

**SINGLETREE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
June 19, 2014**

A Regular Meeting of the Singletree Design Review Committee was held on Thursday, June 19, 2014, at 8:30 a.m., at the Singletree Community Center, Edwards, Colorado.

The members present were: Chairman George Gregory, Charlie Dolan, Connie Powers, Larry Rogers and Karen Zavis. The Architectural Consultant, John Perkins, was also present.

MEETING MINUTES – The Committee reviewed the June 5, 2014 meeting minutes. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the June 5, 2014 meeting minutes as submitted.

Johnson Residence	Lot 14, Blk. 1, Flg. 2	Solar Panel Addition
Bryan Johnson	211 Rawhide Road	

Bryan Johnson presented plans for the installation of solar panels on the east and south roof elevations and the following matters were noted:

- a. A cut sheet and specifications on the solar panels is required.
- b. A detail on the attachment device for the solar panels is required.

A motion was made to approve the installation of the solar panels subject to the conditions outlined above. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the solar panel installation subject to the conditions outlined above.

Spangler Residence	Lot 4, Blk. 3, Lot 16	Exterior Changes:
Philippe Courtois	960 Winslow Road	Railings/Trim/Paint/ Concrete Entry Steps

Philippe Courtois presented the plans for the exterior changes that include new metal railings, exterior paint color changes for trim and fascia, and the replacement of the front entry with concrete steps on the Spangler side, and the following matters were noted:

- a. An application from the adjoining duplex owner is required.
- b. Exterior changes made to one side of the duplex must also be made on the other side of the duplex, before approval can be granted by the DRC.
- c. Both duplex owners will be required to pay Design and Construction Compliance Fees/Deposits to insure the completion of the project. In accordance with Section 8.7 of the Guidelines, where Remodels/Additions are occurring on both sides of a duplex property, the Design and Construction Compliance Fees/Deposits will be held by SPOA until the approved work for both units is completed. The completion of work on one-half of the duplex, while work remains incomplete or unfinished on the other unit, will not entitle the owner of the unit where work is completed to their share of the refundable portion of the Design and Construction Compliance Fees/Deposits.
- d. Photos and/or detailed drawings of both sides of the duplex are required so that the changes to the existing structure are clearly illustrated.

- e. The Applicant was requested to re-study the front entry handrails, including the proposed concrete steps, since this is a change to one side of the duplex only.

The matter is tabled, at the Applicant's request, due to the lack of details and information from the adjoining duplex property owner.

Lewis Residence
Miller Lewis

Lot 16, Blk. 1, Flg. 3
140 Chaparral

Preliminary Review

Miller Lewis presented a 3D presentation of the proposed project, along with a set of drawings, to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. A review by the Architectural Consultant determined that the finished square footage of the proposed home was in excess of the maximum allowed by the Guidelines by approximately 150 square feet, possibly due to the calculations not considering outside wall dimensions.
- b. The Site Plan should indicate a swale for drainage on both the east and west sides of the finished building to promote positive drainage from the building and to mitigate runoff onto the west neighboring property.
- c. Ingress/egress of the driveway is of concern to the Committee, and it was suggested that the Applicant study the turning radius for an appropriately sized vehicle entering and exiting the property. The exact proposed contours of the driveway are required to indicate final grading at street intersection (approach) and at entrance to garages (Section 2.7). Indication of the grade at various points along the driveway should be noted on the plans.
- d. It is strongly suggested that the Applicant review the elevation of the west wing's building mass and consider lowering the floor and roof heights relative to the east wing of the house. This will allow that portion of the building to better follow the existing grade (Section 2.5), lessen the amount of excavation required, reduce the amount of final re-grading, and move towards lessening the mirror image of the building as viewed from the south elevation (Section 2.23).
- e. It is strongly suggested that the Applicant review the roof drainage strategy, considering alternatives to the proposed scupper system.
- f. Show existing grade and proposed grade on exterior elevations as well as the maximum roof heights per the Guidelines.
- g. The color palate for the stucco, as presented, should be reconsidered per the Guidelines (Section 2.11). A Color Board, in accordance with the Guidelines, must be submitted for all exterior materials, including the flat roof membrane and ballasting, if appropriate.
- h. Exterior construction details are required for Preliminary Review and the Applicant is required to prepare the Architectural plans in accordance with the checklist in the Guidelines (Section 9). Specific details requested, based on the submitted plans, include the vertical lines breaking up the stucco, the proposed sunshade, and an explanation for the windows in the mechanical room.

The project is tabled, at the Applicant's request.

**Somers/Warmath
Duplex**

**Lot 23B/A Flg. 1
120 Charolais Circle**

Exterior Color Changes

Mr. Jan Idzikowski (spouse of Doreen Somers) presented the proposed the exterior color changes to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. The stucco color is Benjamin Moore “Edgecombe Gray”.
- b. The fascia, siding and other wood trim color is Benjamin Moore “Tuscany Green”.

A motion was made to approve the colors as submitted. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the colors as submitted.

DISCUSSION:

**Walsh Residence
Brian Judge**

**Lot 23, Blk. 4, Flg. 4
0401 Winslow Road**

Final Review

The Committee requested that Mr. Perkins contact the Applicant’s architect to determine the status of this project and communicate the Committee’s comments from the expedited review of the submitted revised plans for the Walsh Residence. Mr. Perkins advised the DRC that the Design and Construction Compliance Fee has not been paid, nor have the plans been stamped, but they have been submitted to the Eagle County for permitting.

The comments can be summarized as follows:

- a. All existing windows and doors to remain are to match style and color of new windows; please note this on the plans.
- b. Siding transition details are requested to indicate how exterior materials meet and the thickness and depth of each material relative to the adjacent material.
- c. Indicate reflectivity of proposed new roof material and provide specification of coatings for existing roof areas to be re-painted to match.
- d. Specify species and size of proposed landscaping at exterior stair.
- e. Construction Management Plan needs to include ‘green plasticized construction fencing’ at perimeter of work area; not green silt fence as indicated on current plan.
- f. 8 ½” x 11” Color Board is required with actual samples of exterior materials; sample for ‘Metal Panels’ is noted as ‘Dark Bronze’ but appears solid black on the current Color Board.
- g. Indicate final finish on deck railings and proposed steel trellis.

The Committee also had a discussion regarding Solar Reflectivity (SR) on metal roofs, distinguishing that from the Solar Reflectivity Index (SRI), which is more often associated with LEED certification and energy efficiency, although the 2 measures are highly correlated. The objective of the Guidelines was reiterated; to focus on minimizing reflectivity, and that metal roofs will be considered based on individual site conditions and design appropriateness.

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 19th day of June 2014.