

**SINGLETREE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 5, 2012**

A Regular Meeting of the Singletree Design Review Committee was held on Thursday, April 05, 2012, at 8:30 a.m., at the Singletree Community Center, Edwards, Colorado.

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

MEETING MINUTES – The Committee reviewed the March 15, 2012 meeting minutes. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to approve the March 15, 2012 meeting minutes as submitted.

Lauterbach Duplex

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

Review Plans

Mike Lauterbach and Steve Ridden, Architect, were present to discuss minor changes to the most recently revised plans. After reviewing the plans and the photographic massing studies presented by Mr. Ridden; and considering Mr. Ridden's comments regarding the current massing proposal, the Committee advised the applicant that there were essentially no changes in the massing of the proposed duplex from the previous submittal. There was a discussion about the need for a well-conceived, unified, total building with the primary massing appearing near the center of the building.

Mr. Ridden advised the Committee that as often is the case these days, there were budgetary issues. The Committee acknowledged those issues and briefly gave a history of the previous submittals including the conceptual elevations presented by Vail Architectural Group (VAG). There was further discussion regarding; (1) the massing problems and; (2), the necessity of addressing the contextual relationship of the proposed duplex to the adjacent residences and in particular, the southwestern style of those homes that surround the lot.

Mr. Lauterbach was given the opportunity to table the application, or alternatively have it denied by the DRC and proceed with an appeal process. Mr. Lauterbach first requested that the VAG proposal be approved and that the current proposal be denied by the DRC. The Appeal process was discussed at which time Mr. Lauterbach requested that his application be denied.

A motion was made and seconded to deny the current application for conceptual approval as shown on Sheet A4 dated April 2, 2012 because (1), the proposed duplex failed to be a well-conceived, unified, total building and (2), due to the consistent failure to address the contextual relationship of adjoining homes. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED, that the applicant's conceptual plans for a proposed duplex as shown on sheet A4, dated April 2, 2012 is hereby denied at the applicant's request.

NOTE: Mr. Doug Talbot, a neighbor, was present.

Biegler Duplex

**Lot 34, Blk. 1, Flg. 4
141A Corral Road**

Deck Redesign

Jane Biegler, Brown Ell Bailey, Kyle Webb presented the deck design to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. A signed, notarized letter stating approval of the deck plans from the adjoining property owner is required.
- b. Stucco is to be replaced with wrought iron on deck and stairs.

- c. Details on railings, deck and slider is required.
- d. All exterior lighting is to be down light and cut sheets are required.
- e. The existing chimney cap must be brought into compliance.
- f. The community manager will send the plans to the adjoining home owner and she will be invited to the next meeting.

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

RESOLVED to approve the conceptual plans as submitted.

Legg Residence

**Lot 15, Blk. 2, Flg. 2
21 Stagecoach Road**

Conceptual Review

Jo Ellen Legg, Hal Minski, Tim Losa presented the preliminary plans to the Committee for their review and the following matters were noted:

- a. The Applicants wish to raise the roof above the Master Bedroom and the strategy involves a shallow shed with a dormer centered in the proposed shed. The dormer will match a similar architectural element at the entry of the home. The raised roof (which only occurs on the rear or eastern section of the existing roof) would allow the Applicants to construct a loft above the Master Bedroom.
- b. The Applicant's also want to delete the exterior door coming out of the kitchen on the north elevation and modify the window on the south elevation that opens into a bath.
- c. The Applicant was advised that all exterior lighting currently not in compliance would have to be replaced with down lighting and cut sheets of the replacement lights would be required.
- d. The current galvanized flue would require a chimney cap and all galvanized material would have to be painted the color of the adjacent material or in the case of the flue, flat black.
- e. All new materials are to match the existing materials in dimension and color. (The applicant was uncertain about final colors during the discussion).
- f. Final dimensioned architectural and structural drawings must be submitted.
- g. Green netted construction fencing will be required and its location must be indicated on the site plan.
- i. The Applicant was hopeful of getting Final Approval at the next DRC meeting. All concerned were advised that the items listed in the Preliminary and Final Check Lists would be required for Final Approval.

A motion was made to give conceptual approval of the Applicants' proposal and plans subject to the matters and conditions listed above. By motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to give conceptual approval of the Applicants' proposal and plans subject to the matters and conditions listed above.

NOTE: Mr. Gregory recused himself.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Coleman Duplex

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

Roof Framing

A letter was sent to Mr. Coleman stating that the structural plans submitted did not conform with the requirement that the roof system be constructed with trusses so to insure that the maximum head height does not exceed 5 feet in height. The Committee requests confirmation from Mr. Perkins that the roof system is being built as originally approved by the DRC at the March 15, 2012 meeting.

Higer Duplex

**Lot 11, Blk. 2, Flg. 4
01381 Winslow Road**

Deposit Refund

Mr. Higer has requested that his deposit be returned as he is finished with the work on his side of the project. The adjoining owners, the Ristows, have just commenced the work on their side of the duplex and the total project is clearly incomplete. The matter was discussed by all the Committee members. It was recalled that at the time of the Higer's original application that all members agreed, including Mr. Perkins, the Higer's architect, that the proposal could not be considered or approved without a similar level of improvements on the adjoining duplex.

There was a discussion that the approval process of additions on either side was specifically contingent upon comparable improvements on the other side and that compliance deposits were likewise contingent upon completion of the total project. To not do so would result in completely disregarding the requirement that duplexes have a well-conceived, unified, total appearance (Guideline 2.22). In summary, the improvements on both sides of the duplex need to be completed prior to the refund of either deposit.

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 Design Review Committee this the 5th day of April, 2012.