

# CRESTED BUTTE SOUTH PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

---

61 TEOCALLI ROAD, CRESTED BUTTE, CO 81224  
PHONE (970) 349-1162, WEBSITE: [www.cbsouth.net](http://www.cbsouth.net), FAX (970) 349-1163

---

## MINUTES

### DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) January 28<sup>st</sup>, 2021

DRC On-line Attendees: Wes Bellamy, Ben White, Eric Shull, Lori Holgate

Public Attendees: Joe Buckel, Andy Tyzzer, Craig Maestro

Staff Attendees: Dom Eymere

**Call to Order:** 6:10 pm

**Business:** **Buckel Single Family Residence**, Lot C7, Block 5, Filing #2, 225 Gillaspey Ave.

**Discussion:** Joe Buckel opened the discussion on the changes to the plans since the last meeting. Site plan was updated to reflect the corrections. Landscape plan was talked about by Joe. Eric Shull asked about the unfinished space above the garage and the separate entrance. Eric followed up about the parking and suggested that an additional space be provided. Eric wanted to see the site plan show specifically the parking spots.

Ben White addressed a potential issue with the roof over-hang for the accessory dwelling door as it relates to head height and clearance. Eric continued to ask about additional parking for the future accessory unit. Joe thanked Eric for the comments. Eric continued to request the addition of another parking space. Wes concurred that it would be appropriate to include additional parking. Ben stated that there was adequate space on the site plan to include more parking if Joe was inclined to.

Ben motioned to move on with the review. Joe addressed the elevation drawings and the concerns from the first review. This includes a raised roof line and siding to break up materials. Metal siding 25%. Joe would like to do the whole garage in metal. He asked about allowing up to 33% metal and the DRC's tolerance for metal siding. Joe talked about the no-trim concept on the windows where there is metal siding. The 2/12 pitch was noted by Joe as well.

Craig asked if the project was residential or commercial. Joe indicated that it was residential. Craig went down a list of items quickly and asked if these items have been submitted including a stamped set by an engineer. Joe commented that it was not. Joe asked if there were any more questions.

Ben took some time to talk about meeting procedures and outlined the process. Ben asked about time limits. Dom comment that 2 to 5 minutes can be allotted. Ben asked about when the checklist would be relevant regarding the meeting procedures. Dom indicated we are still in the time allowed for DRC questions and answers from the applicant.

Ben made a statement that the DRC will take a moment to ask questions about the project from the applicant. Craig interrupted the proceedings to make a comment. Dom stated that the DRC still has the floor, and public comment will be taken after.

Eric asked about the metal calculations and wanted to see the calculations on the plans. Wes spoke to the metal calculations, elevations and commented that the siding looked good as proposed.

Dom opened it up to public comment. Craig indicated that the application was incomplete, and he stated several items in the process and particularly emphasized the stamped engineered plans. Craig stated that “stamped engineered plans is #1 on the **(explanative)** item on the application. Ben commented that the public comment was out of order. Craig insisted that stamped engineered plans are required and demanded why are still reviewing this project.

Dom spoke to the fact that it is not required and has never been during the design review phase of a project. Craig insisted that it was number one on the process summary. Ben indicated that it will be noted and that the review continues. Wes made comment that stamped plans are required, but not during the review process. Craig feels that it is unfair and that it should be required as listed in the “process summary” document. The application should have never been accepted by the Association Manager. Ben indicated that there is no cause, as stated above, to delay review of the project and that we should move on.

Dom asked about any additional comments. Eric indicated that during a review the DRC may require changes during the project and that it is not feasible to require stamped engineered plans. Eric asked about additional public comment. Eric made a motion to continue with a formal review. Ben noted that Craig was no longer on the call and asked if we should pause the meeting. Dom suggested we take a two-minute break. The meeting went into recess. (Pause)

After two minutes, Ben was given the floor to go through the checklist. Ben asked if Lori Holgate was on the call. No response was heard. Ben shared the chat function that could be used for the conference. Ben noted that a quorum was present.

Summary of the formal review: It was determined to be appropriate, landscape points totals were reviewed, turn-around was indicated, no culvert is proposed,

Wes would like to see parking spaces indicated on the site plan. Grading and drainage was fine. Ben asked about the orientation and if additional building will be proposed in the future. Joe indicated that it was a possibility with his business model. Setbacks were reviewed and discussed. Privacy and views were discussed. Snow storage was indicated to be adequate. Fencing and social path were discussed. Eric commented that the elevation revisions looked great, and Joe appreciated the DRC's comments from the last meeting. Wes concurred. Lori thought the elevations looked good. Facia will be tongue and groove, a Thermar\* brand or Scott's Pine was discussed as a good product to use. Height was noted as appropriate.

Ben noted that Andy Tyzzer has dropped off the call. Ben suggested we pause again and apologized for the delay. (Pause). Ben continued with the review. It was noted that no trim is shown on the plans. Joe indicated the buildings is a more modern design and that it will serve the over-all design better. Ben reviewed the requirements for trim in the Residential Design Guidelines. It was noted that it was a Committee discretion to require trim. Dom read the requirements. Building Materials. C. *Residential Design Guidelines* does not require trim. Lori had no comment when asked by Ben.

The review concluded and several conditions were indicated. 1) Move landscaping out of the setback. 2) Request an additional parking space and show on the plans. 3) Show base elevation in relation to the average grade.

Ben asked about additional time for public comment. Ben noted that Andy Tyzzer has logged back on to the review meeting.

Mr. Tyzzer asked if it was a perimeter lot and if so, does it come into the regs for residential design guidelines? Is this being review under what set of regulations, commercial or residential. Eric indicated that it was being reviewed as a residential in a commercial lot. Mr. Tyzzer was surprised that we were reviewing a modern design and that the project should conform to more traditional mountain architecture. Wes noted that the plated lots in the commercial area have a different setback requirement. Mr. Tyzzer wanted more clarification on this. Eric stated that the Special Area Regulations (SAR) are where the regulations reside. Ben read from the regulations in Section 8.9, page 29 of the Special Area Regulations and noted that it indicates the use relative to the set back requirements. Mr. Tyzzer asked about variance request that should have been made. Wes noted that no variation is needed for this review.

Is this traditional mountain architecture? Mr. Tyzzer asked. Wes stated it has elements of mountain architecture. Ben stated that the DRC has the capacity to review a design based on its architectural merit and that there is some merit to this project. Mr. Tyzzer concerns about the project were that it was not traditional mountain architecture. Joe noted he has seen this type of architecture through out the community. Mr. Tyzzer noted that it was in noncompliance with the SAR. He

was concerned about the precedent being set. Mr. Tyzzer feels this should be reviewed as a precedent and needs a variance. Joe commented that the materials, metal, and wood, are traditional for mountain town architecture. Mr. Tyzzer is concerned that if approved, would continue throughout the community. Joe respectfully disagreed.

Ben continued to move to wrap up the discussion and noted Mr. Tyzzer concerns. Mr. Tyzzer wanted it to be clear and asked if this was the first formal meeting. Ben indicated that it was.

Ben stated that it is a continuation of the previous DRC meeting, and that no formal review was made during the previous meeting. Mr. Tyzzer indicated that he has not had time to review or the opportunity to study the plans. Ben thanked Mr. Tyzzer and opened the meeting for the DRC to make comments. Eric noted that it the DRC did review this project as a single-family residence, but with in the context of a commercial building. Lori indicated that she has second thoughts and reservations about the modern architecture and wanted to take more time to review and apologized for not reviewing the project in depth.

Dom kept the meeting moving forward and asked for more comments and final thoughts. Ben asked Lori about her potential participation in a vote. Ben asked Lori if she would like to abstain from voting. Lori agreed to abstain from the vote.

Ben would like to bring the motion to vote. Wes made a motion to approve. Eric seconded the vote. Ben voted in favor of Approving the project. A list of three conditions were noted as early outlined. All voted in favor of the project and the project was approved.

Dom thanked the DRC and concluded the meeting with the applicant. Joe thanked everyone for their time.

**Adjourn:** 7:59 pm