

**SINGLETREE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
June 4, 2015**

A Regular Meeting of the Singletree Design Review Committee was held on Thursday, June 04, 2015, at 8:00 am, at the Singletree Community Center, Edwards, Colorado.

The members present were: Charlie Dolan, Larry Deckard, Connie Powers, Karen Zavis and Larry Rogers. The Architectural Consultant, John Perkins, was also in attendance.

MEETING MINUTES – The Committee reviewed the May 21, 2015 meeting minutes. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the May 21, 2015 meeting minutes as submitted.

**Mike Lauterbach Duplex
Mike Lauterbach**

**Flg. 3, Blk. 3, Lot 19
621 Singletree Road**

Conceptual Review

Mike Lauterbach presented the conceptual plans to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. The Committee remarked that the revised design reflects a structural massing that is starting to respond better to the topography of the building site and stepping with the slope, in accordance with the Design Guidelines.
- b. The driveway to the east side duplex could benefit from additional paved area for autos entering and exiting the garage.
- c. The hammerhead indicated on the east driveway is not approvable since it is encroaching into the side setback; however, a hammerhead on the west duplex driveway could ease turning and maneuvering in that driveway.
- d. Since both sides of this duplex have garages that face the street, the Committee suggested breaking up one of the double garage doors into a pair of single width doors. (Design Guidelines page 17, Section 2.16).
- e. Applicant was requested to further develop the window fenestrations as the current design does not appear to take full advantage of the south views and the overall impression is that the window fenestrations reflected in the drawings are not well integrated into the design. The distance from the window head to the fascia/eave above it varies throughout the building and appears random; this leads to an overall disorganized feel to the elevations and window placement.
- f. The main entries to both sides of the duplex have been improved, but are still somewhat weak and need further development to strengthen the sense of arrival. (Design Guidelines page 11, Section 2.8).
- g. It was noted that the columns supporting the deck of the east duplex on the south elevation appear undersized for their height and should be reevaluated to establish a better proportion for the columns.
- h. Material selections and details are required for all exterior materials and finishes including roofing, stucco, fascias, handrails, window trim, door trim, etc.

A motion was made to approve the conceptual plans subject to the conditions outlined above. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the conceptual plans subject to the conditions outlined above.

James Residence
Leah Maer

Flg. 3, Blk. 4, Lot 23B
51 Stetson

Final Review
Dormer/MBR Enclosure

Liz James and Leah Maer presented the final plans to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. The Committee felt that the design revisions to the addition using a shed roof rather than the originally proposed gable dormer were more appropriate and in keeping with the original design of the home.
- b. The final square foot calculation table must be included in the final drawings. (Design Guidelines page 52, Section 9).
- c. A signed and notarized Duplex Owner Written Approval Letter is required and must be amended acknowledging the revised square footage calculation.
- d. The detail of the new chimney cap shall include dimensions of the framework and the screening to be used, as well as a detail drawing on the attachment method.
- e. Any exterior metal fabrications are to be painted out to match the existing adjacent color of the home. (Design Guidelines page 16, Section 2.15)
- f. All exterior non-conforming lights are to be down lights and cut sheets are required.
- g. For final design review sign-off, a complete set of plans per the Design Guidelines must be submitted (Design Guidelines page 51, Section 9) including the Construction Management plan and the Design and Construction Compliance Fee deposit. A \$3,000 deposit is required; \$2,500 will be returned after completion of all work and \$500 is retained by SPOA as an administrative fee.

A motion was made to approve the final plans subject to the conditions outlined above. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the final plans subject to the conditions outlined above.

Dickerson Duplex
Ryan Dickerson

Flg. 2, Blk. 5, Lot 14
323 Longhorn Road

Conceptual/Preliminary

Ryan Dickerson presented the conceptual plans to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. The Architectural Consultant verified that the project's habitable square footage exceeds the allowable square footage by approximately 350 square feet. (Design Guidelines page 5, Section 2.1) Floor plans will need to be revised before resubmittal and a table indicating the proposed habitable areas of the duplex are required to be on the drawings.
- b. The topography of the building site is not reflected in the building design or the drawings of the duplex. It was suggested that the west unit could be lower in floor elevation than the east unit to respond to the site sloping lower toward it's southwest corner.
- c. The massing of the duplex was discussed and the Committee advised that the long ridge line connecting the two halves of the building is problematic. It was suggested to position the second story living space toward the center of the building so that the home would have a taller mass in the center section and then could taper to single story forms on either side.
- d. The site plan illustrated issues with the vehicle access to the garages. More study needs to be given to accessing the garages since there are clearance issues at the east garage with a

- e. proposed planted area in the front of the house and the west driveway would possibly benefit from the addition of a turnaround hammerhead.
- f. There are privacy issues with the offset between the sides of the duplex on the south side of the property where the building sides shift and there are windows that allow visibility between the duplex neighbors. The Committee recommends remedying this circumstance in the design phase.
- g. It was noted to the Applicant that a roof overhang must be within the building setbacks as there was an instance of an overhang placed directly on the west building setback.
- h. The exterior elevations indicated several items that were of concern, such as: 1) the long uninterrupted roof ridgelines; 2) window proportions and placements that were not well conceived; and 3) proposed final grade lines which did not reflect the existing slope of the site.
- i. Exterior materials were discussed and the Applicant was informed that faux stone products are not approvable. Wood siding is being proposed for minor sections of exterior walls, and the character of that siding was called into question as it was a convex log type of siding.
- j. The design of deck support columns needs clarification as stone was indicated as a column base both on-grade and suspended at the upper level of the home. Dimension of wood support columns and exposed decorative roof trusses will be required for approval.
- k. The Applicant is encouraged to submit only the most up-to-date drawings for the Committee's review (1 week in advance of such meeting) so as to make the feedback and discussion as effective and meaningful as possible.
- l. The Applicant indicated that he would be consulting with a Colorado-based architect in connection with this project. The Applicant was encouraged to become as familiar as possible with the environmental (mountain elevations and conditions) implications of building here in Singletree, given that he intends to bring his construction crew from Texas.

The matter is tabled per the Applicant's request.

CeDUR Roofing Presentation
Paul Hoskinson/Territorial Mgr.

Synthetic Shingles

Roofing Materials

Paul Hoskinson and Chris Blackstock presented the synthetic shingles manufactured by CeDUR to the Committee for their consideration as an approvable roof product for the Singletree Community.

The Company has been in business in Colorado for 16 years. The material was patented about 18 years ago. They have numerous installations in Colorado and their product has been approved in many high-end mountain communities such as Vail, Beaver Creek, Aspen and Telluride Mountain Village.

Mr. Hoskinson explained that the implications of UV rays were very minimal and related to some minor color degradation (in the first 4 weeks after installation only) and with no impact on the material itself or the fire resistant nature of the material. The product comes with a 50-year Limited Material Warranty.

Of particular note was the Class A fire rating of the material on a stand-alone basis, the fact that the material is solid (not hollow or a cavity on reverse) and it's dimensional aesthetic is akin to a heavy-duty cedar shake shingle. In addition, the manufacturer is limiting the distribution and installation of the product to approved installers to assure proper installation.

A motion was made to allow use of the CeDUR roof shake shingle product for homes in Singletree. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the use of the CeDUR roof shake shingle product for homes in Singletree.

ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business to come before the Committee, by motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Singletree Design Review Committee this the 4th day of June 2015.