

CRESTED BUTTE SOUTH PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

61 TEOCALLI ROAD, CRESTED BUTTE, CO 81224

PHONE (970) 349-1162, WEBSITE: www.cbsouth.net, FAX (970) 349-1163

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

April 16th, 2020

DRC Attendees Uberconference: Ben White, Eric Shull, Thomas Hein, Lori Holgate, Wes Bellamy

Staff Attendees: Dom Eymere

Motion: Approve the Minutes for March DRC meeting
Vote: The Motion to Approve the Minutes was unanimous

Business: **Zablocki Garage Addition**, Lot 15-17, Block 20, Filing #3, 249 Goren Street

Discussion: The project was introduced by Kent Cowherd. The project consists of a two door garage addition to Single Family Dwelling. It was commented that the parking area should be noted on the site plan and that the shed would need to be removed to keep in compliance with the rule of only one out-building per lot. Snow storage looked to be 33% of the plowed surface. All siding will match the existing color which is light green.

Motion: Eric made a motion to approve the project and Ben seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with the above conditions.

Business: **South Butte LLC, Two Duplex Residences**, Lot 7 and Lot 8, Block 9, Filing #2, 471 and 499 Cement Creek Road

Discussion: The project was introduced by Brian Morelan, the applicant. This is the second review of the project that was not approved in October of 2019. The project consists of one duplex on Lot 7 and one duplex on Lot 8. The Design Review Committee did not have much to comment on so the floor was opened up to public comment. It is noted that a petition was submitted the prior day, April 15th, that outlined some concerns. Andy Tyzzer was given time to speak and his concerns included: This project was more of a multi-family dwelling, that it should have two applications, a 10' setback or variance to driveway was not approved, the project needs to have a cost proposal submitted, and the perspective drawing should include the adjacent structures as outlined in the SAR. Additionally, contour lines should be included on the site plan, and the perspective is not accurate. Brian Morelan commented that this project should not be compared to pre-existing homes in the area and is a nice build. Dom commented that the DRC is working in good faith with both the applicant and the adjacent home owners, that the DRC is reviewing the project in a reasonable manner and that it's decisions are not arbitrary. Dom also commented that the petition did bring up some concerns, such as, roof break, two symmetrical buildings, and shared driveway. Ben White noted that two applications were submitted and that the petition submitted usually requires two-week notice. Wes indicated that the architecture fit the definitions in our Residential Design Guidelines and that the shed roof elevations may need additional roof breaks. Shull commented that the shared driveway was appropriate and consistent with other projects in the community and that the two buildings are in fact tow identical structures less the siding. Brian Morelan commented that two identical buildings have been approved in the past like 55 and 17 Elcho Avenue, the Ken Buck project. Dom commented that the Buck project is in a multi-family PUD project with a 9 unit building and a 14 unit building. With no additional comments Ben White suggested we continue the review, formally, with the DRC Checklist. The first item on the checklist includes: Neighborhood Context; Too Similar, Too Dissimilar or Appropriate? Ben White commented that the two duplexes were

excessively similar and if that gives cause for the application to not move forward. Wes commented that the review should move forward. It was agreed by the DRC that each building would be reviewed separately. Building A, Lot 7 was reviewed. It was noted that the landscaping may obstruct the view of motorists entering and exiting Blackstock Drive. It was recommended that the trees be replaced by low shrubs. Height was determined to be 29'8" tall. All trim is 1" x 4" wood and the project is constructed with 2" x 4" wood. The roof material is asphalt shingles and the Fascia is a 2' x 8 "construction. Wes noted that the building is well broken-up in terms of massing.

Motion: Wes made a motion to approve Building A, Lot 7, Ben seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Motion: No motion was made to approve Building B, Lot 8 and the DRC sited that it was Too Similar to Building A, Lot 7.

Discussion: Ben White indicated that the mass differences between the buildings would be appropriate and some architectural features that would make the buildings distinctly different. Brian Morelan wanted clarification on which building was approved. Brian than requested that since it is a relative difference between the two structures asked that Building B, Lot 8 be approved at this time.

Motion: **The Motion to Amend the previous Motion was made. Ben made a Motion to Approve Building B, Lot 8 and not Building A, Lot 7. Wes seconded the Motion and the Motion passed unanimously.**

Business: **Tucumcari, Multi-Family Residence, Lot C9, Block 4, Filing #2, 256 Elcho Avenue**

Discussion: Ben White recused himself from the DRC as he is the architect for the project. Ben introduced the project and explained that it was a six-unit Townhome project. The DRC reviewed the project. It was noted that the trees should be moved out of the snow storage area and closer to the street. A pedestrian easement and sidewalk are noted on the site plan. It was indicated that more changes in colors of the siding could be proposed to break up the mono color schematic of the elevations. No corner trim is proposed, the roof overhang is 1.6" on the side and 3' on the front elevations. Fascia will be a metal wrap. Dom asked if any of the units will have deed restrictions. Ben indicated that they do not at this time.

Motion: Eric made a motion to approve the project, Wes seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously with two conditions. Tree relocation and the site plan include 3' topographic lines.

Adjourn: 10:00 pm