

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Jim Lamb Eric Mamula Trip Butler
Dan Schroder Kate Christopher Gretchen Dudney
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:10pm
Jennifer McAtamney, Town Council Liaison, was absent

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The January 7, 2014 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (6-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the December 3, 2013, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. AT&T Cellular Installation at Red, White and Blue (MGT) PC#2013112, 316 North Main Street
2. Fox Center Change of Use (MGT) PC#2013114, 305-311 South Ridge Street

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

AT&T Cellular Installation at Red, White and Blue:

Mr. Mamula: We are doing both a cupola and a parapet? (Mr. Thompson: It won't change the appearance of the building. The southeast corner is where the new mechanical room addition is proposed, flat roof.) Have any neighbors made any comment? (Mr. Thompson: This is Class C and requires no public notice. The Town Attorney has advised not to notice applications that do not require notice.) It is not small, it is a full story, I have concerns about the size and that the neighbors are not notified. (Mr. Thompson: This won't make the building any taller. We explored the idea of attaching it to the rest of the building with the applicant, but it didn't fit anywhere else. It looks better this way than just having the equipment exposed.) I think it makes the building look odd from the alley, if I was a neighbor I might be annoyed. There are some houses nearby that will look on to this. (Ms. Puester: I think it should be called up if there are concerns.)

Fox Center Change of Use:

Mr. Mamula: How many parking spaces in the underneath garage like structure? (Mr. Thompson: The proposal is to take 10 parking spaces to be reserved for the new residential units out of the 21 existing parking spaces.) Is there elevator access to the parking? (Mr. Thompson: There is not. They have to work with the building department on accessibility.) You are good with this? (Mr. Thompson: Yes, we are good with this and we discussed that there would be assigned parking spaces to the units. Can't qualify for residential parking permits but they could get overnight parking permits at ice rink. The elevator decision will have to be made through the building department as it is a building code issue, not a development code issue.)

Mr. Mamula made a motion to approve Item 2 on the Consent Calendar (the Fox Center Change of Use, PC#2013-114, 305-311 South Ridge Street with the presented findings and conditions). Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion carried (6-0).

Mr. Mamula made a motion to call up the AT&T Cellular Installation at Red, White and Blue, PC#2013112,

316 North Main Street. Mr. Schroder seconded and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Thompson gave a presentation on AT&T Cellular Installation at Red, White and Blue, PC#2013112, 316 North Main Street. It doesn't increase the height but it does change the appearance of the back of the building. Staff worked with the applicant, Ms. Julie Noonan. Staff does believe that this is the best place to put the equipment after talking with the applicant on existing rooftop and building equipment. (Ms. Dudney: When the building was designed in the first place if this structure on it, would it have any problem getting planning approval?) Ideally it could have been approved, but may have been able to be more hidden.

Ms. Julie Noonan, Vertical Real Estate, Denver Colorado:

The plan is to patch a significant gap in coverage by AT&T. We want to fill the gap for safety reasons, most renters and visitors do not have landlines and if they don't have good coverage on the mountain or while in town this can be a problem. Red, White and Blue Fire Department has signed off on these plans. We have previously provided the names of the surrounding neighbors but we were told because this was Class C that we wouldn't need to contact them. I could take questions and concerns back to the architects.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Mamula: What is the actual height of the addition? What is the exposure you are going to see? (Mr. Thompson: The height is 11'6" but the parapet covers some so it is around 8'. Ms. Noonan pointed out to me the mechanical structures and air conditioning units shown are existing.) (Ms. Noonan: No other place to put the additional equipment because of the existing mechanical unit and air conditioning equipment.) (Mr. Thompson: Ms. Noonan did provide a letter that this equipment complies with all FAA and transmitting regulations.) It seems like the equipment doesn't take up the whole interior of the space of the equipment room. (Ms. Noonan: They save some space in this area in case there are other carriers who want to share the antennae space. I venture to guess is that AT&T will use the majority of the unit. Typically, we want a 25 year lease for this structure. We've reduced the term of the lease to 15 years in hopes that we can be more accommodating.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: If you look on Page 16 of the packet, the C2 drawing elevation, the mechanical room is recessed back in on the roof and not obtrusive from Main Street.) I understand that but it is obtrusive from the back for the neighbors behind this already big building. (Mr. Thompson: Pointed out the various equipment on the existing roof and existing mature landscaping in the photos.)
- Mr. Schroder: When I'm looking at the C2 drawing, could you tie the new space with a faux look? (Mr. Thompson: The air handler needs air so it can't be covered.) This is already a big structure, mechanical storage, there are big trees blocking it, so it seems that this new structure will fit in over time, it would grow on us pretty easily.
- Mr. Lamb: It only affects a few houses on the hill behind. (Ms. Puester: Is your concern that it isn't architecturally compatible?) I'm concerned that we are going to get an angry letter from neighbors. I don't have code concerns with the application. I just have people concerns.
- Ms. Dudney: This falls under a Class C because it falls under a commercial structure, so it would be approved it as an improvement to an industrial structure.
- Mr. Pringle: I don't have any code related issues. I would like to see the roof organized better so the new structure wasn't sitting on its own, but other than that I don't think that this addition is going to be too objectionable.
- Mr. Schroder: I have not code related issues.
- Ms. Christopher: I have no code related issues, I feel like it is a good design.
- Mr. Butler: I don't have any code issues either but I don't know what the neighbors will think.
- Mr. Mamula: I think it is architecturally incompatible with the building, it has a flat top on it, there is no intent to make this blend at all. I think there is an issue with the code if something like this that can go through without hearing from the neighbors. You need to let people who live in

the neighborhood have a say. I would give negative points to this for architectural incompatibility, policy 5R. The addition doesn't even fit with the building design itself. Stands out too much.

Mr. Lamb: I have similar concerns with it being incompatible, but I can hesitantly give it approval. I am worried about the neighbors. Are there any motions to change the point analysis?

Mr. Mamula made a motion to change the points to a negative three (-3) under general architectural incompatibility, Policy 5/R. Mr. Lamb seconded. Ms. Christopher, Ms. Dudney and Mr. Schroder voted no. Mr. Mamula, Mr. Pringle, Mr. Butler and Mr. Lamb voted yes. The motion carried (4-3).

Continued Discussion:

Ms. Noonan: The Structure can't be pushed closer to the building. (Ms. Puester: Would you like to continue the application and come back with modifications?) I don't know how to proceed. It seems like we are proceeding correctly with not noticing the neighbors. (Ms. Puester: With the negative three (-3) points, your project won't pass due to architectural incompatibility. (Mr. Thompson: The only thing you could change to not receive the negative points would be to change the architecture. I don't see where you could make up positive points as a lessee on an existing building.)

Mr. Mamula: If you had more of a pitched roof on the shed it could be more compatible, this might help. The way the existing parapet is constructed is to mirror something on old Main Street. Need to blend this in more.

Ms. Dudney: If the applicant came forward with some kind of line of sight renderings and the neighbors agreeing with it, would this change your mind?

Mr. Mamula: No, it needs to be architecturally compatible.

Mr. Pringle: I agree with Mr. Mamula; it could be re-designed so that it would incorporate it better with the existing building. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Did you notice how the siding and detail matches?)

Mr. Mamula: It doesn't mimic any other roof lines, pitched roof? (Mr. Thompson and various Commissioners made some rough drawings to pitch the roof.)

Ms. Christopher: I think they've done a lot of things to make this look better than other industrial additions. (Ms. Noonan: It would add height to the roof and the neighbors may have more of an outcry of the additional height with a gable.)

Mr. Pringle: Our decisions will be code based, not public opinion. I want this to be approved but it needs a little more work. You're close but need a little more compatibility.

Mr. Lamb: We do understand the safety concerns but we want the compatibility element addressed. (Mr. Thompson: If they add this roof, Mr. Grosshuesch pointed out that it could make the application fail because the height increase will cause negative points.)

Mr. Mamula: If you look at photograph C1, it looks like there is room to readjust, south view, there are pitched elements on the south view, east to west, that the equipment on the inside could be readjusted and that there is a large portion that is empty. The pitch would need to go the opposite way, east to west, like the view looking north.

Mr. Lamb: Could the walls go down with a lower roof?

Mr. Butler: There is the parapet with the band, could you drop down the band.

Mr. Pringle: There should be a way to connect it to the existing wall or mimic an existing roof. (Ms. Puester: Would you like to request a continuance?) (Ms. Noonan: Yes, I would like to request a continuance, but I need guidance.)

Mr. Lamb: It is hard to give you direction without actually designing it, but we want it to be more consistent with the rest of the building so that it will be more compatible. We have consensus that this is fixable and that we can get this to work.

Ms. Christopher: Don't be discouraged, we need another cell phone tower, we can get this through.

Ms. Dudney: Since we operate with the code, the basis of this rejection, excessive similarity or

dissimilarity to the structure it is being added too.

Mr. Lamb: Staff will work with you too on ideas to help get this through. We want to get this through.

Mr. Mamula made a motion to continue AT&T Cellular Installation at Red, White and Blue, PC#2013112, 316 North Main Street, to a date to be determined by the applicant and staff. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Epic on French Duplex (MGT) PC#2013113, 308 North French Street

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to construct a new, 3,538 sq. ft. duplex with an attached 649 sq. ft. garage. Each unit will be comprised of three (3) bedrooms and three and a half (3 ½) baths, two gas fireplaces, a one car garage and one outdoor tandem parking space. Access is proposed via a shared driveway with the lot to the south. The design includes two small covered porches at the entrance to both sides of the duplex on the west and east elevations. Exterior materials are comprised of horizontal 4” reveal James Hardie Artisan painted lap siding, natural wood trim, and a natural moss stone 16” veneer and chimneys.

Changes from the September 3, 2013, worksession:

1. The mirror image of the duplex has been eliminated.
2. Connectors have been redesigned.
3. The primary façade width has been adjusted to have depth equal to offset setback to appear narrower.
4. 3’ wide windows have been removed.
5. Lower oval windows have been removed.
6. Intersecting gables have been removed.
7. Barn doors have been redesigned.
8. Full height chimneys per Town of Breckenridge comment.
9. The landscaping plan has been revised and increased sizes have been added.
10. The solid to void ratio of windows has been revised.
11. All upper roofs are asphalt shingles.
12. All lower roofs are 7/8” corrugated mill steel.
13. Stone veneer not to exceed 18” has been added at foundation.

Commissioner questions:

1. Did the Planning Commission believe the primary façade has been designed to portray 1 and ½ stories tall? Did the Planning Commission believe the two-story aspect of the façade is adequately setback from the street?
2. Is the Planning Commission comfortable with the designers considering paint, painted stucco, or exposed fasteners 24 gauge flat mill steel instead of the stone base? Staff is concerned with any proposal other than stone for covering the foundation. Staff welcomed any Commissioner comments.
3. Staff believes the proposed shared driveway deserves positive one (+1) point under this policy (18/R). This would require an easement across the lot to the south. Did the Commission concur with positive one (+1) point?
4. Staff believes that at least two of the 6’ to 8’ spruce trees in the front yard need to be increased to 10’ and 12’ in height to be large enough to have immediate visual impact and meet this design standard. If the landscaping revisions discussed in the report are met, Staff may support positive two (+2) points for the landscaping plan. Did the Commission concur?

The applicant displayed R Panel versus the corrugated metal roof for discussion.

On energy conservation, the applicant was trying to make this a LEED certified, HERS index 41-60 would receive a positive points. Optional solar panels are proposed on connectors.

The Planning Department recommends the Planning Commission allow this application to go to a Final Hearing as the applicant has agreed to lower the above ground UPA below 9.0 UPA. Staff believes that adjustments need to be made to the landscaping plan, foundation treatments, the rear module needs to be at least two feet lower than the connector element, and the chroma of the body color needs to be reduced a maximum of 4.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: If you go to the rendering on our plans, I have question on the setback. The second floor appears that it is in line with the gable with the pop out below it, it looks like a two story element. But the plan view does not look like it is the same. (Mr. Thompson: The architect can address this.)
- Mr. Mamula: I'm assuming that staff is also indicating that it is failing 80A for the connector height? (Mr. Thompson: Yes that is correct, Mr. Mamula. But the applicant has agreed to make all the changes.)
- Mr. Schroder: I only see 4 parking spots for 6 bedrooms total. (Mr. Thompson: A single family house needs to have 2 parking spots and a duplex is required to have 4 parking spaces, it is not designated based on number of bedrooms. A third roommate couldn't get a residential parking permit to park on the street as the required parking will be provided on-site for this duplex.)
- Mr. Pringle: What requirement does the property to the south have with their parking, because they load it up pretty good? (Mr. Thompson: Yes, this was discussed so that the neighbor does not need to change their rear parking area, staff would like to allow the present condition to remain.) I own the property immediately to the East.
- Mr. Lamb: Does anyone have an issue with Mr. Pringle being a part of this discussion? (No objections from anyone.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Garrett Hasenstab, Applicant, Mr. Greg Jordan, Applicant, and Ms. Mary McCormick, Architect:

Ms. Mary McCormick, Architect: Brought a color board and colored landscape plan. The six issues, the 9UPA, has been taken care of. The trees in the front are shown, landscape plan shows the buffer. I can agree with the swap of the spruce tree and the cottonwood around the parking area. Milled steel was proposed in the recessed patio area so that the module and connectors act as different elements and at the base of the patio area. (Ms. Christopher: Are they large squares that are attached one over the other?) No, they are full length sheets. (Mr. Lamb: When would the wood start, how far above grade?) 8" base continuous around the patio, and near the garage the grade would come up to it so it would be a clean detail of about 8", the foundation will not be exposed. (Ms. Dudney: No stucco?) No stucco, either steel or stone. Resolution for the connector height is in motion. The Munsell Book of Color system is new to me but our plan will conform. To answer the question about the front façade and low sloping roof, the second floor comes back 6' but the roof comes back 8'. (Ms. Dudney: I can read this better on the color rendering you brought.) Showed the corrugated R-panel steel proposed for the lower roofs comes pre-painted. We would like your opinion on this. We are prepared to bring moss stone and a lighting sample for our final hearing. Solid / Void ratios on entry doors are 1/3 to 2/3.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: Metal foundation cover, why do you prefer this over stone? (Ms. McCormick: It is preferable for maintenance for shovel and clean off patios and to set the base for the connector element. The milled steel would just be in the patio and connector elements only. The stone would be around all of the rest of the building foundation except for the inset patio and the connector. Pavers will have an inset to hold the pervious patio together.)
- Ms. Christopher: Do we have any precedent on using multiple foundation materials? (Mr. Thompson: There is

no discussion of any steel for foundation covering and many historic buildings did not have an exposed foundation. If there was an exposed foundation it would have a low covering of stone not to exceed 18” above grade. Historic guidelines discuss simplicity and not a lot of ornate details. We did approve steel on Mountain Goat. We have completely corrugated steel on other buildings around such as the old Racers Edge.) My concern was the use of different materials.

Mr. Butler: It seems like a good project.

Mr. Schroder: The Historic District Guidelines encourage parking in the rear, but I like that with this give and take. I’m supportive of the side parking and that it is shielded well.

Mr. Pringle: It seems like the lot drops off from west to east significantly and we don’t seem to be taking that into consideration. Would you consider making a grade break to the existing grade to break up the module? (Mr. Thompson: I agree that it would be preferable.)

Ms. Christopher: Are they proposing to fill it? (Mr. Thompson: I would like to let the architect explain that.)

Mr. Pringle: Concerned about the big drop this will create. (Mr. Thompson: I understand and agree because this is where the nice pocket of existing trees and I would hate to lose them to grading.) (Ms. McCormick: Refer to A 2.4 drawing, General Section. I stepped down the garage and the rear unit. In the effort to meet the connector requirement and make sure our second floor is connected, we couldn’t drop down the main building roof and still meet the connector height rule. The building and grading plans will meet the standards for drainage for the town.) I would like to see the building drop down with the grade in the rear of the lot.

Mr. Mamula: I have to say, this is happening because we’ve allowed connectors to be living areas and not just connectors. We’ve made the 2’ rule and that is why we are getting this problem and the connectors have spun out of control. I think we need to bring this up with Council. Height of the connector should be clearly lower than the masses they connect. The Code says at least 2 feet lower, not necessarily just 2 feet.

Questions for Staff:

Mr. Mamula: Connectors: I think it should be lower, it is reading as a long undisturbed roof line. Connectors are still an issue for me. Foundation Covering: I don’t mind the use of a new material, but how the module is now, it’s not going to be all stone. It is going to read as very fake now. If built in the 1800’s the module would be all a stone base and the connectors could maybe something different, metal ok there. Façade: I think the primary façade reads correctly with the rest of the street. Driveway: I’m good with the shared driveway, but I think you need to be careful with who your neighbors are; always overcrowded there. I agree with everything else that the staff brought up and you all did a good job.

Mr. Butler: Primary façade looks great. The two story aspect is adequately set back. The connector should have the steel not the module. I concur with Staff’s comments on trees.

Ms. Christopher: Thank you for all the changes. I agree with the façade. I have a concern with a change of use of metal to stone. I think stone is more historically accurate, but I’m not good with two different materials. Good with changing the landscaping to hide the driveway and make the trees bigger. I’m good with the shared driveway and I commend your changes.

Ms. Dudney: You did a good job portraying the one and half story. I agree; I don’t see the code stating you need to make the connector smaller but I agree with Mr. Mamula. I don’t have any objection to the mix or the metal but I agree it should be consistent on the module. I agree that the landscaping sizes should be increased and I support the shared driveway.

Mr. Pringle: I have a question on the front façade and the shed roof and that we would look at the primary roof shed as one storey and not the total at one and a half. I see that it reads as a one and a half story, I don’t have a problem with this. (Mr. Thompson: Code says 1 to 1 and a half story.) The flat mill steel I don’t have a problem with the material, but I think the major residential module with the stone and only incorporate the metal on the connector elements.

I don't have a problem with the shared driveway but I would caution you with your agreement with the Chalet House and the residential unit, this is a pretty busy driveway as it exists you will need a tight agreement with these neighbors. Also the snow stacking has been pushed against the back fence all the time. I agree with moving the spruce out of the back corner. Finally, this is a night and day project when you first brought it in. I do wish you could have broken the roof lines a little bit more; it sure would look nice if you could step it down. (Ms. McCormick: Please take it in consideration that the connectors are offset so it will look different when built.)

Mr. Schroder: I concur with Mr. Pringle. I like the steel but keep it on the connector. Question 1: I agree with the façade and that it is adequately setback. The driveway, I am supportive to increase landscaping to make this robust and to make an immediate impact from the street.

Mr. Lamb asked if the Commissioners supported the R Panel roof material:

Mr. Mamula: No.

Ms. Christopher: Could this ever be stained or weathered for the R panel? Yes.

Mr. Butler: Yes.

Ms. Christopher: It feels like a shed not a house; I have a problem with the solid painted color. It should weather.

Mr. Pringle: I believe that corrugated is the appropriate material for the Historic District, but a regular shingle is a better look. Don't paint it, doesn't weather well.

Ms. Dudney: It doesn't bother me; I think it should be weathered not painted.

Mr. Schroder: I would like to see this when it is done.

Mr. Lamb: I do think it looks like a one and half story building. I am hearing the concerns with the milled steel. I think it could be done, but the group thinks it should be consistent on module vs. connector. I would recommend doing the larger trees even though you don't need points and I like the shared driveway. I think a standard corrugated rusted roof would like better. I think there is precedent for using this material. (Ms. McCormick: I don't mind the recommendation to use all shingle, the rear unit's family room area is the intention to bring it down to single story height, does the corrugated metal make it more barn like or should there be shingle on the roof as a one story element.)

The Commissioners gave their opinions on what they like about corrugated metal when it looks like it on "added-on" elements. Weathered metal is more historically preferable. No opinion on how it gets weathered.

Mr. Lamb opened the hearing to Public Comment:

Mr. Michael Cavanaugh, 208 North Ridge and Unit 10, Val D'Isere: I would like to see the James Hardie lap siding and have a question on if these modules are built on site or if they are brought in as modules. (Ms. McCormick: This is a hybrid.) (Mr. Thompson: Would the Commission prefer to see a Hardie board with the imitation wood grain or with the flat?) (Mr. Mamula: I thought in the historic district we prefer to see smooth to look like paint?) (Ms. Dudney: This isn't in code?) (Ms. Puester: Inside the historic district it is standard that it is a smooth board.) (Mr. Lamb: Is everyone in agreement?) Is it fire retardant? (Mr. Thompson: Yes it is cementitious siding, Hardie board.) It looks like a good project.

There was no more public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Hasenstab: Based on your and staff guidance, when might we be able to proceed with final hearing? (Mr. Lamb: That is up to staff, based on the direction we've given you. It is based on the schedule too.)

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Class C Subdivisions Approved July - December, 2013 (Memo Only)

Ms. Puester presented a memo listing the Class C Subdivisions approved from July to December of 2013.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Jim Lamb, Chair