

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Leigh Girvin	JB Katz	Michael Bertaux
Dan Schroder	Jim Lamb	Dave Pringle arrived at 7:07pm
Rodney Allen was absent		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the minutes of the December 1, 2009, Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (5-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda for the January 5, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (5-0).

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Bradley Residence Historic Renovation and Landmarking (MM) 213 E Washington Avenue
Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to perform an extensive exterior and interior remodel that will include a full basement beneath the historic footprint. A new small shed was also proposed at the southwest corner of the property. The existing deck that crosses the west property line would be removed. Local landmarking of the property was also requested.

Staff believed that the proposed improvements would greatly improve the “livability” of the residence. The house currently has a clear head-height of 6’-8”. 7’-0” is the current building code minimum. The crawlspace and joists have mold. Staff believed that this remodel would change the non-compliant detailing and roof forms of the house to those more compatible with the character of Breckenridge and contribute to the historic character of the neighborhood and community.

The presented plans indicated a proposed remodel that would bring the architecture of the house into compliance with the Town’s Historic Guidelines and in this Character Area. The changes would include:

1. The footprint/perimeter walls would remain the same; no additional density is to be added above ground.
2. Maintain the historic exterior walls and remaining historic openings.
3. Raise the plate height of the walls 6 to 12 inches to allow for window and door headers and to meet building code.
4. Replace the low sloping roof(s) and create a new roof with a steeper 10:12 pitch with one added dormer. (Priority Policy 161.)
5. Create a front porch. (Design Standard 162 and 169.)
6. Remove the non-compliant, non-historic windows and replace with vertically orientated double hung compliant wood windows. (Historic openings will be verified prior to final approval.)
7. Repair the historic windows as needed.
8. Create a full basement (along with the landmarking) for additional living space.
9. Build a new detached shed (outbuilding) for storage. (Design Standard 159 and 167.)
10. Reside the structure with historic compliant horizontal lap siding 4-4 1/2 exposure. (Priority Policy 165.)
11. The roof would be re-sheathed with historic compliant cut wood shingles.
12. The house would be shifted slightly on the lot squaring it up to allow for parking on-site. As a result, negative three (-3) points would be incurred for not meeting the relative side yard setback along the south property line.
13. The house would have substantial permanent electrical, plumbing, and/or mechanical system upgrades.

Staff has reviewed the landmarking proposal with the Town Historian and the Town Attorney. The house was built in 1928 in Dillon and moved to Breckenridge in the 60’s. The Town Historian would support locally landmarking the building after the remodel and adjusting the Cultural Survey to reflect the change; however, it would still not be eligible for the national registry. The Town Attorney would support the required criteria under the Landmarking Ordinance as a “significant remodel”.

Staff also suggested that the remodel would significantly “enhance(s a) sense of identity of the community” as identified under section c.1. to allow it to be locally landmarked.

The Applicants would seek to locally landmark the house with the planned remodel and renovation. The sequence of this process will be explained with the pending development application (depending on the outcome of this worksession). All historic framing, windows and most of the roof fabric will be preserved. Staff welcomed any Commissioner comments.

Janet Sutterley, Architect for the proposed renovation: Ms. Sutterley first explained the existing site plan, and the resubdivision (moving the existing lot line such that it does not bisect the existing homes) that occurred previously, and then explained the proposed site plan which included shifting the building northerly on site to allow 2 on-site parking spaces for the unit. Currently all parking is in the Town right of way. Ms. Sutterley explained the existing conditions of the building, including the low ceiling heights, lack of window headers and rotted floors. The floor elevation of the house will not change with the proposal, but head height and windows would be updated to meet code. No main level square footage would be added with this proposal. It is a very simple architectural proposal, and created to strictly meet the historic design criteria of the East Side Character Area. A small porch would be added to the east side of the house and non-historic one removed. This residence is the gateway to the residential district coming down French Street, and is a great opportunity to make improvements.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Girvin: Can you please explain the other house next door? How much over density is it? (Mr. Mosher: The property got divided and it was determined that the large addition was over density. The north little portion is the historic home. As part of the subdivision, all existing density was “grandfathered” and no more can be added.) It is also important to recognize that this house did come from historic Dillon, a part of our community. (Mr. Pringle: Most of the home isn’t being preserved, only a few windows.) The structure is being preserved. I don’t disagree with Mr. Pringle, but at the same time I respect the effort that has gone into the project and I think it could contribute to the historic character of the community and respect its historic roots as a house that came from Dillon. I’m okay with the landmarking and adding the basement and ask that the architecture follow the simple historic guidelines, and its original form and function. I am not a fan of heated driveways. I would be proud of a building that was a remodel, rather than razing this structure and building something new. I would rather see this restored.
- Mr. Bertaux: It is a result of a couple ordinances regarding density and how it can be added to the basement. I am inclined to see it scraped and build something else there. (Mr. Mosher: This would be very difficult to accomplish as the available density would be reduced by about 1/3 and significant negative points would be incurred.) There’s not much historic there. I’d rather see it relocated somewhere else, maybe back to Dillon. It is a great effort, but we seem to be manipulating the system. I agree with what Ms. Katz said; that the house would just get bigger if it was removed and would be out of place. Where is the historic value? (Ms. Sutterley: The historic value of the building.) (Ms. Girvin: Someone actually hauled it all the way over from Dillon, and then moved it again in town and continued to preserve it. Someone cared enough.) Are wood shingles something we really want? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, historically accurate.) There are some windows for egress on the lower level and a door? (Ms. Sutterley: No doors, just windows to reduce impact.) I’d like to hear more from the town attorney and next set of findings.
- Ms. Katz: I appreciate what Mr. Pringle is saying, but I think that we can improve this property and maybe it is even a dangerous property as it exists now. I agree with Mr. Mosher that if we manipulate the density or other policy areas of the code it is much more compromising than the landmarking ordinance that we are dealing with in this situation. We could end up with a much larger home on the lot.
- Mr. Pringle: Exterior siding will not be saved, will it? Windows? What will be saved? (Ms. Sutterley: Windows yes, siding no, none is historic (T-111 paneling). The interior walls will be saved.) It is a building that was not built here, there is no historical significance to the town, but what are we really saving? (Mr. Mosher: The goal is for the property to better contribute to the town character and be made livable. Improve economic viability of the site. If you scrape it the density would be significantly reduced.) Can you buy some density? (Mr. Mosher: The Code does not allow any transfer into the historic district.) Can’t we find a way to get them the basement without the historic

landmarking? (Mr. Mosher: We can't add any more density to the property because it is so far over already. The best option for a passing proposal is landmarking, and it does meet the criteria.) Could they rebuild this house if there was a fire? (Mr. Mosher: No, due to the notes on the plat.) I am puzzled that we have a property that we can't improve, without compromising our standards. When our processes defeat our purposes, we need to take a look at things. I think there should be a way to accomplish a remodel or a rebuild without having to compromise the landmarking ordinance. (Mr. Mosher: When we come back we can bring draft findings of the process and how it will come together, how it meets the criteria for landmarking, etc.) I think the findings are cleaner with the historic remodel text, not the enhancement to the community.

Mr. Schroder: Are we short one year on the age of the home for historic landmarking? (Mr. Mosher: That is when it was moved from Dillon, the house was built much earlier. There is historic fabric as part of the home and we want to make the house contribute to the historic character of the town.) The guidelines don't have a problem with the fact that it got here in 1961? (Mr. Mosher: No. It was moved from Dillon, similar to the Cooney house on French Street. Several homes in Breckenridge were moved from other areas that are historic.) I hear what Mr. Pringle was saying, but I am comfortable with the description and what remains of the original, and also when it was originally built in Dillon in 1928. Parts of that home are now in Breckenridge. Is there a social historic component? (Mr. Mosher: Social is related to people, and it contributes in the fact that it is a simple form, small footprint, etc. As far as social, nothing.) I would be hopeful that the value of historic structures from anywhere in our County is important; it is the broader community. There may even be more historic fabric that we don't even know about yet this early in the process. I am in favor of moving forward.

Mr. Lamb: Are you just heating the 61 square foot snow storage area? (Ms. Sutterley: I think we could potentially locate it on site, or in a heated area, we aren't sure yet.) What is the total density on the two lots? (Mr. Mosher: I'm not sure, but they are significantly over.) If we allow density, scraping it, or other variances on this site, I am wary of the floodgate it could open to future development. We are being site specific on this site; it is a unique property from 1928 that has been moved several times. (Mr. Mosher: Mr. Berry said that this would be considered a unique situation.) I like this and think we can make a strong argument that it has a history, and this is our only option to make a house in the historic district fit in and looks pretty good. We are taking the home back to its historic look, which is a good thing. Would the roof load be 100 lbs? (Ms. Sutterley: Yes.)

Mr. Rossi: Do you think it would be helpful to have the town attorney reply to our concerns? (Mr. Mosher: Yes. We didn't do too much detail yet because this is a worksession.) It would help me and the Planning Commission to understand the findings for landmarking. (Ms. Katz: I think that the town attorney should write a letter regarding these findings.)

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Rossi: We are taking a look at the Gondola Lots Master Plan and points analysis. We also landmarked the Theobald Building. (Mr. Pringle: There were some concerns from the community regarding the lost parking in the Sawmill Lot and moving that parking around. Is the Council going to respond to that?) That is also one of the struggles that the Council had, but the project was called up regarding the points analysis.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Tyndall Residence (MGT) PC#2009053; 584 Discovery Hill Drive
Mr. Bertaux: What is El Prestique? (Mr. Mosher: Asphalt shingle)
2. Breckenridge Park Meadows Exterior Remodel (CK) PC#2009054; 110 Sawmill Road
3. Klack Cabin (MM) PC#2009055; Klack Place

With one request for call up, the remainder of the consent calendar was approved as presented.

Ms. Girvin made a motion to call up the Klack Cabin, PC#2009055; Klack Placer. Ms. Katz seconded. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Mosher presented a brief description of the proposal to rotate the cabin 180 degrees in place to orient the doors towards the center of the Klack instead of five feet off the east property line.

- Ms. Girvin: This is in my back yard. This needs to be looked at an overall component of the Klack, not just a cabin. In fact it is a barn, not a cabin. The Klack is a significant open space and habitat. The barn historically supported the community and likely supported a residence at 209 South Harris, a carriage house for the residence and horses. I think changing the orientation destroys the significance. What is it doing now? It needs to be interpreted as how it related to the homes on Harris Street, and how it relates to the Klack in its entirety. The Klack has been harmed by the construction in the area; there is mud, new weeds, and flooding. There is a tree next to the cabin as well, and will it be removed with the orientation change? I don't think it is necessary to flip the building. More protection to the Klack needs to be provided and natural resources need as much protection as the building. (Mr. Mosher: Interpreting its relationship to the house now is different, as the historic houses that were there are no longer, and there is only five feet to the new house. In the future, a tour coming with 14 people would likely disrupt the neighbors and trespass. The doors could be oriented so people could see them. (Ms. Larissa O'Neill, Breckenridge Heritage Alliance: It is our understanding that there could potentially be a trail that goes through the Klack Placer and the barn could be better interpreted by passers-by with the re-orientation.) Yes, in the Town's trail master plan. (Mr. Tony Harris, Contractor: The topography wasn't changed with the construction. The surge does more damage than we have done. The vegetation will be replaced. The tree that Ms. Girvin mentioned stays. The building will be repaired and placed on gravel. Come spring time, you hopefully will not even see where we were.) I have been photographing the Klack for many years and it carries a large amount of water and creates a very unique environment. All of our wildlife find the Klack very important. It is not just the cabin/barn that needs protection. The Klack needs to be improved. (Mr. Mosher: This could be done by staff in the Town.) If you are going to bring tours here, we should make it look really nice. (Mr. Mosher: I think Ms. Girvin's comments regarding restoration of any damage to the soil are very important and if we need to look at improving the Klack, a separate permit would be processed with input from Engineering and Public Works.) I think it is great that the town is restoring it, but we need to keep the context in mind and if we need to flip it to make it more accessible let's improve the area, not just the cabin.
- Mr. Lamb: We need to ensure that next spring the ditch isn't flooding, the vegetation gets restored, soil compacted and regraded to achieve some of these ideas.
- Ms. Katz: I appreciate Ms. Girvin's concerns regarding re-orienting the cabin, but I think since it is a Town project and we are only spinning it I think it will be okay. I appreciate the comments and I think we have to do this because tours will want to be at the opening to the building.
- Mr. Lamb: I think that spinning it will be an improvement in the future.
- Mr. Pringle: What is the permit type for this? What was ever written and agreed to in that? (Ms. O'Neill: Two phases: stabilization and protection of the cabin.)
- Mr. Bertaux: The cash bond provision #14, who pays that? The Town or the Heritage Alliance? I think it will be a good project.

Ms. Katz moved to approve Klack Cabin, PC#2009055, Klack Placer, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Bertaux seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously, (6-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Class C Subdivisions Approved 7/1/09 through 12/31/09 (CN) (Memo Only)
 2. Class D Development Permits 1/1/09 through 12/31/09 (CN) (Memo Only)
- Summary memos on Class C Subdivisions approved during the second half of 2009 and Class D Development permits approved for the entire year 2009.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Jim Lamb, Vice Chair