
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

MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

April 15th, 2021

DRC Attendees: Dylan Brown, Ben White, Lori Holgate, Travis Hall, Catherine Powell

Public Attendees: Kent Cowherd, Travis Krist, Rob Fessenden, Mellissa Stewart, Alex Mattes-Ritz, Matt Sleightholm, Mark Trittipio, Steven Stewart, Todd Wassinger, Myles Cress, Sophia Truex

Staff Attendees: Dom Eymere

Call to Order: 6:16 pm

Business: **Approve Minutes from March**, Minutes were not completed at this time and not draft was prepared.

Business: **Haverly Townhomes #1, #2 and #3**, Lot C43, C44 and C45, Block 4, Filing #2, 65, 83, and 103 Haverly Street – 12 Units total

Discussion: Dom introduced the project and gave the overview for the record. Application was received March 29th, 2021, the project was published and posted on April 1st. This meets the 14 public comment period. Public comment included the question of whether this should be approved by the Board of Directors. Dom clarified that this is being reviewed under the Special Area Regulations and that no change of use is required since multi-family dwellings are called out as appropriate in the commercial lots. Ben White and Dylan Brown have the appearance of a conflict of interest and will recuse themselves from discussion and vote. Travis Hall took over as chair of the meeting and invited Ben White to talk about the project. Steven Stewart was present. Ben led the discussion. The project is building #1, #2, and #3 for a total of 12 units. 2 and 3 bedrooms with balconies and garages. Height and ridge height is within the 32' foot requirement. Buildings are staggered in 4-foot increments. An MOU will be created to establish two shared access drives. 3000 points per unit for landscape points are shown on the plans. Height relative to slope have been accounted for by stepping down the roof lines. Siding, colors, and materials were discussed. Ben talked about the drainage, grade, and retention walls as it relates to the three lots as well as some of the details. Travis suggested that we begin the formal review. Travis and the DRC agreed it was appropriate. Catherine wanted to review the siding materials and make sure we had good details of the proposed material during the meeting. Ben talked about the LP siding and the reveal. Catherine asked what the height of the building would be as you are looking at it. Ben commented that it would be 32' and

35' where the grade is higher. DRC deemed the neighborhood context as appropriate. Landscaping was then reviewed. Landscaping will be following the residential guidelines at 3000 points per building. Ben noted that he calculated the parking per the SAR and that it is 2 spaces per unit. Additional review continued on the driveway and Travis wanted clarity on the stall lengths and measurements between the garage and the parking spaces. Dom noted that this may be a good time to ask the applicant to add parking on the street during the development process. Travis did not feel it appropriate to require the applicant to develop on-street parking. Ben explained the difficulties in doing this on the easter lot or C45. Catherine noted that the parking looks tight. DRC agreed that the turn-around spot should be expanded, and the site-plan shifted to accommodate this. Ben indicated that he may be able to create an additional parking space per unit. Ben commented that two water retention areas are proposed to help with lot drainage and large stormwater run-off. Setbacks were than reviewed. Per the SAR parking set-back is 0 and front of building is 15'. Privacy and views were noted and deemed appropriate. Elevation drawings were than reviewed. The DRC had no issues with the windows, doors, height, siding, trim or roof pitch. Travis noted that the project is well massed, Catherine felt it looked nice and is appropriate and Lori agreed. Travis summarized that the parking re-due is a condition.

Motion: Travis made a motion to approve, Catherine seconded, and all were in favor. The motion passed.

Public: Fessenden made public comment on the decision not to review the project at tonight's meeting. The DRC discussed and made various comments on the process and indicated that they would accommodate an additional review if needed.

Business: **Krist, Single-Family Residence with Accessory Dwelling**, Lot 5, Block 18, Filing #3, 98 Floyd Avenue

Discussion: Location and public notice requirements were stated by Dom. He than turned it over to the applicant. Kent Cowherd introduced the project. Kent noted that this project was reviewed previously and now resubmitted with changes. Catherine encouraged the DRC, after no comments were made, to begin the formal review. Travis asked about neighborhood context. The DRC agreed it was appropriate. Site plan was than reviewed and the landscaping, driveway, parking was reviewed. Alex noted that four parking spaces are being proposed. Building orientation, setbacks and drainage was reviewed. It was noted that the porch does encroach into the setback but was allowed by the Covenants. Privacy was considered and the DRC indicated that it was appropriate. The DRC wanted to see the calculation for snow storage on the site plan. The review continued with the elevation drawings and Dylan commented that the west elevation on the ADU could use some breaks and Travis added that it was very monolithic. Wall heights were discussed as stated in the residential design guidelines and the DRC would like to see the wall plane broken up with a 32" off-set. Dylan commented that more than just a siding change would be appropriate. Ideas were shared about how to accomplish this. The roof plan on the shows a gabled roof on the plans. Alex and Kent shared that it was a mistake and a previous version carried over. Some solution will be proposed. Siding will be grey stucco on the ADU and shiplap on the primary dwelling. Ben, Catherine, and Lori agreed the siding is appropriate. Windows were discussed at length specifically about the lack of trim on the stucco elevations. Kent noted it was a more modern design. Dylan and the DRC agreed that trim on the windows should occur on the wood siding areas and on the primary building. Lighting, mass, roof pitch all looked appropriate. The accessory dwelling was than

reviewed. Roof plan needs to be corrected. Orientation, setbacks and mass all looked good.

Motion: Ben made a motion to approve, Lori seconded the motion and the project passed unanimously with three conditions. 1) add snow storage calculations 2) Window trim is required on non-stucco siding areas. 3) roof plan needs to be corrected

Business: **Fessenden, Multi Family Residence**, Lot 18 Block 4, Filing # 4, 391 Cement Creek Road

Discussion: This item was removed from formal review for tonight's meeting, but the DRC did offer some comments.

Business: **S.O.A.R. Duplex**, Unit 1 of 2, Lot 3, Block 10, Filing #2, 495 Teocalli Road

Discussion: Public notice requirements were met and Dom gave a quick over view. Dom stated the meeting procedures and turned the project over to the applicants. Todd Wassinger turned it over to the students Myles Cress and she introduced the project. Sophia Truex went over the site plan. Sophia talked about the privacy, driveway, passive solar elements. This project is phase one and the second phase will include an 800 SF unit. Landscaping and placement were explained. Two car garage and two parking spaces are provided for. Myles continued with project description and talked about the floor plans. Yvon Michel talked about the materials and elevations. Height is 29' 2", The roof slopes, siding materials, colors and lighting were explained and include a belly band, board and baton siding. Dylan thanked the students and asked to move to formal review. Dylan commented that phase I is a good-looking standalone building and appreciated it. Travis facilitated the DRC review and asked about the neighborhood context. Catherine and Lori agreed that the project and past projects looked good. The site plan was reviewed. No issues were raised. No snow storage calculation was indicated on the plans, but Dylan noted that the driveway and parking has been calculated. Ben indicated that the landscaping should not occur in the water and sewer easement. Elevation drawing reviewed included height, siding, windows, doors, and trim. Travis asked about the overhangs on the roof and Myles gave a good explanation of the different eaves on the roof. Travis indicated that the dimensions for the eaves will be a required condition. Dylan commented that the future garage may not have a one-foot overhang. Lighting plan was accounted for. Travis recapped the conditions: Snow calculations and eave dimensions will be required.

Motion: Travis made a motion to approve the project. Catherine seconded the motion. All were in favor and the project was approved unanimously.

Unscheduled Property Owner comment Time: Rob Fessenden was present to continue the discussion on his proposed project and wanted comments from the DRC. Catherine indicated she liked the changes from the original submittal Rob recapped his changes and asked for more suggestions to the project. Rob mentioned that the Residential Design Guidelines and CAMP should be better tied together for clarity for builders and the process. Rob continued to ask the DRC about any changes and the DRC hesitated to do any review until the Board had time to approve the land use change.

Adjourn: 9:58 pm