

ASPEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES October 12, 2011

Vice-chairperson Ann Mullins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.
Commissioners in attendance: Jason Lasser, Brian McNellis and Jamie McLeod. Nora Berko and Jay Maytin were excused.

Staff present:

Jim True, Special Counsel
Amy Guthrie, Historic Preservation Officer
Kathy Strickland, Chief Deputy City Clerk

MOTION: Ann moved to approve the minutes of Sept. 14th and Sept. 21st second by Jason. All in favor, motion carried 4-0.

**400 E. HYMAN – CONCEPTUAL MAJOR DEVELOPMENT –
CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL DESIGN REVIEW – REDUCTION
OF PEDESTRIAN AMENITY REQUIREMENT, CONTINUED
PUBLIC HEARING**

Paul Irwin, Ripple Design Studio

Amy said this is the third review and it is for the removal of the “Thumb building” which is a two story building with a basement level and it is all retail and will be replaced with retail on the ground floor and residential units on the two upper floors. The discussion has been focused on context and how the height should be dealt with. The height limit is 38 feet and they are now under the height limit and maintaining the existing foot print. They need no variances from the board. There is a small entry into the public amenity open space that surrounds the building. They are using 25 square feet to close in an elevator.

The first floor height is 12.6 and the code says 13 to 15 feet. The second level is 8 feet and the upper is 9 feet. Perhaps HPC wants to discuss the overall floor to floor ratio. The massing is very similar to the existing model. Staff finds that the building does fit in and we recommend conceptual approval.

Paul went through the elevations with a power point. We are at 33 feet above the sidewalk on the Mill Street side. The elevator will go to all floors and provide ADA access. I’m trying not to have this building a masonry building. The building will look different at different times of the years. The Yule marble will be on the inside. We are widening the entrance into

ASPEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES October 12, 2011

the plaza about ten feet from seven feet. On the entrance the fountain on the mall will reflect into the building.

Ann asked about the glass in the building and if it was different on the second and third floor. Is it a reflective glass. How do you control what you are seeing in such a transparent building especially on the second and third floor?

Paul said how we shade, heat and cool it will be the next step. We might have insulation panels on the inside that come up and down and we will have an energy analysis of the building. The design will reflect what is going on inside.

Ann also asked about the glass dropping to the pavement. Usually there is some kind of coarse .

Paul said there is brick at the bottom against the marble and then the frame.

Ann also asked about the public amenity. You have 14% as opposed to the 25% that is required.

Amy said they are staying within the footprint except for the 25 square foot elevator bump out which is 14%. They can pay cash-in-lieu for the impact of that.

Brian said his concern is the lighting competing with the Wheeler and has any applicant every worked with staff regarding the interior lighting. The building is transparent and the concern is reflective lighting.

Amy said she hasn't looked at the lighting code yet and there are some measures of control in place. HPC can ask Paul to address interior lighting for final.

Jamie inquired about the solar panels. Paul said they will turn accordingly and the height is under the 38 feet.

Ann asked about the drainage concerns that the Parks Department had regarding the fountain. Paul said it is his desire to do modules if possible and the 8 foot basement is existing.

ASPEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES October 12, 2011

Amy said Parks has a concern about all construction in the malls.

Vice-chair Ann Mullins opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing portion of the agenda item was closed.

Commissioner comments:

Jamie addressed height, scale and massing. Jamie said she is pleased that it is under the height limit. I am a little worried about an 8 foot ceiling height for a residential unit downtown and you should study it. With the mass and scale we are really looking at a glass box. When we get into the materials there will be a lot of questions. What does the glass look like? What do the panels look like? We will need to see the context of the materials. You are fitting into the same context and not expanding the building which is good. I have no issue with the public amenity space due to the elevator. 14% is ok rather than the required 25%. If this is approved we will have a lot of conversation about materials. Jamie also thanked the applicant for making the changes.

Brian also thanked the applicant. Bringing the height down makes the board feel more comfortable and the fact that you are staying within the footprint. There will be a lot of questions about materials and my main concern will be the lighting. Materials do have an impact on mass and scale. It is an interesting piece of architecture.

Jason said on the eight foot ceiling he has no concern because that helps keep the height down. The elevator piece seems tall and maybe there is a way to break that down.

Ann said the building conforms to the guidelines and will be a great addition downtown. The transparency with the residential use needs to be maintained especially with a family living in there. I agree with Brian that there are lighting concerns.

Jason said the context drawing helped. Color and fenestration are an issue and having lights on downtown could be beneficial.

Ann said at the next meeting she would like to see the materials chosen that about the pavement.

ASPEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES October 12, 2011

Paul said you would read the marble floor as a separate element.

Jason said you could put the solar panels on the east side rather than west side. Paul said there was concern from the neighbors on the east.

Jamie also requested a roof plan at the next meeting.

Ann re-opened the public hearing.

Ruth Kruger, tenant. Ruth mentioned the glass going to the floor and the fact that mud will splash up etc.

Vice, chair Ann Mullins closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Jamie moved to approve resolution 11, conceptual design of 400 E. Hyman Ave. per the staff's comments along with looking at the lighting impacts; connection to the street and the elevator mass; second by Ann. Motion carried 4-0.

**1102 Waters Avenue – Conceptual, Residential Design Standards
Variances, Public Hearing**

Amy explained that this is the vacant lot created through a lot split. A Fritz Benedict design modern house on the adjacent property has been declared a landmark and will be preserved with no significant addition. The rest of the square footage is on the site we are reviewing tonight. It has an FAR of 2975 for a duplex. The application was tabled because the owner had to appear before the Board of Adjustment because each duplex had to have a single stall garage and the Engineering Dept. would only allow one curb cut. Board of Adjustment went in their favor so they can have the plan presented before you. The only recommendation was a height decrease adjacent to the Benedict building which has been included in the proposal. Staff recommends approval and there are a few design standard variances needed: One is the building orientation and they don't meet the requirement that they are to have a secondary detached mass on the property but they have the single stall garages on each end and that meets the intent. The garage is to be ten feet behind the house and it clearly isn't. They are also to have a slightly larger front porch than what is proposed.

Doug Rager, architect

ASPEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES October 12, 2011

Scott Geary, owner

Doug said the Board of Adjustment granted the variance for the two driveways. We were able to lower the south unit roof one foot.

Ann asked about the irrigation ditch. Scott Geary said the ditch is private.

Doug said we didn't show it because we would have to get city approval to locate it on city property.

Jason questioned the stone on the south stair. Doug said there is a stone base and we would take it up to the stair and it would be lichen rock and tightly jointed.

Ann asked about the shingles. The shingles would be tapered sawn wood shakes on the walls of the duplex and the roof would be asphalt type shingles.

Vice chair Ann Mullins opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing portion of the agenda item was closed.

Commissioner comments:

Jamie thanked the applicant for their patience. In looking at the house I appreciate lowering the roof of the south unit closest to the historic house by a foot. I am also in favor of the two curb cuts. I am in approval of the alignment of the building along with the secondary mass structure. We need to know the sizes of the porches and how they work before ruling on them.

Brian said he is in support of the project. The only concern is trying to bring the porches into conformance.

Ann said she is OK with the orientation etc. Ann said her concern is the porches being too small. The roof form seems complicated.

Doug said the roof form is a complicated plan that works around the envelope. We can look at the roof form. Ann said the angle is great but the different variations detract.

ASPEN HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES October 12, 2011

Jason said he is looking for a lower inflection toward the historic resource. There is quite a bit of complexity in the roof forms and maybe at the upper story bathroom it can be reduced.

MOTION: Ann moved to approve resolution # 12 as written with the condition that the porches should be built in compliance with the residential code. Do a restudy and look at the roof line for final; second by Jamie.

Jamie said there are different levels of the roof and if you could look at it in 3D it might simplify the roof.

Brian said he disagrees and likes the articulation as it breaks down the mass.

Jason said it is not the complexity of the roof it is the inflection of the roof and its relationship to the Benedict building. It is the height of the south unit gable.

Jamie said she feels the roofs are not as complicated as they look because of all the angles in the elevations. The lower garage in front will also give a nod to a one story structure next to the Benedict building.

Amy said you are not asking for a complete departure of the roofs just look at the south building and possibly drop the height of the bathroom or something like that. Amy also said she will add the garage variance in the resolution.

Motion carried 4-0. Roll call vote: Jamie, yes; Ann, yes; Brian, yes; Jason, yes.

217 E. BLEEKER – work session – no minutes

Jim True, Special Counsel said this is a work session and there can be no approvals and the applicant cannot rely on anything that is said by the commission as a whole or by any individual commissioner. There is nothing that can be stated up front that you can rely formally on. Certainly you are trying to get impressions and input and you need to understand that work sessions are not for making final determinations.

MOTION: Brian moved to adjourn second by Ann. All in favor motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m. Kathleen J. Strickland

