

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher            Dan Schroder            Trip Butler  
Gretchen Dudney           Michael Rath  
Gary Gallagher, Town Council Liaison

Dave Pringle and Jim Lamb were absent.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the April 17, 2012 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (5-0).

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the May 1, 2012 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (5-0).

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Palomo Building Change of Use (MM) PC#2012029, 105 North Main Street
- 2) Roedel Residence Addition (MGT) PC#2012030, 219 Byron Court

With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

### TOWN COUNCIL UPDATE:

Mr. Gary Gallagher, Town Council Liaison, introduced himself and updated the Commission on what the Council is currently working on.

1. Three new appointees for BOSAC
2. Rodeo: The Council has approved moving forward with certain conditions for the event; were looking to make it 10 evenings (5 weeks), requiring a refundable deposit assuming all conditions are met; land shouldn't be given for nothing (suggestion to share the cash flow). (Mr. Schroder: I like that the Town is going to support this.) The Town got over 200 emails about this event; once the event is over in August, the Town will go back and do a survey of businesses and residents who live near the site.
3. Town and County have agreed upon the architectural firm for the Harris Street CMC building; they will also study feasibility of a library in building along with secondary uses.
4. Riverwalk Center: Looking at current program but potentially expanded program and uses for the facility; what are the needs within and without to support current and potential uses? (Mr. Schroder: Glad to hear that the group is thinking beyond just the building, internally and externally.)
5. Public Works: IGA with CDOT on the roundabout will be moving forward (4 O'clock Road). (Ms. Dudney: Why a roundabout?) The traffic builds up, particularly in the winter, and gets extremely backed up; you get better traffic flow with the roundabout; putting in a traffic light would limit the traffic movement. They are also going to figure out a way to make pedestrian crossing safer within that area.

### WORKSESSIONS:

- 1) Pastor's House Restoration, Rehabilitation, Addition, Local Landmarking (MM) PC#2012031, 106 South Harris Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to restore and add a full basement to the historic house, move the historic shed, and build a one-story addition to the south rear portion (attached to the existing non-historic portion of the house).

Mr. Mosher explained that Policy 80A required connector links in three cases. 1. When the above ground density exceeds the standard 9 UPA; 2. When the masses of modules exceed that which is required in the Character Area; and, 3. When the proposed addition is greater than 50% of the primary existing structure.

The average module size of historic homes in this Character Area is 1,500 square feet. With the total above ground density proposed at 2,120 square feet, the project needs to be broken into smaller modules. The back of the existing house has an existing non-historic addition with an east facing bay window.

The plans show that, after the removal of the bay window, the new addition and the historic shed (after being moved) will be attached to this non-historic portion without all of the required criteria as described in Priority Policy 80A (design of connector links).

The newly submitted drawings show that one portion of the addition generally meets the intent of Policy 80A. The connection of the historic barn does not.

The barn is currently located over the east property line beside the house in the Town alley and is proposed to be moved to accommodate the proposed addition. The architect/agent is showing the barn moved away from the south corner of the lot to the north corner, moved 22-feet and behind the house. Staff would recommend negative points at development review for moving the shed. The historic barn would no longer be a separate out-building and would become a part of the main house. Though the barn will have better exposure of the south wall, the historic outhouse will no longer be visible. Staff is not supportive of connecting the barn to the main house as shown. Did the Commission concur?

With this proposal, we are seeing the proposed addition to the historic house resulting in the shed being moved 22-feet north, connected to the house and the new addition proposed without connector elements. Staff asked the Commission to answer the following questions based on the Development Code:

1. Did the Commission have any general comments on the proposed site layout?
2. Did the Commission support moving the shed from the south corner to the north corner of the lot?
3. Did the Commission find that the proposed plan meets the connector requirements of Priority Policy 80A?

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schroder: On page 34; 5-bullet items were presented. Possibly bullets 1 and 2 are different now. From what you presented now, 1 and 2 are both now in compliance, is that right? (Mr. Mosher: Correct. Since the report was written and published, the agent has submitted changes for your review. I have placed these in front of you.)

Mr. Rath: When you talk about the connector in relation to the width of the rest of the building, does it include the roof overhang? (Mr. Mosher: No, just to the building corners.)

Mr. Schroder: Regarding the outhouse, I was wondering about points and within Policy 80A, where does it say that we can't use a historic piece to be the connector? (Mr. Mosher: Policy 80A is an Absolute, hence points can't be assigned. Additionally, this policy asks for a connector when adding to a historic structure, not to use the structure as the link. In this case, the link is what is missing. Staff is not supportive of using historic structure as a link.)

Ms. Christopher: What is the difference between connecting the outhouse to the house or to the connector link? (Mr. Mosher: The connector link would then be too small. Also, we want you to think about the preservation of character within the historic district and what it means to lose that character.) Does the historic structure have to be left intact? (Mr. Mosher: If you moved the outhouse it would be assessed for points as if moving the whole structure since they are connected as one building.)

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect/Agent: People need to be able to develop their properties somehow. We need to be able to make them current with real uses and make them livable. What would I do if this were my own project? I would propose the same design. My clients want to add on another bedroom and have a den area somewhere. The property is under contract and it is contingent with what we can do with the property based on tonight's worksession. From what I understand, there are no Code issues from the addition to the south; we are not compromising the yard; the addition will sit back from the front and will be same size as the Pastor's house; they would like to add a garage as well. The connector link requirement has been met or will be met with the addition to the south. Two major options are: #1: Leave the shed where it is or #2: move the shed to the northeast corner as presented.

1. Do you support having the shed in this corner?
2. Is there a way we can all look at this outhouse and how to use it as a connector or to not have it. Look at ways to utilize the outhouse.

The clients don't want to remove the non-historic addition; we don't want to remove a bedroom to build another bedroom, as this is not a logical approach.

Reasons for moving the shed into the northeast corner:

- All sides of shed will be more visible from the alley in new location
- Horrible proximity of the adjacent yellow building to the current location of the shed
- All the sides will have more breathing room and will be more protected
- Sheds will be clustered together; this will open them up (and avoid an abrupt change in scale)
- Opportunity to mitigate the look of the yellow house next door
- Will display the shed more
- Use shed as the second bedroom; we cannot do that in the location where it currently sits

The yard will be shorter and wider once we move the south fence. We will lose a minimal amount of fabric using the outhouse as a connector, compared to building a new connector link. (Ms. Sutterley also presented photos and exhibits for the Commission to view.) (Mr. Mosher clarified that the shed currently sits 5 1/2-feet from the property line and after relocation, in either scenario presented, would be placed 3-feet from the property line.)

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Ms. Dudney: If you didn't have the outhouse connection, why you would have a greater loss of fabric? (Ms. Sutterley: Displayed drawings of Options A and B showing where the shed is proposed to be moved. No way to make the shed a bedroom if it was detached from the house.) What is the use of the shed going to be? (Ms. Sutterley: It would have to be storage if not attached to house. Circulation space to get to the bedroom/garage is an issue and important to the client.) Did you look at moving the shed and rotating it? So you have the longer edge of the shed on the east side? (Mr. Mosher: The shed isn't sitting equally on the ground; it was designed to follow a slope, so rotating the shed would not work on a flat surface.)

Mr. Schroder: I wouldn't be opposed to this as long as they meet the Codes. (Mr. Mosher: We need to have a passing point analysis and not lose any of the historic value.)

Ms. Christopher: If you were to put a connector link on any other side you would end up losing a significant amount of historic fabric? (Ms. Sutterley: The outhouse connector would be the same amount of space as a doorway connector.)

Mr. Rath: What would be the problem with actually keeping the shed on the same plane and general location but moving it forward (west) and using it as the master bedroom? (Ms. Sutterley: You mean move it forward on the lot? To be substituted for the new structure?) (Mr. Neubecker: So the shed is visible from the street and the alley as it is now?) Yes. (Ms. Dudney: I thought you said the shed was built on a slope.) (Mr. Mosher: One could backfill it to some extent.) (Mr. Neubecker: We ultimately want to avoid moving the shed any more

than it needs to.) I was trying to figure out how to make it more visible from Harris and the alley. (Mr. Neubecker: Ms. Sutterley has proposed two proposals. Proposal A is what she wants to do. Proposal B is showing what they could also do. Does Proposal A meet the Code? If it doesn't then we need to identify where it doesn't and what we need to do to help them meet the Code.)

Mr. Schroder: Seems like we are all starting to get a little emotional about this. We can't be subjective but we can give suggestions on how they can meet the Development Code.

Ms. Sutterley: I suggest we use the Secretary of the Interior Standards; they anticipate unique and project specific changes we can't see ahead of time. This is unique and they are all about rehabilitating the building and how to make it a useful structure. We need to look at the Historic Standards. (Mr. Neubecker: The Town's Standards are based in the Secretary of the Interior Standards and as these are the adopted documents; they supersede the Secretary of the Interior Standards.) I'd like to know your opinion about Option A. I don't know that moving the shed to the west is the correct thing to do but I am willing to look at that as an option. (Mr. Grosshuesch: I don't think there is a Code provision about moving the shed to make them visible; they are secondary to the original building, and don't need to be visible from the street. But, it has to be Code based. Retain historic structures on site with historical context, but it doesn't say that you can't move them.) (Mr. Jeremy Fisher, Contractor: Has a degree in historic preservation. Most sheds read from the alley, with a historical interpretation and honoring some of that, the shed should remain on the alley where it was.) Moving the shed forward will expose that entire yellow wall of the adjacent south building. (Mr. Grosshuesch: You don't have to build as much if you move it forward.)

Ms. Dudney: The problem seems to be the outhouse. What happens if they want to remove it entirely? (Mr. Mosher: The Code allows removal and would give negative points.)

Ms. Christopher: Can the outhouse go somewhere else? (Mr. Grosshuesch: If you took it off and put it somewhere else on the building then?) (Ms. Sutterley: The shed is less than 50% of the building, so do we need to have a connector link for that?) (Mr. Mosher: Yes, since it is historic fabric.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: I think the module size is the problem because you must have a connector link.)

Mr. Schroder: Seems like the outhouse is the problem for everyone.

Ms. Christopher: I feel like the outhouse could be considered a hardship—it is the sore thumb to the project. (Mr. Neubecker: Based upon the proposal, does it meet the Code? And if it doesn't, does it meet variance criteria?)

*Final Comments:*

Ms. Christopher: No, "A" doesn't meet Code. Feels there is a variance of hardship. Because Option B proposed creates hardship for the historic structure. Feel like the variance is better for the historic structure in giving it more space.

Mr. Butler: No, "A" doesn't meet Code. Can't compare them. Appreciating that the clients are trying to make it work.

Mr. Rath: Based on Code "A" does not work. Maybe a more creative way to look into this. Not a hardship case. There is a way to get more square footage with less footprint.

Ms. Dudney: Agrees with Mr. Rath. I can't approve option "A" since it doesn't meet Code. Would love to see it renovated but I can't see the basis for a variance.

Mr. Schroder: The outhouse is the issue. I would like to see it work but we need to angle on the Code and I can't support what I am seeing tonight. (Ms. Sutterley: To clarify on not supporting Option A, the primary reason is due to the outhouse/connector? Trying to understand and clarify the reading of the Code with your reasoning.)

**OTHER MATTERS:**

Mr. Neubecker: We are not doing the joint meeting on May 8th. Apologize for that. Hopefully we can do it in the future and bring those issues up with the Town Council. No other matters to discuss.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

---

Dan Schroder, Chair