

Chairperson Greenwood opened the meeting at 4:32 p.m.

Commissioners in attendance: Gretchen Greenwood, Jeffrey Halferty, Nora Berko, Scott Kendrick, Bob Blaich, Roger Moyer, Kara Thompson, Sheri Sanzone. Absent was Richard Lai.

Staff present:

Nicole Henning, Deputy City Clerk
Andrea Bryan, Assistant City Attorney
Amy Simon, Historic Planning Director
Sarah Yoon, Historic Preservation Planner

MINUTES: Mr. Blaich moved to approve the minutes of March 27th, Mr. Halferty seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Mr. Halferty moved to approve the minutes of April 10th, Mr. Kendrick seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS: Ms. Greenwood said she won't be here on May 8th. Ms. Sanzone and Ms. Thompson won't be here May 8th either. Ms. Simon said it's possible we won't have a meeting on that date anyway.

Mr. Halferty thanked Ms. Simon for the tour earlier in the day and said it was great and well versed.

DISCLOSURES OF CONFLICT: None.

PROJECT MONITORING: Ms. Simon said she has one for Mr. Moyer and two for Mr. Kendrick to discuss after the meeting.

Ms. Greenwood said she noticed a few unmonitored projects on the list and asked Ms. Simon to address. Ms. Simon directed them to page 22 and said she could use a monitor for the Stein building across the street from Boogies and noted that Ms. Greenwood and Mr. Halferty were on the board when it was approved. Ms. Greenwood said she will take that one. 210 W Main is Ted Guy's project and that needs a monitor. Mr. Kendrick said he will do this one. She said the rest are not super urgent. Ms. Sanzone said she is conflicted on 135 E Cooper. Ms. Simon said they will find a new monitor when it comes back around. From the site tour, Ms. Sanzone said she is going to help Mr. Halferty on Hotel Aspen – 110 W. Main.

CERTIFICATES OF NO NEGATIVE EFFECT: None.

Mr. Halferty asked about the National Trust conference and Ms. Simon said it will be in Denver in October. Ms. Simon said there isn't a lot of info yet, but she can start an email to see who is available to go and as always, AIA credits are available for this.

PROJECT MONITORING: 602 E. Hyman
Dylan Johns – Zone 4 Architects

Mr. Johns said this is a mural project. We are fairly far along with construction and expect completion in a few months. The building owners have asked if HPC will allow a contemporary mural artist to do a painting on the north side on the corner of Hunter & Hyman. A CMU wall was constructed as part of the

addition on the historic structure. He showed plans on screen and said he hasn't heard any opposition from the building owners or anyone else.

Ms. Simon said she provided a brief memo in the packet and said Ms. Berko is the pm on this project. This mural will be on a painted CMU wall and we as staff, have no concerns. The artist is not allowed to sign it according to the sign code.

Mr. Halferty asked from a zoning standpoint, if any project can ask for a mural on a residential or commercial building and Ms. Simon said there are commercial design guidelines that would be applied to any request. Ms. Greenwood asked what the timeframe is for how long a mural can be up and Ms. Simon said there is no timeframe. Mr. Moyer asked if there is a utility box in front of this wall and Mr. Johns said no. Mr. Moyer pointed out that artists normally sign their work and Ms. Simon said that would be considered advertising for the artist, which isn't allowed by the sign code. We're very sensitive to signage limitations here. Ms. Greenwood asked about the content and political statements and if the city has any control over that. Ms. Bryan said that it's under very limited circumstances due to freedom of speech.

Ms. Simon reminded the board of the Smuggler Mine company mural on the back of the Brand building that was done decades ago that is peeling off. She said we don't want to have people putting these up and not maintaining them. If you wanted some kind of term limit or condition relating to maintenance, we could add that in. Ms. Yoon said there was a condition added in regarding maintenance on the last mural which was approved.

Ms. Greenwood said she thinks it would look great on the building and is in favor of it after looking at the site earlier today. She likes that it's kind of subdued and in the background of the building. She thinks this particular mural would look great on the building and is in complete favor of it.

Mr. Moyer said he is not opposed. He said this graphic kind of painting was done a lot in the 70's. Mr. Johns said we feel like it complements the building.

Mr. Halferty said this application is well done and well placed, but he does have some concern. He is all in for freedom of artists obviously, but its monkey see monkey do everywhere on every building for everyone who requests it, so he has a challenging thought about consistency and controlling that. Just like graffiti was treated in city scape before it became hip & cool. This is a philosophical discussion, but he he likes that it's on a residential project and not on a commercial building. What prohibits a dude from Leadville with a spray paint can who wants to do a mural. Ms. Greenwood said they would have to get approval from the owner of the building and possibly us and go through the process like everyone else. Mr. Halferty said that does make sense and he is in support of the project.

Ms. Berko said she totally applauds urban art, but she thinks the windows on this building are so beautiful and thinks it detracts from the beauty of the building. She has a hard time with this project.

Mr. Kendrick said he likes the idea and he thinks the artist is very complimentary and it's a tasteful design. He is very much in favor of this project.

Ms. Thompson agreed with Mr. Kendrick.

Mr. Blaich said as one who has three contemporary sculptures in his front yard of a historic home, he can't object.

MOTION: ROGER moved to approve, Mr. Blaich seconded. Voice vote: 6 in favor, 1 opposed. Motion carried.

PUBLIC NOTICE: Ms. Bryan said has the notices.

CALL UPS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: 333 W Bleeker

Sarah Yoon

Ms. Yoon said this is a conceptual hearing and continuation. HPC gave the applicant instruction to restudy the design of the proposed addition and the location of the historic out building. This structure is located on the corner of 3rd and Bleeker. This is very visible and is in the R6 zone on a 6000 sq. ft lot. Following HPC's advice, the location is rotated and now there is a space of 3 ft 5 inches from the rear property line. With the permission of Parks, the 3 alley trees will be removed. The new addition is located directly behind the historic landmark with an 8-foot connector and a full basement is also proposed. With the recent proposal, the drywall location is identified between two large spruce trees. Staff would like to clarify, they originally misunderstood where the historic house was to be stored and it will be on-site instead of off-site. This has been clarified and put into the conditions. Ms. Yoon presented the 1893 Sandborn map on screen. There have been constant alterations to the rear of the building and the existing out building is not an original feature. Staff is in support of the removal of the rear addition and relocation of the historic out building. The fenestration changes haven't changed since last time. Staff focused on guidelines 10.6 and 10.11 last time regarding the relationship between materials and fenestration and the need for the new addition to strongly relate to two of these. The applicant has restudied the roof form by relating the pitch with the historic out building. They will be moving the chimney feature to the east elevation, which has the least visible impact. They have also changed the roofing material to asphalt shingles to match what is existing on the current site. This is all in support of strengthening the relationship between the historic resource and the new addition. Staff recommends continued work with staff and monitor on a secondary entrance. Staff recommends continued work with various city departments and staff and monitor on the proposed secondary entrance. Staff supports the setback variations with the 7-inch variation related to the historic resource not moving and is recommending approval. The conditions are as follows:

1. Curb heights for the skylights and lightwells be brought to the minimum requirement and would like to see the dimensions
2. Further discussion of storm water mitigation and for staff and monitor to be involved in final approval
3. Work with staff and monitor and city departments on the secondary walkway and restoration of the ditch
4. Investigation for historic framing before the fenestration changes happen
5. Agreement with temporary storing of the historic resource to be on site
6. Removal of 5 spruce trees in the right of way
7. Financial securities are required
8. Details of setback variations requested for the out building and new addition
9. Submit for final development within one year of obtaining conceptual approval

Ms. Greenwood asked what the new measurement would be if the variation is granted. Mr. Haas said 9 feet 5 inches. Ms. Greenwood also asked why the parks department is taking down spruce trees in the right of way. Ms. Simon said the owner planted them and they've been maturing without approval.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: Mitch Haas of Haas Land Planning LLC & Rally Dupps of Rally Dupps Architect and Interiors

Mr. Haas said Ms. Yoon did a good job of presenting most of the project. He said the roof form on the addition started with a modern rake roof and now it's been changed to a 12-12 pitch to match the garage structure. The material went from standing seam metal and has been switched to the asphalt shingles which is the same material found on both historic structures on the property. The setback of the garage entrance was about 1 foot before and is now about 3 ½ feet. He thinks they have storm water figured out with Josh Rice, so hopefully it won't have to go to staff and monitor. We have the horizontal siding on the garage, the historic house and now you'll see a good deal more on the addition. We made a conscious decision to maintain a departure in fenestration to keep it a product of its own time. We're feeling good about it and we are good with guideline 10.6. Hopefully everyone feels the same way too.

Ms. Sanzone thanked the applicant for engaging Josh Rice at this conceptual level. She asked where other utilities and utility pedestals might land and hopefully they will be on the alley side. Mr. Dupps said they haven't thought about that yet. We will start fresh and will submit a landscape plan later on.

Ms. Greenwood asked if they have a sketch up looking east and then asked what condition the windows are in on the historic resource. Mr. Dupps said they've all been replaced including the feature window. There are new windows in the original openings. Ms. Greenwood asked about the windows in the gable and Mr. Dupps said he thinks the whole back is new construction. At that time, they added the French doors and extended the Dutch gable. He thinks the historic framing is much removed. Ms. Greenwood has one issue and doesn't think the proportion of the windows is in line with the other double hung windows. She is curious about the drywell and what is going to it. Mr. Haas said he understand its sheet flow across the site and a good amount of green flow and no down spouts. Mr. Rice didn't suggest any routing.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Mr. Kendrick said he acknowledges the hard work on the changes that have been made and said it's come a long way and is ready to approve at this point per staff's comments.

Mr. Blaich said that everything has been covered and he is comfortable with the project.

Mr. Moyer said the applicant's have done a good job, but there are a few concerns. Oftentimes at the end, there are a lot of pipes sticking out of the roof, and the siding as well. If they are thought about now, we don't have to worry about it later. The utilities should be discreetly placed in the alley. The shape of the windows on the south peak is very disconcerting because their proportion doesn't fit with the others.

Mr. Halferty said he agrees that it's come a long way and the setbacks he has requested are appropriate. The treatment to the historic resource has been well done and the addition is in line with the guidelines.

He said he hopes they can adhere to Mr. Moyer's comments about fenestration and venting. The proposed resolution from staff is something he can adhere to.

Ms. Greenwood pointed out that the board is being a little redundant, but we do make a good impact on the community when we analyze these thoroughly and give the applicant's professional recommendations. She does think the project is in a good place, but she wants to comment about the pipes. The building department does require us to label every single pipe, so she suggested the applicant do that before they come back for final with the board. Throughout the process, please keep Ms. Simon informed on what you are finding. Other than that, she feels the windows on the rear need to be restudied. She also recommended restudy of the flat roof underneath the fascia on the new addition because the building, in detail, should correspond to the historic resource. We're all in agreement with staff's comments.

Ms. Sanzone said she agrees with Mr. Moyer's comments and that they probably seem like details, but they are really important details. She said where the fence is shown, it would intrude on where you would want to put the utilities, ideally.

MOTION: Mr. Moyer moved to approve resolution #10, Mr. Kendrick seconded. Roll call vote: Mr. Blaich, yes; Mr. Halferty, yes; Mr. Kendrick, yes; Ms. Berko, yes; Mr. Moyer, yes; Ms. Greenwood, yes; Ms. Sanzone, yes. 7-0, motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS: 312 W Hyman
Sarah Yoon

Ms. Yoon said this is a conceptual design review and was also part of the site visit today. This is in the R6 zone district on a 6000 square foot lot. The applicant is requesting major development and setback variations. This is a city owned property and was designated in 2006 as an Aspen Modern landmark. At the time, there was a threat for demolition. This has been listed for sale and the applicant is currently under contract. This landmark is an excellent example of the chalet style architecture. Some of the characteristics include the large singular roof forms, shallow pitched roof, deep overhangs, very simple footprints and a continuous balcony. Some of the more noticeable details are in the decorative geometric motifs. There was very little development surrounding the property when it was built. There are a lot of large trees on the site and they now have neighbors on either side. The applicant has been in communication with the parks department regarding removing two trees on the alley. The driveway access off of Hyman and the two garage doors are considered significant features. Engineering has allowed for another driveway from the alley. Because of the constraints, it's important that the applicant work with staff and relevant departments to develop the site. The current proposal does meet the minimum 5-foot setbacks, but not the 15-foot combined. The applicant is requesting a setback variation and HPC does grant these if they meet listed criteria, which are listed on screen. The resource cannot be relocated or moved due to existing encroachments. Staff would support a setback variation in accordance with design. Going into the design proposal for the addition, staff focused the memo on guidelines 10.6 and 10.12. There must be design compatibility and the design must not destroy or obscure historic features or materials. The proposed addition has two levels and a flat roof. There is no connecting element that we typically see on other projects. The location of the addition to the rear of the property is very appropriate to the site. Staff does want to see a sensitive transition between the old and the new. A two-story transition might meet the guidelines in this case. The material choices for the addition, don't meet with the historic landmark, so staff is recommending further study of the

material and form to relate back to the landmark. This is a wonderful resource and a very challenging site. Staff recommends restudy of the transition from old to new to something more sensitive to the historic materials. Staff is also recommending restudy of guideline 10.6 regarding visual compatibility and recommending working closely with other relevant city departments.

Ms. Thompson clarified that the shed at the back is not historic and Ms. Yoon agreed.

Ms. Greenwood said she noticed that the drywell was proposed for 20 feet down and she thought they couldn't be more than 15 feet. Ms. Simon said that was a discussion about putting in a drywell under a basement, but in the yard, there is not a limit or specified depth.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION: Doug Rager of Doug Rager Architect

Mr. Rager said this has been a process of discovery for his clients and the floor plan was actually drawn by them. We didn't make any effort on materials or fenestration because we are just trying to come to grips with what is possible first. They are convinced that they need all the square footage they can get to make their program work. If they can't have this kind of connection, which was presented, they will not purchase the property. He suggested that the board not consider the fenestration or materials at this point. He wanted to turn in the application without these things and consider this more of a work session because it's not a typical project. It's under contract and want to buy it, but they won't without the connector. They are in love with the house and do this type of restoration work in New Orleans. He hasn't been able to do much about the concerns and comments at this point. He showed the back of the house on screen. They had a second-floor link centered under the ridge, which was using the window as the link connection.

Mr. Moyer said the box on the back is not higher than the peak of the resource, but on the corner, he wanted to know how high it is above the fascia. Mr. Rager said the plate height is 8 foot and we did a 9-foot plate height on the addition because our roof frame will be thicker. Mr. Moyer said he is curious why there is no connector. Mr. Rager said a link connector won't allow them to develop enough square footage to make the program work. They started with the garage and feel it is inadequate and too low, so they wanted to put it off the alley. The only location to clear the trees is as shown, which comes around the east side of the building. Mr. Moyer pointed out that Mr. Rager didn't submit a north west view.

Ms. Sanzone asked if in working with the civil engineer, they discussed doing the drywells underneath the proposed addition and Mr. Rager said he did. It's unbelievable that we need a 20 ft hole to put the storm water in. He said it doesn't work where it's at under the drip line and it's cross hatched on the plan where it seems like the best spot.

Mr. Moyer asked if they want to take a straw vote regarding a project that has no connector. Ms. Greenwood said they should save that for discussion and go through the public hearing process.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Ms. Greenwood said that since Mr. Rager mentioned a work session, maybe this is a good opportunity to work this from the board side. We have the expertise; knowledge, and we care.

Mr. Halferty said this is a tough site. He said he worked on this project and did the affordable housing downstairs. He understands the client's request for adding as much square footage as they can with all of the challenges they have brought to it. He appreciates Mr. Rager doing the massing study. Right now, he agrees with staff's memo and thinks there are a lot of missing pieces. It's a product of its own time, but it's a stacked container meet a chalet type of architecture. This is the hardest part regarding the trees and setbacks, angles; it's all extremely tough. He agrees with staff's comments and appreciates the client's wants and with some modifications, he could maybe support, but not as is now.

Mr. Moyer said that to him, this is a little like the Connors cabins, which were restored nicely. This is not a project you can add onto; you must have a connector. He agrees completely with staff's comments and said it's a difficult project.

Ms. Greenwood said that a connecting link is required in following the design guidelines. A lot of time is put into helping the applicants understand the design guidelines and this project doesn't seem to meet any of that. She said she doesn't think this is a difficult building to add on to, but they wouldn't follow the traditional alignment of the chalet and make the addition follow a more linear pattern with the alley and the street and use the connector element to make this transition. This would be more appropriate for this house. The design guidelines state that you have three elements. We care about form and not so much about materials at this point. In this case it's a box a box form doesn't belong on this site with this very interesting and unique chalet, which is a gem for the City of Aspen. Right now, the addition overwhelms the cuteness. It's really special and it's going to need more conceptual thinking on your part to get it to be an addition which works with the form. She can't support the project at this time. I hope we can give you some direction, but it's more than a tweak on this addition. You need to rethink it and meet the guidelines for the City of Aspen because they do work.

Ms. Simon said she wanted to clarify and make sure that everyone understands that a connector is not required by the guidelines unless your addition is taller than the resource, but that is not the case here. You do have purview over how the addition attaches and over the historic materials. She wants to make sure that no one is expecting to see that classic hallway connector because it is not required and they have not violated a requirement.

Ms. Berko said she totally supports the staff memo and comments by the board so far. She said it's a jewel of a building and thanked the City for taking it on and designating it. We've got to be able to see the whole thing. Whether you do a below grade connector or whether it's where the shed is could be two ideas. Maybe there is something that can work where the garage is and more horizontal to the alley. It just has to be preserved; that is what this board has been assigned to do, to not erode the historic resource. Thank you to staff for the memo.

Ms. Thompson said she agrees with everything that has been said so far. When it comes to massing the roof of the chalet, it really does need to be respected because it's a very special element.

Mr. Blaich said there are two garages, but only one being utilized. We want to maintain the façade and if it's not going to be converted back into a garage, he questions the width of the driveway, which is pretty imposing in this neighborhood. Otherwise, he is supportive of staff and other comments that have been made.

Mr. Kendrick said he doesn't need to rehash as it's an extremely difficult site. For him, there is too much of a departure right now and agrees with staff.

Ms. Sanzone said she agrees with almost everything she has heard.

Mr. Rager said that even he agrees with staff and said this is a tough one because this is what the applicants think they need and want and asked me to come to you. I got my answer, so I think we will leave it on the books for now. I suspect they will not go forward with the purchase and I've been trying to lecture them that this wouldn't fly, but here we are now. He said it's all good and thanked the board and staff for their time.

MOTION: Mr. Kendrick motioned to continue this to May 8th, Mr. Moyer seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

HPC Awards:

Ms. Simon ran through the projects which are up for awards this year and showed them on screen.

Board discussion.

MOTION: Mr. Kendrick motioned to adjourn, Mr. Halferty seconded at 7:08 p.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Nicole Henning, Deputy City Clerk