

**SINGLETREE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
January 19, 2012**

A Regular Meeting of the Singletree Design Review Committee was held on Thursday, January 19, 2012, at 8:30 a.m., at the Singletree Community Center, Edwards, Colorado.

The members present were: Chairman George Gregory, Charlie Dolan, George Haller and Connie Powers. The Community Manager, Kim Ahmad, was also in attendance.

MEETING MINUTES – The Committee reviewed the January 5, 2012 meeting minutes. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the January 5, 2012 meeting minutes as submitted.

Stitt Residence	Lot 53, Blk. 2, Flg. 2 800 June Creek Road	Conceptual Review
------------------------	---	--------------------------

Steve Isom presented the conceptual plans to the Committee for their review and the following concerns were discussed:

- a. The two front loaded garages and their respective doors dominate the entire project giving it more of a commercial or multi-family appearance as opposed to a well-conceived, unified total building (Guideline 2.6).
- b. It was suggested to Mr. Isom that one of the units be moved forward to provide an opportunity to side load one of the unit's garages and to break up the front elevation of the project.
- c. The plans indicated a slightly different window arrangement for each unit, they were so similar as to be "mirror images" which are not permitted. (guideline 2.22).
- d. At least one entry needs to indicate that there is a dominant entrance to the property. Their current location is largely hidden and lacks interest due to the deep recess between the two garage elements. (Section 2.16)

The matter is tabled per the Applicant's request.

Kilgore Residence	Lot 33, Blk. 2, Flg. 4 47 Howard Drive	Dormer Addition
--------------------------	---	------------------------

Mr. Kilgore and his architect, Courtney Giphart, presented the plans to add a dormer on the east (front) elevation and horizontal transom windows above the sliding doors on the rear elevation of the home. The following matters were noted or requested:

- a. Detailed dimensioned, working drawings are required.
- b. All materials and colors are to match the existing materials. (Section 2.11)
- c. All exterior lights must be brought into compliance and cut sheets are required. (Section 3.13)

A motion was made to approve the dormer on the east (front) elevation and the horizontal transom windows on the rear elevation subject to the requirement listed above. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve dormer on the east elevation and the horizontal transom windows on the rear elevation subject to the conditions outlined above

NOTE: A Compliance Deposit of \$2,000.00 will be required, all of which will be returned less \$250.00 which will be retained as the final inspection administrative fee.

MLJ Duplex

**Lot 43, Blk. 1, Flg. 4
43 Morgan Drive**

Conceptual Review

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

- a. The Committee Members advised the applicant that there were only two discernable changes from the previous presentation. To wit: (1) the laundry facilities had been removed from the garage areas yet the excess square footage concerns remain: and (2), the revised driveway configuration eliminated the dual drives but still presents problems by leaving all guest and overflow parking for the East Unit in the front Setback. The applicant was advised that this garage unit needs to be side loaded to avoid the appearance of the garage doors dominating the front of the project. However, the applicant was specifically advised that simply revising the plans to side load the garage was not going to bring this project closer to conceptual approval unless the requested change was coupled with a comprehensive reconsideration of the entire project.
- b. The applicant was advised again, very clearly, that the total project needs to be revisited in terms of massing and its relationship to adjacent homes (Guideline 2.6). Mr. Lauterbach was advised that the same issues that existed with his previous presentation continued to exist as there was no effort to address the massing and the two separate and distinct units. Board members repeated that the conceptual plans looked as though two unrelated units had been simply joined at a common wall and that there was no "...well-conceived, unified, total building." (Guideline 2.22)
- c. The Board unanimously requested the applicant to reconsider the total design program for this project, and specifically address the contextual issue of adjacent homes and the massing.
- d. The applicant was given a copy of the minutes from the prior meeting where many of the same issues were discussed. It was reiterated that another presentation of the proposed project without addressing the matters listed above, and at the previous meeting, would only result in continued frustration for the applicant as the proposal is not conceptually approvable as submitted.

The matter is tabled at the Applicant's request.

Coleman Residence

**Lot 18, Flg. 1
20 Stagecoach Road**

Garage Addition

Alex Coleman presented the proposed garage addition plans to the Committee for their review. The Committee discussed the following and/or requested additional information as set forth below.

- a. The Applicant was requested to reconsider the long linear façade resulting from the proposed garage addition and proposed ideas for giving the facade more architectural interest. One idea was to step back the front of the garage thus reducing the long North elevation. Even with such a step back, the North elevation will still need to be revisited.
- b. An ILC and site plan are required to verify set backs.
- c. A signed, notarized letter from the adjoining property owner is required indicating they approve the proposed changes. Mr. Coleman was provided the form that is acceptable to the DRC

- d. The elimination of the octagonal window on the front elevation and the reworking of the entry door was received well but the Applicant was cautioned about recessing the entry too deeply. (Stepping the front of the garage addition back somewhat will help address this concern).
- e. The applicant was advised that the living space proposed for the area over the garage addition is not acceptable because there is minimal (12 square feet) additional developable square footage available.

The matter is tabled at 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 of the Singletree Design Review Committee this the 19th day of January, 2012.