TOWN OF MOUNTAIN VILLAGE
REGULAR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
THURSDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2017 10:00 AM
2nd FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, MOUNTAIN VILLAGE TOWN HALL 455 MOUNTAIN VILLAGE BLVD, MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, COLORADO

AGENDA

|  | Time | Min. | Presenter | Type |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1. | $10: 00$ |  | Chair |  | Call to Order |
| 2. | $10: 00$ | 5 | Starr | Action | Reading and Approval of Summary of Motions of the <br> of the October 5, 2017 Joint Town Council and Design <br> Review Board Meeting. |
| 3. | $10: 05$ | 60 | Bangert | Initial <br> Architecture and <br> Site Review | Consideration of a Class 3 Design Review Process <br> Application for new construction of a single-family <br> home on Lot 702, 124 Adams Ranch Rd |
| 4. | $11: 05$ | 60 | Starr | Public Hearing, <br> Quasi-Judicial <br> Action | Consideration of a Class 3 Final Design Review <br> application for a single-family home on Lot 628D, 109 <br> Double Eagle Way |
| 5. | $12: 05$ | 10 | Haynes | Discussion | Other Business |
| 6. | $12: 15$ |  |  |  | Adjourn |

# SUMMARY OF MOTIONS <br> TOWN OF MOUNTAIN VILLAGE <br> DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING <br> THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2017 

## Call to Order

The Meeting of the Joint Town Council and Design Review Board was called to order by Maylor Laila Benitez at 9:00a.m on Thursday, October 5, 2017 in the Mountain Village Town Hall, 455 Mountain Village Boulevard, Mountain Village Colorado.

## Attendance

The following Town Council members were present and acting:
Laila Benitez, Mayor
Dan Caton, Mayor Pro Tem (by phone)
Dan Jansen
Jack Gilbride
Bruce MacIntire

The following Town Council members were absent:
Natalie Binder
Patrick Berry

The following DRB members/Alternates were present and acting:
David Craige
Dave Eckman
Greer Garner
Phil Evans
Jean Vatter

The following Board members were absent:
Luke Trujillo
Banks Brown
Keith Brown

## Town Staff in attendance:

Kim Montgomery, Town Manager
Susan Johnson, Deputy Town Clerk
Christina Lambert, Administrative Coordinator
Michelle Haynes, Director of Planning and Development Services
Jim Mahoney, Assistant Town Attorney
Dave Bangert, Town Forester/Senior Planner

Public in attendance:
Jeff Proteau
Stefanie Solomon
Neil Wiser
Robert Stenhammer
Bill Jensen

## John Cheroske

Bill Masters
Mike Rozycki
Gregg Anderson
Matt Porter
David Ballode

## DRB to Provide a Recommendation on a Second Amendment to a Previously Approved Conditional Use Permit for a 100 foot Communication Tower to be Located in Tract OSP 49-R (Resolution No. 2015-0423-08 \& Amended by Resolution No. 2017-0216-04) to Amend Condition \#1 to Allow for a Red-Light Beacon as Required by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Michelle Haynes presented the Design Review Application for an amendment to allow for a red-light beacon as required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) on Tract OSP-49R. Neil Wiser of Fidelity Towers. presented on behalf of the applicant, and Jeff Proteau of Telluride Ski and Golf, Inc. presented on behalf of the property owner.

Public Comment was provided by Chris Broady, Chief of Mountain Village Police Department, who pointed out that the proposed tower on Tract OSP 49-R will be important for public safety.

Mike Rozycki, San Miguel County Planning Director, provided clarification on why San Miguel Board of County Commissioners decided to require a 1 year review of visual impact mitigation. Mr. Rozycki also demonstrated support for approval.

Bill Masters, San Miguel County Sherriff, echoed the comments of Chris Broady by insisting that the tower is important for public safety.

On a Motion made by Phil Evans and seconded by Dave Eckman, the DRB voted 7-0 to make a recommendation of approval to Town Council with the following conditions:

1. The tower may include a red-light beacon if required by the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA").
2. The proposed towers and antennas shall be painted to match the surrounding tree color below the tree line and a blue gray above the tree line to mitigate visual impacts. The applicant shall provide color samples to the Town and San Miguel County for review and approval prior to or concurrent with submitting for a building permit.
3. New antennas or equipment placed on the existing tower shall be painted to match the surrounding tree color below the tree line and a blue gray above the tree line to mitigate visual impacts, with the color reviewed and approved by the Town and San Miguel County.
4. The new tower shall be designed to co-locate the number of antennas shown on the Proposed Site Elevations plan, Sheet C-3. I dated 4/15/I 5.
5. The current and proposed towers shall be made available for colocation of new telecommunication equipment so long as: (A) there is enough room on the tower for the new equipment (given the vertical \& horizontal separation requirements of the current users), (B) there is enough structural capacity for the new equipment, and (C) the new equipment will not cause interference to the current users.
6. Prior to issuing a building permit, the applicant shall submit long-term easements from The Ridge and/or TSO and any other intervening property owner's land is necessary for access, for (1 the access road to the tower site; (2) the tower site; and (3) utility routes for existing and new utilities to the site. Prior to executing such easements, the Town shall
review and approve the easements to ensure long-term vehicular and utility access across intervening land and long-term tower siting.
7. Prior to issuing a building permit, the applicant shall submit a composite utility plan to show the planned routes for power, fiber and any other necessary utilities to the site.
8. The approved conditional use permit application is for the benefit of the existing tower that is owned by Telluride Ski and Golf, LLC ("TSG") and the proposed new tower on TSG owned land. Therefore the conditional use permit is hereby granted to TSG and any successors or assigns.
9. The conditional use permit shall be valid for a period of twenty (20) years from the Effective Date subject to meeting the conditions specified herein.
10. The applicant, TSG, as the site owner/lessor, and/or the tower owner/operator/lessee who TSG enters into an agreement with to own/operate the Tower, enter into a legally binding written commitment with SMCo, both the BOCC and Sheriff, as well as with SMETSA, and the State of Colorado OIT, to allow the relocation of the State of Colorado's DTRS 800 Radio System equipment located on the existing 90' communication tower (KOTO tower) onto the proposed new I 00' communication tower in a manner and at locations acceptable to the SMCoSO, SMETSA, and the Colorado Office of Information Technology.
11. The applicant, TSG, and or its Tower Company shall commit to a one-year review after construction of the Tower is completed, and every three years thereafter, to provide an update to the Town of Mountain Village and the County Board of Commissioners to address possible lighting mitigation of the red light beacon. The update would include an assessment of available technology including but not limited to possible light shielding or light switching.

See Approved Town Council Minutes for associated Town Council Action dated October 5, 2017

Adjourn
Town Council adjourned the joint meeting at 10:00 am.

## Call to Order

Chairman David Craige called the meeting of the Design Review Board of the Town of Mountain Village to order at 10:20 a.m. on Thursday, October 5, 2017 in the Conference Room at 455 Mountain Village Boulevard Mountain Village, CO 81435.

## Attendance

The following Board/Alternate members were present and acting:
Keith Brown
Phil Evans
Greer Garner
David Craige
Dave Eckman
Jean Vatter (Alternate)
Liz Caton (Alternate)

## The following Board members were absent:

Luke Trujillo
Banks Brown

## Town Staff in attendance:

Michelle Haynes, Planning \& Development Services Director
Dave Bangert, Senior Planner/Forester

| Public in attendance: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gregg Anderson | Gregg@alpinelandconsulting.com |
| Matt Porter | Mattiep11@yahoo.com |
| David Ballode | dballode@msn.com |
| Michael Barker | cmbarker@cox.net |
| Steve Morton | smorton@mortonarchitects.com |
| Armando Coronado | 2013proservices@gmail.com |

## Reading and Approval of Summary of Motions of the August 31, 2017 and September 7, 2017 Design Review Board Meetings

On a Motion made by Phil Evans and seconded by Greer Garner, the DRB voted 7-0 to approve the Summary of Motions from the August 31, 2017 and September 7, 2017 Design Review Board Meetings.

## Consideration of a Design Review application for driveway improvements with General Easement encroachments on Lot 254B, 115 Polecat Lane.

Dave Bangert presented the Design Review Application for driveway improvements and General Easement encroachment on Lot 254B, 115 Polecat Lane for review. Gregg Anderson of Alpine Land Consulting presented on behalf of the owner.

There was no public comment.

On a Motion made by David Eckman and seconded by Phil Evans, the DRB voted 7-0 to approve a Design Review Application for driveway improvements and a General Easement encroachment, 115 Polecat Lane with the following conditions:

1. Applicable Town fees and taxes shall be paid prior to commencing the activity or prior to the Town issuing a permit, as applicable, including but not limited to the Town's use tax.
2. Owners of Lot 254B will enter into a new revocable General Easement encroachment agreement, with new Improvement Location Certificate, with the Town of Mountain Village.
3. Any additional exterior lighting for the auto court area will be reviewed by staff and raised to Staff/DRB Chair if the new lighting needs specific approval.

## Consideration of a Design Review application for new construction of a single-family home on lot 628D, 109 Double Eagle Way.

Sam Starr presented the Initial Architectural Site Review consideration of a Class 3 design review application for new construction of a single-family home on lot 628D, 109 Double Eagle Way. Michael Barker of Michael Barker Architects and David Ballode of Uncompahgre Engineering presented on behalf of the owner.

Public Comment was provided by Mike Shimkonis, a representative and owner of a neighboring property. Mr. Shimkonis requested that there be no General Encroachment Agreements, there is minimal lighting by the utility box, and that and the chimney caps be reduced in height.

On a Motion made by Greer Garner and seconded by Phil Evans, the DRB voted 7-0 to approve the Initial Architectural Site Review of the application for a single-family residence on lot 628D, 109 Double Eagle Way, with the following conditions:

1. A monumented land survey shall be prepared by a Colorado public land surveyor to establish the maximum building height and the maximum average building height. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
2. A monumented land survey of the footers will be provided prior to pouring concrete to determine there are no additional encroachments into the GE. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
3. Applicant shall submit detailed lighting plans within 14 days of approval.
4. Make all revisions to driveway per TFPD referral comments, if necessary.
5. The owners will enter in to a revocable General Easement encroachment agreement for the driveway and auto court prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
6. Indicate the location and design of the address monument with the final DRB submittal.
7. Grading of the Northwest corner of the site be tapered to make the home design more sensitive to the natural slope of the property.

## Consideration of a Class 1 Design Review application, raised to a Class 3 application, for exterior changes to lot 18, 124 Yellow Brick Road.

Sam Starr presented the Consideration of a Class 1 Design Review application, raised to a Class 3 design review application for exterior changes to lot 18, 124 Yellow Brick Road. Armando Coronado of Pro Services presented on behalf of the owner.

There was no public comment.

On a Motion made by Phil Evans and seconded by Keith Brown, the DRB voted 7-0 to approve the exterior changes on lot 18, 124 Yellow Brick Road, with the following condition:

1. The finish of a dark brown patina shall be completed prior to installation of the copper roof.

## Other Business

Planning and Development Services Director Michelle Haynes provided an update on the cedar shake roof rebate program recently approved by the Town Council.

## Adjourn

On a Motion made by Greer Garner and seconded by Phil Evans, DRB voted 7-0 to adjourn the October 5, 2017 meeting of the Mountain Village Design Review Board at 12:50 p.m.

Prepared and Submitted by,

Sam Starr
Planner
Town of Mountain Village

## TO: <br> Design Review Board

FROM: Dave Bangert, Senior Planner
FOR: $\quad$ Meeting of November 2, 2017
DATE: October 25, 2017
RE: Initial Architecture and Site Review application for a new single-family dwelling on Lot 702

## PROJECT GEOGRAPHY

## Legal Description: Lot 702

Address: 124 Adams Ranch Road (Rd.).
Applicant/Agent: Luke Trujillo/Trulinea Architects
Owner:
CTH Holdings
Zoning: Single-Family Zone District
Existing Use: Vacant Lot
Proposed Use: Single-Family
Lot Size: $\quad 0.845$ acres

## Adjacent Land Uses:

- North: Open Space
- South: Open Space
- East: Single-Family
- West: Single-Family


## ATTACHMENTS

- Exhibit A: Narrative
- Exhibit B: Plan Set


## PROJECT SUMMARY

| CDC Provision | Requirement | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Building Height | $35^{\prime}$ maximum (35'+5' for gable roof) | $34^{\prime}-10-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Maximum Avg Building Height | $30^{\prime}$ maximum (30'+5' for gable roof) | $23^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Maximum Lot Coverage | $40 \%$ maximum | $34 \%$ |
| General Easement Setbacks |  |  |
| North | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | Less than 1' to GE |
| South | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $42^{\prime}$ to GE |
| East | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $0^{\prime}$ to GE |
| West | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $2^{\prime}$ to GE |
| Roof Pitch |  |  |


| Primary |  | $1.5: 12,3: 12$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Secondary |  | $0.5: 12,1: 12$ |
| Exterior Material | $35 \%$ minimum |  |
| Stone | $25 \%$ (No requirement) | $37.05 \%$ |
| Wood | $40 \%$ maximum for windows | $24.62 \%$ |
| Windows/Doors | 2 enclosed and 2 non-tandem | $80.13 \%$ |
| Metal Accents | 3 enclosed and 2 exterior |  |
| Parking |  |  |

## BACKGROUND

In accordance with 17.4.3 of the Community Development Code (CDC), the applicant has applied for a Class 3 Design Review for the development of a single-family residence. The proposed project consists of a 10,014-total square foot (with 8,712 square foot livable) single-family home located on lot 702. This first step of our two-step process will be initial architectural and site review.

### 17.3.12.C BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS

The average height for the proposed designed is relatively low at 23 ' -5 ". The main views of the design are from the east and west elevations, with the east elevation average height of 22' -8 $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ and the west elevation at an average of 23 ' -5 ". The north elevation indicates the Maximum Building Height at 34' - 10-1/4" feet from the highest eave vertically through the upper story deck and stair well to the finished grade of the north patio. The same eave from the east elevation is perceived and would otherwise be measured at 30 ' $-8-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ to the natural/finished grade to the east of the stair well.

When a proposed development is approved that is five (5) feet or less from the maximum building height or maximum average building height, the review authority approval shall include a condition that a monumented land survey shall be prepared by a Colorado public land surveyor to establish the maximum building height and the maximum average building height. This shall be done prior to the Building Division conducting the required framing inspection.

### 17.5.5 BUILDING SITING DESIGN

Lot 702 is an average size lot (. 845 acre) that slopes gently from the southeast portion downward to the northwest corner. There is no tree cover on this lot, just grasses and a few native shrubs. The applicant has designed a home that is broken up into three "pods" with connecting sections in between. The separation of these pods allows for the building to be built into the site, minimizing visual impact with the separate pods adjusting accordingly to the topography. The design is set back from Adams Ranch Rd. and drops with the slope of the lot. There no proposed encroachments into the General Easements however there will be grading in the GE's and there is a proposed berm area in the southern GE to screen the home from Adams Ranch Rd. There are no proposed General Easement building encroachments but foundation walls are within 5 ' of GE. This will require a footer survey prior to pouring concrete to ensure there is no encroachments in to the General Easement area.

### 17.5.6 BUILDING DESIGN

## Building Form and Exterior Wall Form

In accordance with the Community Development Code, the proposed building form and exterior wall form portray a mass that is thick and strong, with a heavy, thick grounded foundation.

## Roof Forms, Design and Materials

The CDC states that the roof shall be a composition of multiple forms that emphasize sloped planes, varied ridgelines and vertical offsets. The primary roof forms for the residence are described by the applicant as intersecting shed roof structures. Meaning that there is a center valley between opposing shed roof elements with the highest point being the roof eaves. The secondary roof forms are low pitch sheds over the front entry way and bridge elements that connect the three main "pods". The roof over the garage is an offset hip roof design with low pitches. The proposed roofing material will be copper standing seam. This will require specific approval from the DRB for use of copper roofing.

## Exterior Wall Materials

The exterior walls consist of $37.05 \%$ stone veneer (Eagle Moss Rock) with recessed dark grey grout; 24.62 \% wood, vertical reclaimed 8" boards with varying stains from lighter to darker; $30.13 \%$ fenestration (dark bronze metal clad Loewen Curtain wall systems); $8.20 \%$ steel accents, with horizontal mill finished steel bands on the stone masses, metal panel siding, Cchannel deck edges and tube steel guard rails.

### 17.5.7 GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN

The applicant has provided a grading and drainage plan prepared by Uncompahgre Engineering, LLC for the proposed development. Positive drainage away from the structures has been provided with all disturbed areas and to have final grades of $3: 1$ or flatter. There proposed window wells that will have drains that tie into the perimeter drain. There is proposed grading in the southern GE to create a landscape berm to shield the property from Adams Ranch Rd.

### 17.5.8 PARKING REGULATIONS

There are 3 enclosed parking spaces and 2 exterior spaces proposed. All parking spaces are completely located within the property boundaries. The applicant has indicated that there will be snowmelt in front of the garage doors and extending along the front walkway to the entrance, on the north patio and the eastern window well. Total square footage of snowmelt is 2,519 square feet. This will require an energy offset for the square footage of snowmelt above 1000 SQ FT.

### 17.5.9 LANDSCAPING REGULATIONS

The proposed landscape plan shows 15 aspens, 5 spruces and 5 bristlecone pines to be planted along with shrubs and perennial beds. All plantings will need to be in compliance with Table 5-4 of the CDC:
Table 5-4, Minimum Plant Size Requirements

| Landscaping Type | Minimum Size |
| :--- | :--- |
| Deciduous Trees -Single Stem | 3 inches caliper diameter at breast height ("dbh") |
| Deciduous Trees - Multi-stem | 2.5 inches dbh |
| Evergreen Trees -Single-family lots | 8 to 10 feet in height, with 30\% 10 feet or larger. |
| Evergreen Trees - Multi-family lots | 8 to 12 feet in height, with 30\% 12 feet or larger. |
| Shrubs | 5 gallon or larger massing of smaller shrubs |

A formal irrigation plan has not been submitted at this time but the irrigation plan will need to show a rainfall sensor and a backflow prevention device.

### 17.5.11 UTILITIES

All shallow utilities are proposed to be run from Adams Ranch Rd. on the southern side of the driveway. The water line will come in from the west of the driveway and run parallel with the western GE cutting back to the garage to the east. Sanitary sewer will tie in to the existing sewer line to the north. Public Works requests that all utilities be field located by the contractor prior to construction.

### 17.5.12 LIGHTING REGULATIONS

The proposed lighting plan includes 11 sconces and 3 down puck lights in the soffit above each garage door and LED downlights underneath the bridge. Locations include egress, deck, garage and patio areas. Lighting is permitted in all proposed locations and seems appropriate for the design.

### 17.5.13.E. 4 ADDRESS IDENTIFICATION SIGNS

The address monument is compliant with the code; however, the numbers will have to be reflective per the TFPD and the LED up light will need to be changed to a down light.

### 17.6.6.B. DRIVEWAY STANDARDS

The driveway design meets the standards of the CDC. The drive width is 12 ' of asphalt with $2^{\prime}$ compacted shoulders. The first $20^{\prime}$ of the drive is at $2.10 \%$ grade and the auto court area has a maximum grade of $3.35 \%$.

### 17.6.8 SOLID FUEL BURNING DEVICE REGULATIONS

The applicant has indicated the fireplace will be a gas as well as the fire pit on the back patio.

### 17.7.19 CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION

All construction staging is with the lot boundaries but the construction staging plan shows construction parking and disturbance in the General Easements. This disturbance is minimal and will not adversely affect the surrounding properties.

## PROPOSED VARIATIONS AND SPECIFIC APPROVALS

- Grading and landscaping in the General Easements
- Use of copper standing seam roofing


## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the DRB approve the Initial Architecture Site Review application with the stated variations and specific approvals for Lot 720 with the following conditions which shall be addressed before Final Review hearing unless otherwise noted:

1. A monumented land survey shall be prepared by a Colorado public land surveyor to establish the maximum building height and the maximum average building height. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
2. A monumented land survey of the footers will be provided prior to pouring concrete to determine there are no additional encroachments into the GE. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.


Oct. 25, 2017
Town of Mountain Village
Michelle Haynes, MPA
Planning and Development Services Director
Mr. Dave Bangert
455 Mtn. Village Blvd. Suite A
Mountain Village, CO 81435
970-369-8250

Subj: Design Narrative - CTH Holdings
Lot 702 -Mtn. Village
Mtn. Village, Colorado
Cc/Courtney Kizer, Jeff Koenig, Landon Barrett cc: DRB members

Dear Michelle and Dave,
\{Roof Design Revised as of 2017.10.25\}
DRB and staff members: we have changed the roof design on the main building. You will now notice that the 'valley' has been shifted East. This makes our design compliant and under 35 feet as measured from the lower patio at 9262 . This small change creates a pitch break on our North elevation. It also allows us to have more headroom in the bridge going to the guest suite above the garage. Please note that we did this after considerable time and dialogue with planning staff and the clients.
Please also be advised that new AREA calculations are on sheet A002. Total heated livable SF $=8,712$. Garage is 1302 SF
To create anything great and truly memorable, there has to be a confluence of talents as well as great timing. This project, fondly referred to as "CTH Holdings" in the Trulinea office has all of the parts to make it a landmark project and home; a team of extremely talented and ambitious designers, and even more importantly, ambitious, smart and savvy clients, combined with the recent, long coming, design regulation changes in Mountain Village.

Not only is this a premiere site within the mountain village, it is visible from all sides by all people and thus must be thought out extensively. Many years from now, the demarcation line between structures built under the old regulations and those built under the new will read like night and day; leading to higher resale values and increased demand for new design. Currently this paradigm can be seen as it exists in the mountain village with houses that are built pre-cdc in the late 80's and early 90's.

The new mountain village CDC aims to preserve open space and protect the environment, while at the same time ensuring that uses and structures enhance their sites, not just for land owners, but for the community as a whole. We have addressed this through three main moves or design features, the relation of the overall building massing to the site and surrounding area as a
whole, the orientation and design of the butterfly or 'valley' roof structures along with the overall massing, as well as the historical context of designing a new structure under new design regulations, effectively creating a new standard.

Among the most important key characteristics of the new town design theme is building siting [site design] that is sensitive to the building location, access, views, solar gain, tree preservation and visual impacts of the existing design context of surrounding neighborhood development, using massing that is simple in form and steps with the natural topography. Effective site planning is crucial to designing a building and development that blends into the existing landscape. Building site shall respect and relate to the existing land forms and vegetation. Design solutions shall be site specific, organizing the building mass in a way that relates to the terrain and the functional constraints of the site.

The roof characteristics changes to the new CDC typify this, stating, the roof shall be a composition of multiple forms that emphasize sloped planes, varied ridgelines and vertical offsets and, roof ridgelines shall, where practicable, step with the topography of the site following the stepped foundation.

To achieve these goals we have separated out the different uses in the building into different "pods" or buildings that allow us to maximize views for both the end users of the project as well as the general public that happens to be passing by; the separation of these pods also allows for the building to be built into the site, minimizing visual impact with the separate pods adjusting accordingly to the topography, along with their corresponding roof structures.

In addition to breaking the main structure up to minimize visual impact while maximizing views, the intersecting shed roof forms, not allowable under old regulations, seek to maximize viewable areas from within the home. By creating the high points of the roof at the walls (rather than at the ridgeline as in a traditional roof) we have created more views within the home, bringing the outside in and inside out, a goal that is also achieved with the outdoor patio and living area.

Finally, designing to historical context takes on new meaning in this project with the aforementioned passage of the new Mountain Village CDC. Keeping to historical roots with the usage of natural, sustainable, materials in wood, stone, and metal that blend with the environment, but using the new CDC to imagine new and different combinations and detailing of these materials to create a structure that is expressive of its alpine function and heritage.

Thank you for your time,
Luke Trujillo AIA
Principal Architect - TruLinea Architects Inc.
www.TruLinea.com
Cell: (970) 708-1445

## Specific design facts the DRB board should review:

-Stone Veneer: Eagle Moss Rock. Irregular sizes mixed with some ashlar configurations. Grout is to be recessed with darker gray fill. Faces of the stone should be cleft and irregular. Rustic character of Telluride.
-Wood siding: reclaimed boards with varying stains from lighter to darker; nickel wide gaps over building wrap [8"]
-Windows: dark bronze metal clad Loewen Curtain wall system - see attached cut sheets
-Horizontal steel exposed bands on the stone masses - like a c-channel with mill finish or gun blue finish
-Metal panel siding: plate steel $3 / 8$ or $1 / 4$ thick - with $1 / 2$ gaps over black background with recessed screw heads
-Rafter tails and soffits: medium to dark stains on smooth faced lumber; big rafter tails on the main envelope will be exposed Steel I-beams or W sections - with thermal breaks from the inside
-Roofing: wide 12 or 14 inch standing seam copper with dark gray patina - similar to Timm Residence on Hood Park -Chimney caps: matching copper clad elements with seams and overlaps
-Garage doors: plate steel clad to match other elements - light weight panels to move with the doors
-Guard rails: tube steel with $1 \times 1$ bar stock runs; darker mill scale finish
-Deck edges: C-channels with mill scale finish to match guard rails
-Roof design is intentionally low slung with valleys to let the mountain beyond read through the composition - this allows the neighbors to look over the top
-We do have a substantial amount of excavation - therefore we want as much dirt fill left on site for landscape and privacy - thus we are seeking to grade in the GE on the North and South of the lot Material Proposals:



## EAST EXTERIOR LOOKING AT WILSON PEAK



LOOKING EAST



















$\bigcirc \frac{\text { WINDOW TYPES }}{1 / R^{2}=1-0^{\circ}}$



(1) AXON WITH BACKGROUND


## TO: <br> Design Review Board

FROM: Sam Starr, Planner
FOR: $\quad$ Meeting of November 2, 2017
DATE: $\quad$ October 26, 2017
RE: $\quad$ Design Review application for a new single-family dwelling on Lot 628D

## PROJECT GEOGRAPHY

## Legal Description: Lot 628D

Address: 109 Double Eagle Way
Applicant/Agent: Michael Barker
Owner: Steven and Jodie Konold
Zoning: Single-Family Zone District
Existing Use: Vacant Lot
Proposed Use: Single-Family
Lot Size: $\quad 0.34$ acres

## Adjacent Land Uses:

- North: Open Space
- South: Single-Family
- East: Single-Family
- West: Single-Family


## ATTACHMENTS

- Exhibit A: Narrative
- Exhibit B: Plan Set
- Exhibit C: Public comment letters


## PROJECT SUMMARY

| CDC Provision | Requirement | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Building Height | $40^{\prime}$ maximum (35'+5' for gable roof) | $33.5^{\prime}$ |
| Maximum Avg Building Height | $35^{\prime}$ maximum (30'+5' for gable roof) | $24.6^{\prime}$ |
| Maximum Lot Coverage | $40 \%$ maximum | $23.4 \%$ |
| General Easement Setbacks |  |  |
| North | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $1^{\prime}$ to GE |
| South | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $0^{\prime}$ to GE |
| East | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $0^{\prime}$ to GE |
| West | $16^{\prime}$ setback from lot line | $2^{\prime}$ to GE |
| Roof Pitch |  |  |

Agenda Item 4

| Primary |  | $9: 12$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Secondary |  | $3: 12 ; 1: 12$ |
| Exterior Material | $35 \%$ | $36.1 \%$ |
| Stone | $25 \%$ (No requirement) | $43.0 \%$ |
| Wood | $40 \%$ maximum for windows | $20.9 \%$ |
| Windows/Doors | Specific Approval | N/A |
| Metal Accents | 2 enclosed and 2 non-tandem | 2 enclosed and 2 exterior |
| Parking |  |  |

## BACKGROUND

In accordance with 17.4 .3 of the Community Development Code (CDC), the applicant has applied for a Class 3 Design Review for the development of a single-family residence. The proposed project consists of a 4,560 total square foot (with 3,910 square foot livable) singlefamily home located on lot 628D. This project completed the Initial Architectural Site Review Step of the DRB approval process on October 5, 2017. During the Initial Architectural Site Review, the board directed the applicant to address lighting, general easement encroachments, grading, and height of the building cupolas. Design Review Board approved the project 7-0 with the following conditions:

1. A monumented land survey shall be prepared by a Colorado public land surveyor to establish the maximum building height and the maximum average building height. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
2. A monumented land survey of the footers will be provided prior to pouring concrete to determine there are no additional encroachments into the GE. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
3. Applicant shall submit detailed lighting plans within 14 days of approval.
4. Make all revisions to driveway per TFPD referral comments, if necessary.
5. The owners will enter in to a revocable General Easement encroachment agreement for the driveway and auto court prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
6. Indicate the location and design of the address monument with the final DRB submittal.
7. Grading of the northwest corner of the site be tapered to make the home design more sensitive to the natural slope of the property.

In accordance with the DRB input and conditions of approval, the applicant has reduced height of the cupolas, submitted a lighting plan with reduced watt lightbulbs, and removed the potion of the southwest corner of the auto-court that encroached into the General Easement.

### 17.3.12.C BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS

The proposed maximum building height for the building will be $33^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$, and the average building height is $24^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$. When a proposed development is approved that is five (5) feet or less from the maximum building height or maximum average building height, the review authority approval shall include a condition that a monumented land survey shall be prepared by a Colorado public land surveyor to establish the maximum building height and the maximum average building height. This shall be done prior to the Building Division conducting the required framing inspection. The applicant has also reduced each cupola 6 " in height and length.

### 17.5.5 BUILDING SITING DESIGN

Lot 628 D is a small (. 34 acre) lot that slopes gently from the southeast portion downward to the northwest corner. As demonstrated on the submitted plans, the driveway and exterior parking spaces do encroach into the southern and eastern portions of the General Easements (GE). The patio on the northern part of the lot and the foundation wall on the western side of the home are close enough to the GE to warrant a footer survey prior to pouring concrete to ensure no additional encroachments in to the General Easement area. There are no proposed impacts to wetlands, and applicant has worked with the town forester to establish optimal placement of the driveway and residence for forest health and preservation of existing aspen, spruce, and pine trees on the site. Applicant has also demonstrated an alternative grading plan that indicates feathering on the northwest corner of the site.

### 17.5.6 BUILDING DESIGN

## Building Form and Exterior Wall Form

In accordance with the Community Development Code, the proposed building form and exterior wall form portray a mass that is thick and strong, with a heavy, thick grounded foundation.

## Roof Forms, Design and Materials

The CDC states that the roof shall be a composition of multiple forms that emphasize sloped planes, varied ridgelines and vertical offsets. The roof forms for the residence are a gable with a pitch of $9: 12$, and a secondary roof form with a pitch of $3: 12$. The roof of the garage will be a gable with a $9: 12$ pitch. A flat roof is proposed over the entryway that connects the garage to the residence. The proposed material for all roofs, soffits, and chimneys will is a dark grey standing seam. Cupolas have been reduced 6" in height and 6" in length since the Initial Architectural Site Review meeting.

## Exterior Wall Materials

The exterior walls consist of $36.1 \%$ stone veneer; 43 \% wood siding with 8" horizontal siding; steal deck handrails and 20.9\% fenestration (metal clad, color not specified).

### 17.5.12 LIGHTING REGULATIONS

The applicant has submitted a lighting plan that includes 10 10" black sconces, 4 recessed LED downlight cans, and 6 Lincrest $43 / 4$ " step lights. Sconces will have a 3 watt bulb (maximum), the recessed cans will have a 10 watt LED bulb, and the step lights will have a 5 watt LED bulb. The proposed address monument will be lit with LED strip lighting, but will also require reflective lettering.

### 17.5.13.E.4 ADDRESS IDENTIFICATION SIGNS

As shown on the site plan the address monument is currently proposed to be located in the Town of Mountain Village right of way, which will require approval of Town Council. Material is a powder-coated black, tube steel with LED strip lighting and $45 / 8$ " lettering. TFPD recommends an overall monument height of 54 ", and 6 " reflective lettering.

### 17.6.6.B. DRIVEWAY STANDARDS

The proposed driveway has a maximum grade of $2.43 \%$, and is 16 ' wide with 2' v-pan shoulders on each side. The applicant has revised his grading plan to demonstrate that parking in the auto-court is also outside of the General Easement.

### 17.6.8 SOLID FUEL BURNING DEVICE REGULATIONS

The applicant has not indicated if the fireplace will be a gas or solid fuel-burning. Staff would note that in order to install a solid fuel-burning device (i.e., interior fireplace, wood burner or fireplace insert) in any structure in the Town, the Owner must have or obtain a Mountain Village fireplace permit..

### 17.7.18 INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE

Telluride Fire Protection District (TFPD), acting as fire prevention authority, found the proposed building siting, fire mitigation, and building materials to be acceptable. However, TFPD requires that this home install a monitored fire sprinkler system. TFPD also requires that the address monument be 54 " in height, and have 6 " lettering with a reflective coating.

### 17.7.19 CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION

All construction staging is with the lot boundaries but the construction staging plan shows construction parking and disturbance in the General Easements. This disturbance is minimal and will not adversely affect the surrounding properties.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the DRB approve the Final Review application with the stated variations and specific approvals for Lot 628D with the following conditions which shall be addressed before Final Review hearing unless otherwise noted:

1. A monumented land survey shall be prepared by a Colorado public land surveyor to establish the maximum building height and the maximum average building height. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
2. A monumented land survey of the footers will be provided prior to pouring concrete to determine there are no additional encroachments into the GE. This condition shall be carried over to any Final Review Approval as it is a construction condition.
3. Per direction of the TFPD, the residence shall have a monitored fire sprinkler system and the numbers on the address monument shall be 6 " tall, and coated or outlined with material to cause them to be reflective.
4. Applicant shall enter in to a revocable General Easement encroachment agreement for the address monument to be located in the southern General Easement.

## Development Narrative

## Konold Residence 109 Double Eagle Way, Mountain Village, CO

Inspired by the age-old barn vernacular of the surrounding area, the proposed Konold residence borrows from the simple forms and inherent function of the "bank barn".

The bank barn derives its name from being built into the hillside, or bank, thus permitting direct entry on two levels. The upper level constructed of wood and the lower level of masonry.

The proposed project incorporates two "bank barn" structures, one housing the main living spaces and the other the utility spaces of garage, mud, laundry and mechanical, joined together by a stone entry element of smaller proportion. Each structure nestles into the existing slope to allow a shared main level, southern deck and entry walkway/courtyard, all without steps. The lower level again shares while adding direct access to covered and uncovered patio areas.

Orientation of the main house \& garage doors take advantage of the southern solar gain, while the northern elevations enjoy view corridors from the airport to Dallas Peak.

Driveway access is located to allow gentle re-grading of the slope, thus excluding the need for retaining walls, while also preserving the mature trees near Double Eagle Way.

Natural stone base and entry of Colorado sandstone provides a well grounded structure, as well as protection from the alpine elements. Windows and doors within the stone are recessed to convey heavy, thick massing.

8 " wide vertical wood siding re-calls the past interpreting old weathered wood in tones to blend with the bark of the abundant aspens.

Black TDL windows and doors add accent to the stone \& siding. As does the dark gray standing seam metal roofing with matching flat metal fascia, soffit and chimney cupolas.

Landscape is intended to be as natural as possible with re-graded areas re-seeded to natural. Decorative plantings limited to the planter beds at entry area.

## Bank Barn



> The Bank Barn derives its name from being built into the side of hill, thus permitting direct entry on two levels. The lower level houses animals, while the upper level serves as storage and a threshing area. The upper hillside entrance provides easy access to wagons carrying hay or wheat. The fodder can be dropped through floor openings to the stables below.
 The lower level of Bank Barns is constructed of masonry, older barns using stone or brick and newer versions employing concrete. Vertical slits or other gaps are sometimes found in the side walls for ventilation as well as decoration. Rooftop ventilators are also common as is gapped vertical siding. Curing hay can generate enough heat to spur spontaneous combustion. Poorly ventilated barns full of hay occasionally burst into flames.
Common elements:
3. masonry lower level
<< All architectural styles

Common elements:

1. built into hillside
2. two level entry
3. masonry lower level
<< All architectural styles
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October 5, 2017
Design Review Board
Sam Starr, Planner
sstarr@mtnvillage.org
RE: Proposed Development
Lot 628D,
109 Double Eagle Way
To Whom It May Concern:
I am the owner of 215 Double Eagle Drive, B1. I have reviewed the plans for the proposed development of Lot 628D and have the following comments.

1. The chimney caps seem to be a little large for the size of the house and could possibly be revised to a smaller scale which would in my opinion create a more attractive elevation.
2. I am also opposed to any General Easement encroachment as I feel it sets a precedent for future developments and seems to be easily remedied by a slight redesign of the driveway.

Other than the comments above, I think the plans portray a very attractive house.
Sincerely,
Karla Barlow

October 4, 2017
Mountain Village Design and Review Board
Sam Starr, Planner
sstarr@mtnvillage.org

RE: Proposed Development of Lot 628D, 109 Double Eagle Way

Dear Mountain Village DRB,

My wife Jennifer and I are the owners of the home directly east of Lot 628D on Double Eagle Way. We have reviewed the development plan and are pleased with the aesthetic look and architecture the Konold's are presenting. As pointed out by Sam Starr in his planning memo to the MVDRB as well as my own investigation, I am concerned about unnecessary encroachments into the general easement that appear in the Konold's application. We remain open to better understanding if there is any compelling reason why a driveway encroachment into the GE should occur. As of now we request that there is no GE encroachment. Also, we want to make sure the light fixture for the utility box/metered area on the east elevation is as minimal as possible and casting its light as downward as possible.

We also request berming be considered at the corner of the driveway into the GE where it turns in towards the garage in order to minimize any car headlight glare into our front door and front porch. In addition, besides the overall attractiveness of the buildings, one thing that jumped out at me is the size of the chimney caps. I don't have a good sense if the home's chimney caps are appropriately scaled to the neighborhood or not. It causes me to wonder if it makes the roof and ridgeline look bigger than it needs to be. I also have trouble understanding the scale of the Konold's home in relation to the homes on each side of it. Is it possible to show a portion of my home and of the Perrotta's home to the west to best understand the scale of the Konold's home to ensure it is not overpowering? I suspect it is not overpowering but it would be helpful to be certain of that.

Thank you for your consideration with my comments and for making the appropriate recommendations to the Konold's. We believe it is a beautiful design and look forward to having them as neighbors.

Sincerely,


Mike Shimkonis
111 Double Eagle Way
970-708-2157, shimmytelluride@gmail.com


SIGN-IN SHEET
DRB Meeting
THURSDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2017
Please write clearly






