issue; that has to do with the point analysis on Item #3; Design Standard #57 for the proposed changes to the historic door opening on the south elevation of the main residence. The policy says to “avoid changing the position of historic doors. It is especially important on significant facades. Avoid adding additional doors to facades visible from the street.” I am saying that I disagree with the points as a result of the historic door. The historic door is 6’4””; that door is currently 30” wide, we want to go to 3’, the front and back door openings are 2’8” and 2’6””. We need to have one 3’ wide door; as it is difficult to get furniture into the main residence with these historic doors. If we maintain the historic door opening position, we would be moving the right side of that door 6” to be able to have a 3’ opening door, we can keep the historic framing and header; it will not be functional anymore, because it will need to be sistered. We would only be taking away historic material on the right door jamb. I feel like adding another negative three points to this is not fair. If there was nothing on the shed wall, if we were to add a door and

window that would fall under the other negative points for historic fabric. It would not be another negative three points on top of the other negative six points that we have. That door opening should be part of the points associated with historic fabric that we are already receiving. To Susan, I would like to understand everyone's perception of the landscaping. I am happy to discuss, we would like to keep the landscaping away from the structure.

- Ms. Propper: I was talking about the front yard, not more trees, but more shrubbery when the project is near completion. For lack of better term, "spruce it up." That would be helpful. As far as the sky lights, are you keeping the existing roofing material?
- Mr. Sutterley: We are trying to look at the roof framing. We can try to get the skylights between the rafters. You will be losing the 1x sheathing that is sitting on top of the roof.
- Ms. Propper: On Design Standard 57, you still come out with two positive points. I am not sure that I would worry about the door situation.
- Ms. Sutterley: I am a little concerned about the precedent that this sets on future projects. Do you really see that as a negative three point hit right there?
- Mr. Frechter: There are a total of six bedrooms and four parking spots? Does parking have to go with the deed restriction? The main residence should only have two parking spaces. (Ms. Crump: The requirement for the main residence is three parking spaces because it has four bedrooms. The accessory dwelling unit is only required to have one parking space no matter the number of bedrooms. They are meeting the parking requirements.) I am just thinking that you have two families having to coordinate the tandem parking.
- Ms. Gort: What is the parking on the street? (Ms. Crump: Those are public parking spaces. We would not allow a project to be approved with deficient parking. They do have to meet the parking on-site for this residential project.) Could they park on the street? (Ms. Crump: The Town would not allow them to have an on-street parking permit because the property would not be considered deficient in parking because they are meeting the requirements.)
- Mr. Frechter: I think this is a logistical issue that the property owners will need to work out. (Ms. Sutterley: I agree. It is the only way that parking can be on the site. We looked at other organizations, but it was messing up the front yard which results in more negative points and obstructs the primary facade. We all recognize the parking issue for sure.)
- Mr. Giller: With all the site work that has to happen, would you be able to move the gas meter away from the main elevation? (Ms. Janet: Right now, I am leaving it on the front, but I would love that to be moved. Xcel is difficult to work with and we will address it when we get to that point. I would love to not have that on the front façade.) The shed is really fascinating to me. Certainly, the Town is paying attention to the evolving shed uses. One comment, the mismatch window aspects; that is the shed vernacular. Don't formalize it too much, the shed should not look too perfect.
- Mr. Guerra: Great project.

The hearing was opened to public comments. There were no public comments.

*Commissioner Comments:*

Commissioners were asked to give their opinion on ten questions in the packet and provide comments.

1. Historic Preservation – Staff has assigned positive six (+6) points for on-site historic preservation/restoration efforts of above average public benefit for a primary structure and positive three (+3) points for the secondary structure. Does the Commission agree?
2. Design Standard 23 – Does the Commission agree with the assigned negative six (-6) points for removal of historic fabric to include roof openings for two new skylights on the primary structure,

- four new window openings on the secondary structure, enclosure of one historic door opening on the secondary structure, and openings for two skylights on the secondary structure.?
3. Design Standard 57 – Staff believes the proposed increase in height of the rear historic door opening violates this standard and warrants negative three (-3) points. Does the Commission agree?
  4. Priority Design Standard 77 – Staff believes the proposal to enlarge and replace the historic upper window and to enlarge the historic lower horizontal window opening, both on the rear façade, cause the project to fail this policy. Does the Commission agree?
  5. Design Standard 91- Does the Commission agree the proposed random sizes and placement of new windows on the secondary structure meet Design Standard 91?
  6. Design Standard 127/ADUs – While the proposed ADU was assigned positive three (+3) points for the provision of a deed-restricted housing unit under Policy 24R, staff has also assigned negative three (-3) points under Design Standard 127 for utilizing the secondary structure as living space which is discouraged for the character area under this standard. Does the Commission agree with this assessment?
  7. Solar Panels – Does the Commission find the proposed location of the solar panels is compliant with Policy 5/A and the Handbook?
  8. Local Landmarking – Does the Commission find the property is eligible for Local Landmarking?
  9. Final Hearing – Does the Commission find the project is ready for a final hearing?
  10. Does the Commission have any additional comments?

Mr. Frechter: 1) Yes. 2) Yes, for fabric. 3) I say no, I don't think changing the size of the door qualifies as changing the position. No negative points. 4) Yes, but that is irrelevant because the applicant has agreed to change it. I do agree it fails. 5) I do agree with the random placement, yes. 6) I do not agree with the code, but I agree with the point calculation. Our job is to follow the Code; I believe at a future work session we should change that. 7) Yes. 8) Yes. 9) Yes. 10) No more comments.

Ms. Gort: Yes, for everything, except No. 3 on the door position. I do not agree with the minus three points. 10) Love the shed, that is what Breck is all about. Can't wait to see it.

Ms. Propper: 1) I agree. 2) I agree. 3) I think Mr. Frechter makes a good point and I do not agree with the points. 4) I am glad that Janet is willing to revise to original size so it will not fail. 5) I agree. 6) As it stands now, I agree with the allocation of points, but I would want us to consider changing Design Standard 127 to add "unless the living space is a deed-restricted accessory dwelling unit." Because I do think that is a current need and we should be encouraging that. 7) I agree. 8) I definitely agree. 9) I do think it is ready for final. 10) No additional comments.

Mr. Giller: 1) Agree. 2) Agree. 3) I semi-agree, functionality in codes matter. 4) Irrelevant because Janet said she would adjust the window. 5) Agree. 6) The ADU, Susan said it best. We should consider clarifying that. 7) Yes. 8) Agree. 9) Agree. 10) This is a really great project. Hats off to you. There are a lot of very good things, good execution.

Mr. Guerra: 1) Agree. 2) I agree. 3) I do not agree with the negative three points. 4) Agree. 5) Agree. 6) I'm in cahoots with Susan and everyone else. We do need to revise Design Standard 127. 7) Agree. 8) Agree. 9) Agree, it is ready for final. 10) I think this is a great project, great job.

Mr. Leas: 1) I agree. 2) I agree. 3) I do not agree the minus three points is warranted. So, I disagree. 4) Agree. 5) I agree. 6) I agree, but think that we should revisit that at a future meeting. 7) Agree. 8) Agree. 9) It is ready for final. 10) I think it is a great-looking project- making our Town look nicer.

#### **OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:12 pm.

---

Mark Leas, Chair