

**STEAMBOAT SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
OCTOBER 22, 2009**

The special meeting of the Steamboat Springs Planning Commission was called to order at approximately 5:07 p.m. on Thursday, October 22, 2009, in the Citizens' Meeting Room, Centennial Hall, 124 10th Street, Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

Planning Commission members in attendance were Chairman Rich Levy, Cedar Beauregard, Karen Dixon, Sarah Fox, Brian Hanlen and alternate Jason Lacy. Two positions are vacant.

Staff members present were Director of Planning & Community Development Tom Leeson, Senior Planner Bob Keenan, City Planner Jason Peasley and Staff Assistant Janet Dunham.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

10/22/09

DRAFT

**RESOLUTION OF DENIAL ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR LOTS 1 AND 2, SCE
SUBDIVISION #ZMA-09-05**

Discussion on this agenda item started at approximately 5:08 p.m.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jason Peasley –

This application was denied at the last Planning Commission meeting. The code requires we do a Resolution of Denial.

MOTION

Commissioner Fox moved to approve the Resolution of Denial for Zoning Map Amendment for Lots 1 & 2, SCE Subdivision #ZMA-09-05 and Commissioner Beauregard seconded the motion.

VOTE

Vote: 3-2

Voting for approval of motion to approve: Levy, Beauregard and Fox

Against: Hanlen and Dixon

Abstain: Lacy

Two positions vacant

Discussion on this agenda item ended at approximately 5:10 p.m.

Text Amendment to CDC – Use Classification and Definition for Urban Chickens #TXT-09-05
Text Amendments to the Community Development Code to create a new definition for urban chickens, to allow up to five (5) chicken hens in single-family and zone districts as a use by right, to allow chicken hens as a Use With Criteria in multi-family and commercial zone districts, and to amend the definition farm animal.

Discussion on this agenda item started at approximately 5:10 p.m.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Keenan –
Summarized the application.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Hanlen –
One of the criteria is ‘enclosures shall be located so that they meet the minimum principle structure setback requirements’. Why was that thrown in there? I could easily see the coop being located in the back rear corner of a lot and have them meet principle setbacks.

Bob Keenan –
Because the accessory structure setback in the residential old town district is 5’, that it would be better to have a greater buffer to properties versus just 5’.

Commissioner Hanlen –
Currently you could have a shed as long as it’s movable right up to the property line.

Bob Keenan –
No, that would be considered a structure.

Commissioner Hanlen –
I thought that as long as it was on skids it could be.

Tom Leeson –
No, it would need to meet accessory structure requirements.

Bob Keenan –
Because it’s movable, then they would feel more comfortable that if there was a complaint that they could move it outside of the setback.

Commissioner Hanlen –
Just to clarify, when it says enclosures of a fenced area containing chickens, does it need to meet the principle structure setback or the coop itself?

Bob Keenan –
It’s the coop.

Commissioner Hanlen –

10/22/09

DRAFT

I would just recommend clarifying that because that's a broad interpretation. The coop that I built in town had to have a lid with mesh on top of it to help prevent the foxes from getting in. Technically that's an enclosure at that point. I could see people getting into an argument about what the definition of enclosure is.

Bob Keenan –

You can direct staff to add a definition as it moves forward to City Council.

Commissioner Hanlen –

I would just say to change enclosure to coop.

Tom Leeson –

Good point, we can change to coop.

Commissioner Hanlen –

I would also recommend 7 chickens vs. 5.

Commissioner Dixon –

Why 7?

Commissioner Hanlen –

Based off of how many eggs you're going to get from a group of 5 chickens you might average about 3 eggs a day. Come winter time you might average about 1 or 2. If you're trying to feed your family off of 1-2 eggs a day you run through them pretty quick. To expect to get 4 or 5 eggs per day, you would need 7 chickens.

Commissioner Fox –

Bob, why did you put 5 chickens? Is that common in other ordinances?

Bob Keenan –

Other ordinances vary from 3-5. He explained why they used 5 chickens. Used other codes as examples. We can always up it later.

Commissioner Lacy –

Is there any reason why staff did not recommend use with criteria in all of the zone districts? We have 4 that are use by right.

Bob Keenan –

We would like to be able to review. Don't want to make conditional use because of a higher fee.

Commissioner Dixon –

Could every unit, say in an RR condominium building, have 5 chickens? If you have 20 units then you could get 100 chickens?

Bob Keenan –

For multi-family we visualize a common area versus a common coop for raising chickens for the whole development.

10/22/09

DRAFT

Commissioner Hanlen –

Where it says feed must be stored in a bear proof container if located outdoors, what about the chickens? Isn't that a necessary thing to write in there?

Bob Keenan –

The chickens will be in some sort of coop or enclosure. The food could be outside of the enclosure and inside a bucket.

Commissioner Hanlen –

Wouldn't the bear go after the chickens before it goes after a bunch of dry feed? I don't know if it's necessary.

Other Commissioners think it's necessary.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

RECOMMENDED MOTION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the attached draft ordinance amending the Community Development Code to allow up to five (5) chicken hens on single-family zone districts as a use by Right, as a Use with Criteria in commercial, multi-family, mobile home, and industrial zone districts, amend the definition of farm animal, and create a new definition of chicken.

MOTION

Commissioner Hanlen moved to approve the Text Amendment to CDC for Use Classification and Definition for Urban Chickens #TXT-09-05 with the correction to add the enclosures of the coops and change to allow seven (7) chicken hens instead of five (5). Commissioner Lacy seconded the motion.

VOTE

Vote: 6-0

Voting for approval of motion to approve: Levy, Beauregard, Dixon, Fox, Hanlen and Lacy
Two positions vacant

Discussion on this agenda item ended at approximately 5:15 p.m.

Original Town of Steamboat Springs, Block 5, Lots 7-12 (Holy Name Catholic Church) #DPF-09-02 A PUD application to allow the construction of a 15,382 square-foot addition to the existing Church. This application includes variances to the height, parking and design standards.

Discussion on this agenda item started at approximately 5:15 p.m.

Commissioner Fox stepped down.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Keenan –

He summarized the application. The applicant has proposed 7 variances because of location of institutional building in this zone district. This zone never was designated for institutional use. When a PUD is proposed the applicant is required to add a public benefit. Providing use of church facilities for nonprofit organizations. Also note, principal discussion items in Section 4.

Also note that the County Court House is 38 feet tall. We used this as an example. Institutional uses are encouraged in the Community Area Plan.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Diane Franklin –

She is the chair of the developmental committee. She discussed the need to expand this church. This parish is about 650 households, which comes to about 1,700 persons as well as many tourists. Tourist increase the number to about 490 families during this season. During ski season and summer our church is overfull. People are standing and the fire dept. does not like this. We put a video in the basement for people to see the service. This is a central location. It is good to have churches on Oak Street. We are anxious to build this large church and we feel that the architect has made it pleasing and will service our worship space inside.

Bob Saas –

He gave a PowerPoint and walked through the facility. He showed a sense of where the building is and the size vs. other churches. This area has some major big buildings in this area. There is really only one block that has maintained the residential character.

He showed the site with a footprint of what is there now. The church has been here for over 100 years.

Variances –

Front setback

- Liturgical alignment
- Outdoor gathering area
- Residentially based/church use

They would like to continue to use the nave and keep many of the present uses in alignment, which is critical. The front area is used for gatherings with the lawn area.

Maximum lot size and width

- All other churches along Oak St. occupy 1/2 to 3/4 of the entire length of the block
- Presence in this area for the last 100 years
- Services the largest church population in the City of Steamboat Springs. Lot size and width based on residential use

Snow Storage

- Variance based on not meeting snow storage for three parking stalls
- Suggested eliminating parking stalls and drop off area

This is similar to Christ the King Catholic Church in Denver.

Comparison –

He showed the existing along with the new addition.

Building & Architectural design standards

- Harmony in an eclectic environment is challenging
 - 85' tall communication tower
 - 38' tall courthouse
 - Small residential homes
- Many efforts made to respect the residential character of the street
- Multiple heights and shapes to break up geometry and volume
- Roof slopes to expose vertical surfaces
- Roof slopes to design for cold roofs
- Sensitivity to adjacent neighbor's solar issues
- Develop shapes to respond to catholic liturgy

They have tried to bring this in so that the higher elements are in the middle. The rest is in more human scale. Created yard setback for a play and gathering area. Tried to create an element that is respectful of neighborhood. The grade in the back is less severe for the handicap area. The roof slopes are important to create cold roofs and not all churches are designed with steep roofs. The roof will stair step up.

Also to point out that we were encouraged to use different materials. The roof elements are fairly consistent with exception to the copper roof area that we're adding. The stair stepping allows light to come into the church to create elements that are identified as light and dark in the church.

Public Benefit –

We're going to have expanded seating in the nave so we can accommodate more people from the community. The unfinished basement will become a meeting hall. The new building will have an elevator. Accessibility from the parking lot entrances will be improved.

Contributes to preserve or enhance cultural and historical resources.

Public Arts –

10/22/09

DRAFT

There's going to be a lot of stained glass that's going to be developed in the church. There will be new statutory in the church. A new bell tower will be developed. There may be artistic bike racks that people have done through the community that may be added.

Any Public benefit deemed by the City Council to be in the City's best interest.

This project will allow the City the unique opportunity to use newly adopted landscape standards along Oak Street. When people see this building landscaping along this street will hopefully be encouraged to adopt this same type of landscaping along their property. The multiple public benefits that are being applied right now will be increased. They will reuse many of the old pieces that are there now. With the design of the building it creates the illusion of a 12x12 pitch roof without being a 12x12 pitch roof. He showed the relationships with neighbors issues for solar use. He walked everyone around the building showing the amenities. This building was published in Architect Colorado magazine.

Tom Fox –

Will speak with parting comments at a later time.

Bob Keenan –

He showed the 3D model.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Hanlen –

What are new landscape standards for Oak Street?

Bob Keenan –

They are actually streetscape standards. He showed what the standards require on the slide.

Commissioner Hanlen –

Is there any concern with the lack of rhythm to the street trees like consistent spacing that we talked about with the TND regulations?

Bob Saas –

He reflected what was in the standards, which is grouped instead of individual spacing.

Commissioner Beauregard –

I had a question about the definition of an appurtenance and the 10% of the roof area. What stands out when I look at the building is the percentage of the roofline sticking above the height limit. Does it speak to that in any way?

Bob Keenan –

It's the actual square footage of the roof area.

Commissioner Beauregard –

What is seen is 1/3 of the building is the ridgeline being that tall.

Commissioner Lacy –

10/22/09

DRAFT

Has the applicant firmed up their parking agreement with the County, Wells Fargo, and State Farm Insurance for a significant period of time or is it just month to month?

Bob Keenan –

The County reviews on an annual basis. Wells Fargo does not mention period of time.

Commissioner Levy –

At work session there was a discussion about the roof materials and if they had changed and if there was a discrepancy between the material's board and what was in our packet. If copper is only on that one spot on the north side of the building?

Bob Saas –

Correct. The existing will be metal and painted to match. There are three different materials that are on the roof.

Commissioner Levy –

Will the CN district in trying to maintain a residential feel. I would have to agree that we're far from that right now on Oak St. We have a strip mall on 8th. There are a couple of other buildings that give a residential feel. Is there a thought on how this should be addressed or whether we have a COO on Oak St. or a commercial district on Oak St.? How should that get addressed for now and in the future?

Bob Keenan –

Most were constructed before we had those standards. The public wanted smaller scale structures on Oak Street.

Commissioner Levy –

You envision say in 20 years the non-conforming buildings would be redeveloped and meet the current code? What is the vision? A lot of those things aren't really that old.

Bob Keenan –

The vision is for small scale commercial, residential, mixed-use.

Commissioner Beauregard –

I remember there being some discussion about the Shepard house being moved to the proposed snow storage across the alley.

Bob Keenan –

That's not under consideration at this time.

Commissioner Beauregard –

It was discussed, correct?

Bob Keenan –

I think that was discussed at some point in time.

Commissioner Beauregard –

10/22/09

DRAFT

If it were moved to that location is there any possibility that we could waive the snow storage requirements or maybe give some requirements? I think that there was an issue with 2 homes on that lot. Was that discussed in TAC at all?

Bob Keenan –

No, because there was no proposal to do that and would conflict with snow storage area in the alley.

Commissioner Hanlen –

Could I get some more detail on the numbers of people present at a typical service? You ran through those numbers and there were so many groups and numbers there that I couldn't follow that straight. What I'm looking for is how many people does the current church hold and what would you estimate that some of those services that you end up having in attendance and what's the increase to the new structure?

Diane Franklin –

When full it holds about 300 people presently. We have 650 families, which is about 1700 people and we have 3 services. We could be okay for a year or two if we didn't have tourists. We get jammed and over packed during ski season. We need more space. The new building will hold 650. An average attendance is about 175 – 400 per service. That is most of the time in ski season and summer. Still intend to have 3 services. At Christmas and Easter we could expand people into entry areas.

Commissioner Hanlen –

What would you call your rate of growth of your congregation? Where do you expect to see the size of the congregation over the next 20 years?

Diane Franklin –

It depends on the growth of the community.

Commissioner Hanlen –

What do you typically see, like 5% per year?

Tom Leeson –

Typically it is 2.2% and 3.2% annual growth rate.

Diane Franklin –

People come from all over the County and not just from Steamboat Springs.

Commissioner Hanlen –

If we assume the population of Routt County increasing at roughly the same rate. Routt County seems like it's growing at the same rate as Steamboat Springs.

Bob Saas –

We want to be building for the next 100 years, because they can't keep adding on. The priest also goes to Oak Creek. They are trying to cut back on as many services as they possibly can in order for the priest to be able to survive.

10/22/09

DRAFT

Commissioner Hanlen –

If around the US aren't we seeing a decline in church attendance? We're basing the growth off of straight population increase?

Bob Saas –

Typically 30% of the population is Catholic. With new homes, we can assume many more people will be attending.

Commissioner Hanlen –

If 30% of the population is Catholic in 2009 then how many were Catholic 10-20 years ago?

Bob Saas –

I don't have any information on that.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Diane Franklin –

Most of the people here are in support of the project.

Karen Fox –

I belong to Holy Name Church. Father Ernst is an amazing priest and has brought many people into the church. This can help the whole community.

Carol Ward –

I am a member of the church. I do hospitality and so many times tourist are stunned that they have to stand along the sides. They can't believe that they have to watch the service on a video camera. They expect a better facility in a resort area.

Chad James –

I'm in support of the project. This project is designed to keep the church downtown. If we moved it outside the City limits it would be cheaper. It needs to keep the character of where the community is.

Greg Neppl –

I'm with the parish finance council. I support the project. I've been with the church for 9 years. There are a lot of benefits for weddings, etc.

Mary Effinger –

I'm a member of the church. The church is fulfilling with open arms for Spanish. We do have a Spanish mass. I think that it's a good place for socialization and would like to see support for that.

Tom Fox –

I'm with the building committee and am a member of the church. It is to our intent that we want to build this building as LEED certified if at all possible. We're not into absolute interior design, but we're just trying to get the building built right now. Our intent is to look at this building as a LEED building. If for some reason we can't make the criteria work then we will do everything that we can to make it a green building. Father Ernest was concerned with public benefit. The need for the building itself is a public benefit. Hospitals

10/22/09

DRAFT

and other institutions have the buildings being the public benefit. 16 years ago we stood before PC & CC regarding the church school. When we build it they will come. The schools are bursting at the seams. There are activities all week long, not just weekends.

FINAL STAFF COMMENTS

Commissioner Levy –

On pg 3-16 the design of the institutional design is compatible. I was wondering how we incorporate a use like this? These design standards as far as I know don't exist and say the institutional design is the design criteria? Under the context and scale you say 'the scale is desired for institutional uses and it is consistent with institutional uses'. How did you determine that consistency?

Bob Keenan –

It's consistent with the other institutional uses on and along Oak Street.

Commissioner Levy –

The square footage is substantially bigger than the other 2?

Bob Keenan –

You can say that it's consistent with institutional uses in general.

Bob Saas –

We did a comparison with other churches in regards to our project.

Commissioner Hanlen –

How much of that is the Whiteman School?

Bob Saas –

We just looked at it as what was tied together as one building.

Commissioner Levy –

On pg 3-14 for various consideration for building and architectural standards. Superior development needs to be met. What level of comparison did we use to determine that this was a superior development?

Bob Keenan –

We really don't have anything to compare except St. Paul's church.

Commissioner Levy –

The superior development I would think would speak to this would be the building and architectural design standards since that's the section that it's under. You refer to the location, but it seems like the superior development needs to be architecturally superior. Do you agree?

Bob Keenan –

Superior development to what could be built with the existing standards.

Commissioner Beauregard –

10/22/09

DRAFT

A lot of the roof pitches you said were designed for the snow sliding. Is there a standard roof pitch that snow slides? I know that I've seen snow stick to an even steeper roof pitch than a 6:12.

Diane Franklin –

I built a house with a 12:12 pitch and the snow slid off of it every year. I built a house right next to it with an 8:12 roof pitch and it still slides. I'm suspecting that a 6:12 pitch will hold the snow much better.

Bob Keenan –

There are also ways for steeper roof pitches. There are snow guards that hold the snow before it slides off of the roof. The Grand has birds in place to help keep the snow from sliding off. There are ways to mitigate this.

FINAL APPLICANTS COMMENTS

Bob Saas –

Thanked PC members for listening. We tried to be good stewards to what is going on in Steamboat Springs.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

Finding #1 DP/PUD –

The Holy Name Church Expansion #DPF-09-02, reviewed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) is consistent with the required findings for approval as a Development Plan/PUD with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must comply with community benefit contributions as described in their letter to the Planning Commission dated August 11, 2009.
2. Prior to building permit the applicant must receive approval of a final plat lot line elimination so that the expanded building is not built across lot lines.
3. The Good Sheppard House shall not be demolished until a building permit has been issued.
4. Civil construction plans prepared by a licensed Colorado civil engineer must be submitted to Public Works for review by Public Works, Planning, and City Utilities/Mt. Werner for review and approval prior to approval of any improvements agreement, building permit, or final plat and prior to the start of any construction. We recommend submitting the construction plans a minimum of five weeks prior to building permit application to allow time for review, comment response, and approval.
5. Prior to CO or CA, dedicate easement(s) for public pedestrian use along all sidewalk surface that deviates from the public right of way.
6. The following items to be identified on the construction plans are considered critical improvements and must be constructed prior issuance of any CA or CO; they cannot be bonded:
 - Public drainage improvements

10/22/09

DRAFT

- Public sidewalk improvements
- Access drive, driveway, and parking areas
- Storm water quality features. (Vegetation must be established prior to CO when required as part of the feature design.)

Finding #2 FDP/PUD -

The Holy Name Church Expansion #DPF-09-02, reviewed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), is consistent with the required findings for approval as a Final Development Plan/PUD with the same conditions as motion #1.

MOTION

Commissioner Hanlen moved to table #DPF-09-02. Commissioner Dixon seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Commissioner Hanlen –

I feel pretty strongly that a lot of the comments from the pre-application weren't considered with the design that's being presented to us tonight. I would be naïve to think that I know more than you in regards to the church. I feel that the design is a good design.

I think that there are three (3) potential directions that one could go in with the design of a church. That could be one of a contemporary design that would become an iconic piece of architecture, which is both an original statement while still referencing church architecture. I think that a second would be a design that's an exact replica of a proto typical Catholic church with stone and brick with the same massing proportions. The third would be one that mimics the massing proportions of a historical church that has references to mountain architectures through the details and structure.

I don't have an issue with the side setback.

I'm concerned about the parking. As long as the neighboring businesses and residences are not impacted I think that this concern is minimized.

I don't have a problem with the height.

I strongly encourage maintaining the same location. I highly encourage you guys to build the structure that you need, but I think it just needs some tweaking. I don't have any concern with the lot size or width.

I'm fine with the snow storage variance.

My concern comes back to the pitches. I think that you either need to have the upper and lower roofs matching or there needs to be a differentiation between the two. That said I think that the upper pitch needs to be steeper than the lower pitch. I think that the current configuration just creates an awkward looking building. I think that it can be improved upon. I think that the consensus that the Planning Commission led with at the pre-app it doesn't feel

10/22/09

DRAFT

like it was fulfilled with the design that's before us tonight. I would like to table it to give you an opportunity to address those concerns.

Commissioner Dixon –

I concur with Commissioner Hanlen's comments. But it's not just the roof proportions or the roof slopes it's the detailing, the proportions, the material choices. It's all very underwhelming. In my pre-app comments I wanted you to be more grand and more pious. If you choose to use a basilica symbology then you really need to do it well and I would applaud that. I would hope that we get that. This is going to be a landmark building regardless of what it is, because of it's size, nature, and use. I think that the architecture needs to be worthy of that. Right now I think that you're a little bit short on that. I think that a tabling is appropriate, because I don't think that you're that far off. I think that you can work with staff and take some of these comments to heart. The other church building you showed us tonight is a very good example. I think that there's some work to be done in the architecture if it's going to be this big of a building, and I think it should be this big. I don't have any problems with any of the variances. If it's going to be that big then give me something that's going to be awe inspiring.

Commissioner Levy –

Are there any procedural steps that we need to go with the tabling of a motion? I know that in the past we've had to get an agreement with the applicant to have an item tabled to a date certain.

Tom Leeson –

You need to be sure that the applicant is very clear on the direction you are providing and they don't have to guess and come back and go through this again. You need comments from all Commissioners to get exactly what they want. Engage in dialogue with the applicant for a date certain.

Commissioner Beauregard –

I also have concerns about the 6:12 roof pitch that high above the height variance. I'm not a fan of the 6:12 roof pitch. I liked the example that you had of the Christ King church. I liked the idea of the light coming into the highest point there. Maybe I won't get the hip roofs, but the hip roofs minimize the feel of the proportion of the church that's above the height limit all the way around with more of a steeple look. I didn't like 1/3 of the ridgeline being substantially above the minimum height limit and it being that tall horizontal line above the height limit. I have concerns with that being an appurtenance when it physically takes up 1/3 of the ridgeline of the building. It's far from 10% of what you feel when you look at the building from the side. I have a 9 ½:12 pitch on the top of my roof and it holds snow fine without snow fencing. If we went 8 or 9:12 in the upper pitches and reduced the lower pitches down to 6:12 I think that all of my concerns could be met. I agree that it needs to be this big and in this location.

Commissioner Lacy –

I think that I'm the only Commissioner disagreeing tonight. I wasn't on the Planning Commission when this came through pre-app. Based on my review I feel that staff is correct. I would vote to approve this proposal. I think that we could argue for some time. I think that we could all have different opinions on what design standards should be and we

10/22/09

DRAFT

can argue about roof pitches, but based on the criteria we have to review I feel like they meet their burden. I will be voting against this motion to table.

Commissioner Levy –

I've been on the fence on this item. I will support the motion, because I think that it will bring us a better product. My main concerns is the mass and the ridgeline above the congregation seating area along that extended ridgeline. The views from Oak St are uninterrupted. From 7th street as well it seems massive. It doesn't seem like we have the break up of architecture that is required to offset a massive building of this size. I don't have a problem with the actual details.

I also had concerns with the public benefit. There's a discussion that anything that's going to be public art needs to be placed. There were some public benefits that were increased with this proposal and I accept those. Public art was specifically called out and according to the code it needs to be placed according to the Steamboat Springs Art Council. I haven't seen anything that's said that it's gone through any review from our Public Arts Council. There are some nice design features, but not enough to really break up the overall size of this product.

Bob Saas –

I'm pretty confused in regards to what you want us to do and how you want us to do it? I've got a pile of different opinions. We could be doing this forever. We tried to design the building to what needs of parishioners have asked them to do. We haven't out stepped the design standards that are up for interpretation. We don't know where to go with this.

Commissioner Hanlen –

One of the things, which is something that the City is working on improving in the near future is trying to improve the pre-application process to prevent what you're concerns are right now. Is there some format where we can do an interim step where they can present the design schematics in a work session where they don't have to have a finalized product and to present to us so they know that they're going in the right direction rather than have a fully designed product only to find out that it's still wrong?

Tom Leeson –

Yes, we could. We would need to do it in a public hearing format and could do something like that. He heard at least 3 PC's with concerns with upper roof pitches. That should be focus for changes. I don't know if it would be helpful for you to have more dialogue about the direction or any more specific advice on the direction or you need to come to a consensus to what you would like to see?

Commissioner Hanlen –

I don't know if this is the place or time to design this building in this format. That's why I'm proposing to have some type of a Monday work session where we can have more of a dialogue rather than trying to explain this or this? I don't see this being the appropriate place to do that.

Commissioner Beauregard –

10/22/09

DRAFT

I think that we can give them the starting point. If we're asking them to come back with a preliminary then let's give them some direction to giving us something preliminary.

Commissioner Hanlen –

Then we need to create a bullet point of concerns.

Commissioner Beauregard –

I want to be clear that the upper roof pitches being flatter than the lower roof pitches. I think that we can go a lot steeper than 6:12.

Commissioner Dixon –

The choice of materials and the detailing seemed a lot more residential. Perhaps that was your choice to blend in. I don't think that it should be. I think that it should be more in keeping with looking different and looking like a church and looking like it is going to last 100 years. The stone is what we see all over here on residences and on some of the commercial buildings. I think that you need to stand out and be different with the stone choice. The roof pitches are a huge factor. And some of the proportions just seem like a little bit of tweaking would make them better proportionately and more in keeping with some of the very fine basilica style churches all over the world.

Bob Saas –

We pride ourselves in listening to what parishioners want. The reason why the whole thing isn't stone is because there was a request to break up the elements in terms of some wood.

Commissioner Dixon –

That's not what I'm saying. It's the choice of this stone. You can do some stone and you can do some other stuff. It's this choice of this one that makes it too in keeping with what other stuff is around here.

Bob Saas –

Isn't it up to the choice of the parishioners and the church to decide what color they want their building to be?

Commissioner Dixon –

It's subject to our approval.

Commissioner Hanlen –

What creates subjectivity in this is just the fact that if you were designing a building that met all of the standards of the zone district then you could design any kind of building. The fact that you are exceeding those limits is what puts this all into question. We're not saying that one's right and one's wrong. That's what adds the subjectivity to this.

Bob Saas –

The church is stuck in a hard place. When they first built this building none of those standards were in place and now that they want to expand the building it is very difficult to meet your standards in criteria based on what you've decided throughout that time.

10/22/09

DRAFT

Commissioner Dixon –

None of us are saying that you should move out of town.

Bob Saas –

I am hired to reflect what the client wants. The standards don't show what a pitch needs to be, do they?

Bob Keenan –

The CN design standards do encourage roof pitches that are traditionally seen.

Bob Saas –

That are traditionally seen. When you drive down Oak St. there's a vast difference in roof pitches. We need some clear direction in terms of roof pitch.

Bob Keenan –

What is traditionally seen is 6:12 or greater.

Commissioner Hanlen –

The concern is that the steeper roof pitches is below the flatter pitch. What I was trying to say is that if you want me to give you a pitch then the upper pitch should be a 12:12 and the lower pitch a 3 or 4:12 if you want to make them different. Otherwise having both pitches the same. To have both pitches at an 8:12 pitch lends itself to my opinion as being a better design. I think that it looks awkward to have a flatter pitch above a steeper pitch. You have the empathy of every developer in town. This is the process.

Commissioner Dixon –

This is why we're making a motion to table versus denying. We don't think that you're that far off. We don't think that it's that big of a set of changes. Right now I can find at least 2 criteria that are a basis for denial that you're not meeting in the variance standards. I would rather not deny you. I would rather you build this building and to work on this a little bit. Meeting us at a work session I think is a great idea. I don't know if that's possible, to see us in work session and then do a public hearing?

Tom Leeson –

We can work with that.

Commissioner Dixon –

I want you to do this and I want you to have your church and I want it to be for the next 100 years. I want all of your parishioners to continue to be serviced. I think it's noble and necessary. I don't have questions with your public benefit. I just want the architecture to be fantastic and to blow us away. I want it to be the landmark that we deserve.

Commissioner Beauregard –

I understand how hard it is to come back and redesign. This building could be here for another 300 years. I think that it's worth the one more going through to make it a 300 year building. I think that it's worth that effort.

Commissioner Dixon –

10/22/09

DRAFT

You were here at pre-app for this exact same thing and I applauded you then and made the same comments basically then. I thought that what we were looking at in pre-app was schematic design and that the design would be developed further. Here it is again a year later with the exact same thing.

A 10-minute break was called for.

Commissioners, staff, and the applicant agree to have a work session with the architect on Nov. 9th.

Commissioner Dixon –

I would be willing to even extend the work session a little longer if needed.

Commissioner Beauregard –

Is this a work session that's also a public meeting?

Leeson -

Yes, our work sessions are public meetings and are posted.

Commissioner Dixon –

It's in our meeting room on a Monday.

Commissioner Beauregard –

I would like to thank the applicant for agreeing to that. I think that we will end up with a better church with this process. I am sorry about your added workload.

VOTE

Vote: 4-1

Voting for approval of motion to Table: Levy, Beauregard, Dixon and Hanlen

Voting against: Lacy

Stepped Down: Fox

Two positions vacant

Discussion on this agenda item ended at approximately 7:08 p.m.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 8, 2009 MEETING MINUTES

Corrections:

Commissioner Levy –

There are 2 items that need to be re-corrected. One is on pg. 12 under my 1st comment change to ‘alluded’. There was a paragraph that was moved that was from Jonathan Spence on pg 26 and 27. It’s just missing the header that says that Jonathan Spence said this.

MOTION:

Commissioner Dixon moved to approve the minutes as corrected and Commissioner Hanlen seconded the motion.

VOTE

Vote: 6-0

Voting for approval of motion to approve: Levy, Beauregard, Dixon, Fox, Hanlen and Lacy
Two positions vacant

Commissioner Beauregard –

When we get the final draft. I think that it would be nice if we could see a final draft with everybody’s redlines.

Janet Dunham –

Redline copies of the corrections that are made will be sent out to all the Planning Commission Members before the meeting for approval.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

None

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Fox moved to adjourn the meeting at approximately 7:12 p.m.
Commissioner Lacy seconded the motion.

VOTE

Vote: 6-0

Voting for approval of motion to adjourn: Levy, Beauregard, Dixon, Fox, Hanlen and Lacy
Two positions vacant