

**SINGLETREE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 18, 2014**

A Regular Meeting of the Singletree Design Review Committee was held on Thursday, December 18, 2014, at 8:00 a.m., at the Singletree Community Center, Edwards, Colorado.

The members present were: Larry Rogers, Larry Deckard, Charlie Dolan and Karen Zavis. The Architectural Consultant, John Perkins, was also in attendance. George Gregory was not in attendance, but he provided the other members of the Committee his notes and comments in connection with the project reviewed at this meeting.

MEETING MINUTES – The Committee reviewed the December 4, 2014 meeting minutes. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the December 4, 2014 meeting minutes as submitted.

**Brandrup Residence
Melissa Brandrup**

**Flg. 1, Lot 76
711 Charolais Circle**

Preliminary Review

The Architect and owner, Melissa Brandrup, the Landscape Architect, Greg Roesler, and the Architect from Blu Homes, Matthew Schulte, presented the preliminary plans to the Committee for their review.

The Committee acknowledged that the "concept" of the home was approved at the Conceptual presentation on 9/18/14. However, at that time, the Applicant did not indicate that the project was to be constructed in modular units and transported into Singletree in exactly the same manner (garage site-built; residential portion primarily manufactured) as another home that brought considerable concern and issues to the entire Singletree Community and the DRC several years ago.

A Conceptual presentation is an opportunity for the Applicant and the DRC to discuss relevant issues regarding the site, general design concepts, the Singletree Design Guidelines, construction methods, etc. In this case, the Applicant focused her comments to the DRC on "green" design and construction objectives and how her family would use the home. Design Review Guidelines Section 8.2 indicates that: "This step in the process gives the owner an opportunity to see if the direction of the project is in keeping with the Design Guidelines and the community of Singletree and will help eliminate unnecessary expenditures on a design that will not be acceptable." Conceptual Approval is a step in the process; it is not assurance of Final Approval.

It was the consensus of the Committee that virtually every design issue mentioned in the following list of matters results from the method in which modular or manufactured units are constructed and transported. While a home similar in floor plan may be approvable, the Committee believes that the current presentation lacks the necessary and appropriate architectural detail and presents finished elevations that reflect that this is a manufactured product.

The specific matters noted are as follows:

- a. The residence presented to the Committee proposes the use of 2 factory-built modules that are to be shipped from the Blu Homes factory in California to the site and connected by several site-built structures.
- b. It was noted that the intended use of this hybrid build/design approach (modular + site-built) was not known at the time of the Conceptual Approval granted on 9/18/14.
- c. Design Review Guidelines Section 2.22 (Manufactured Housing and Plan Services) states that: “The use of either of these methods is strongly discouraged and will receive special scrutiny from the Committee”.
- d. Design Review Guidelines Section 2.6 (Adjacent Homes) states: “The type of construction, scale and general context of the neighboring homes should be taken into consideration when designing a home that will be constructed next to an existing home”. The Committee has consistently applied and interpreted this Guideline in the context of not only the neighboring homes, but the diverse Singletree Community in general. As such, the DRC encourages designs that have substantive massing, design-appropriate scaled exterior finish details, and optimize the mountain views, which are so desirable.
- e. Collectively, the Committee felt that the structure’s design could benefit from an overall reassessment, with particular attention to massing, fenestration and details. Some observations and selected recommendations related thereto include:
 - Door and window trim and the siding corner boards are very thin
 - The steel post and beam detailing at the main entry to the home appears disproportionately under-sized
 - The fascia boards need to be of 2x material as opposed to the 1x material proposed
 - The depth of the overhang should be increased from the 10” as presented, with due consideration to snow loads; a minimum of 18” at the eaves is suggested
 - The stone veneer was presented as being 2” thick with a 2” stone cap; the veneer should be at a minimum a 4” thick real stone material, with a minimum 3” stone cap, which should be at least 4” proud of the siding above it
- f. It was noted by the Committee that the east facing facade does not take advantage of the primary view to the mountains from this site and that perhaps the applicant should consider increasing the height of the fenestration on this elevation, in conjunction with a higher roof form and a bump-out in the façade to help break up what is currently a long, regular elevation.
- g. It was noted by the Committee that the long elevation of the three-car garage would benefit by some relief in the form; by offsetting a section of the garage door wall, and staggering the roof line, thereby breaking up the massing.
- h. It was suggested by the Committee that the street elevation could be more interesting and additional fenestration in this area would be an asset to the home’s ‘sense of arrival’.
- i. The final finish specifications of the garage doors are required and are to be consistent with the exterior finish of the house (Guidelines Section 2.16).
- j. The exterior up-lights as presented are not allowed and must be revised to be down lighting (Guidelines Section 3.13)
- k. The Committee requested a sample of the proposed exterior wood siding.
- l. A note must be added to the drawings that indicate that the height of the proposed unfinished basement/crawl space will not exceed 5 feet.
- m. Final exposed finish of the hot tub is to match the home’s exterior siding.

- n. A Construction Management Plan is required and must include 'green plasticized netted construction fencing' along the perimeter of the work area (Guidelines Section 6.4).
- o. The proposed exterior fire pit is to be noted as a gas appliance (Guidelines Section 3.14).
- p. Details are required for the proposed board formed concrete as presented for the various site walls to indicate how the forms integrate with the other exterior finishes of the structure.
- q. Per the Design Guidelines, final construction details will be required, including building and wall sections. If modular and conventionally framed construction is to be employed, then a wall section of each is required.
- r. Utility meter concealment strategy to be indicated on elevations (Guidelines Section 2.18).

The matter is tabled per the Applicant's request.

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 this the 18th day of December 2014.