

**Town of Crested Butte
Board of Zoning and Architectural Review
January 27, 2026**

Note: The foregoing minutes of the meeting are designed to be a synopsis of the issues discussed at the public hearing not a verbatim account. The recorded audiotapes are the official account of the meeting.

With a quorum present, Nauman called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm.

Members present were: Nauman, Davol, Anderson, Schmidt (virtually), and Spann Labato (virtually).

Staff members present were: Earley and Yemma

Nauman made a motion to approve the agenda for the January 27, 2026 BOZAR meeting.

Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Nauman made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 16, 2025 BOZAR meeting.

Davol seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in support.

Item No. 1

Appointment of the BOZAR Chair and Vice Chair.

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Per Section 16-22-30, each year the Board must appoint the Chair and Vice Chair positions. She said she has not been in contact with Nauman and Davol to see if they are willing to continue with their positions. If they are, someone should move to elect each one for each position. If they are not able/willing, then Earley asked if there were others that would be willing to step into these positions.

Anderson made a motion to elect Nauman as the Chair of the BOZAR for 2025.

Davol seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously in support.

Schmidt made a motion to elect Davol as the Vice Chair of the BOZAR for 2025.

Nauman seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously in support.

Item No. 2

*Consideration of the application of **Augusta Park Partners LLC** to site a single family residence and a cold accessory building to be located at 45 Augusta Drive, T5, Slate River Subdivision in the R1F zone.*

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Chris Penfield and Andrew Hadley submitted plans on behalf of Augusta Park Partners for siting the new single family residence and cold accessory building a T5 in Augusta Park, which is the R1F zone. All zoning requirements are met. The following information must be included on the site plan: ground cover for disturbed areas. A few trees have been added to meet requirements of GL 2.19. Solar panels meet requirements. Exterior lighting has been included and meets requirements. Mass, scale and form are supported by the GL. Applicants have a 3D rendering to show context for this R1F neighborhood and what has been approved to date. Design and style of the proposed is supported by the GL. The South gable dormer was supported. Roof forms and porches are compliant. The window to wall ratio for the front (east) is proposed as 20.4%, which is in the 10-20% usually seen. The fenestration is top heavy at 74.58 sf on second floor versus 63.67 sf on first floor. There is a three pack on the east elevation that must have 3.5” of trim and cannot be mulled, right now it is shown at 3”. There

are now four window sizes on the front, GL allow for 4. Doors supported. Materials supported, but confirm sizes overall, including deck materials.

The new cold accessory building is placed on the north. The orientation of this lot precludes the allowance of placing the AB in the rear. The building steps back from the primary building. There are other examples similar to this situation. Staff finds that the building is simpler and subordinate to the primary building. Staff finds compliance. There are two doors on the south, two single half-light. The French door was removed. Staff finds support for all other elements of the building, as proposed. The metal height was discussed and due to this being a new zone, like R1B where material heights vary. The material is also not visible from the street. Proper public notice has been given.

DRC: Davol and Alvarez Marti were members in December and Davol stated that there was a discussion about the shed module, which was supported. They asked for reduction of window size number. The FAR was revised. The setbacks were revised slightly. Windows on the front were revised slightly. The foundation cover varied. On the accessory building, the small wall was discussed and French doors were discussed.

Davol and Anderson were members in January and fenestration was revised but felt as though it was more balanced. The foundation cover was discussed, but interior to lot. Pavers were discussed and an amount

Applicant Presentation: Hadley and Penfield were present and explained that he will update the site plan with the ground cover and the utility information that was discussed in the staff report and during the DRC. Window separation dimensions were also added.

Public Comment: NA

Close Public Comment

Board Questions and Deliberation: Trees and snow storage were discussed. Anderson appreciated the logical location of the snow storage. Support.

Hardscape was discussed and Davol suggested reduction of the width of the paver sidewalk. It was suggested to be normal width.

The asphalt drive was discussed and amount of coverage. Penfield suggested he could continue pavers out from the accessory to reduce the amount of asphalt. Davol thought that this was a bit convoluted and folks would have to park in this area. Schmidt said that the way that the lots are configured creates odd situations. He suggested writing something into the findings to allow for understanding that this is for Augusta Park. There was a consensus that it could be supported as drawn.

On the front, the window to wall ratio was discussed. Overall, the elevation was supported.

There was support for the North elevation.

The foundation height for the primary building was discussed. Davol asked in the future for the minimum and maximum. Earley showed the approval from 75 Pyramid Avenue and the rationale and connection for this zone and the R1B zone. Nauman appreciated bringing the height down in the middle module to match that to the north but keeping positive drainage. He could support this allowance. Anderson supported this due to the grade challenges.

On the west elevation, the meter was discussed but was regarded that it was the CBFDPD purview. The lower roof on the left will be shortened.

Schmidt asked about the overhang of the front porch roof and if there was a GL regarding an overhang without supports. There are not. Others found support.

For the accessory building, all elevations were supported.

Horizontal metal application for siding was supported.

Foundation cover was supported.

Materials were reviewed. Doors on accessory building to match surrounds. Windows are to be bronze.

*The Board finds that the application of **Augusta Park Partners LLC** to site a single-family residence and one cold accessory building to be located at 45 Augusta Park Drive, Lot T5, Slate River Subdivision in the RIF zone **will not appear excessively similar nor dissimilar** to residential structures within the surrounding neighborhood. The scale and forms of the home **are effective in incorporating** traditional forms seen within the surrounding RIF zone; and*

*The cold accessory building (garage) appears subordinate in scale to the residence by reducing the overall mass on the site and convey relationships with historic styles. The architectural design of the buildings can be **supported** based upon the application of Guidelines 4.25-4.26 (similarity/dissimilarity-context), 4.84-4.86 (location and massing/forms, scale), 4.89 and 4.90 (materials).*

Foundation cover height can be supported due to the location in the RIF zone (new zone) and also because of the topographic and dimensional challenges of these lots per GL 4.75.

The driveway hardscape coverage is supported due to layout of the lots within this zone and street per 2.16 e and 2.28 e and f.

*The architectural design and style of the residence can be **supported** per the application of Guidelines 4.25-4.26 (similarity/dissimilarity-context), 4.32-4.34 (mass/scale) and 4.35 (contemporary interpretation), 4.41-4.45 (roof form/scale), 4.49-4.52 (porches), 4.53-4.63 (windows), 4.64-4.66 (doors), 4.72, 4.75-4.76, 4.82-4.83 (materials), with the following conditions:*

- *Final landscape plan should be provided to the building department for Chair review and sign off if changes are proposed during the construction phase.*
- *The natural average grade for the purpose of measuring FAR will be 8875 '9" for the primary building. The natural average grade for the purpose of measuring FAR will be 8872' for the accessory building (garage).*
- *The following information must be added to the site plan:*
 - *Ground cover.*
- *Parking will be maintained and accessible on a year-round basis.*
- *Snow must be stored on the site or removed from the site. Snow may not be placed on the Town rights of way.*
- *The improvements will be constructed as per the approved plan on file at the Town offices.*
- *Requirements of the Colorado Model Electric Ready and Solar Ready code must be met prior to permitting, including EV ready parking space for the dwelling unit.*

If approved by the Board, the approval is valid for one year from the approval date with a request for extension of up to three years administratively through Staff.

Nauman made a motion to approve architectural appropriateness for the application of Augusta Park Partners LLC to site a single-family residence and one cold accessory building to be located at the aforementioned address in the RIF zone and based upon the findings, and per the plans and material list.

Anderson seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously in support.

Item No. 3

*Consideration of the application of **Augusta Park Partners LLC** to site a single family residence and a cold*

accessory building to be located at 31 Augusta Drive, T4, Slate River Subdivision in the R1F zone.

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Kyle Ryan and Andrew Hadley submitted plans on behalf of Augusta Park Partners for siting the new single family residence and cold accessory building at T4 in Augusta Park, which is the R1F zone. The height of the accessory building meets the 20' requirement. All zoning requirements are met. Trees have been moved out of utility easement on the southeast corner of the lot. Solar panels meet requirements. Exterior lighting has been included. Mass, scale and form are supported by the GL. Discussion is encouraged regarding what module is the primary module and if this meets requirement of GL 4.34 b with the change to the front module. Design and style of the proposed is supported by the GL. Roof forms and porches are compliant. The window to wall ratio for the front (east) is proposed as 20%, which is in the 10-20% usually seen. The fenestration is well balanced at 61.7 sf on second floor to 62.1 sf on the first floor. There are window wells proposed on the east, north and south. The east proposed window well was discussed per GL 4.63 and found to be supported with the inclusion of the shed roofs. Doors are supported. Materials supported, but confirm sizes overall, including deck materials.

The new cold accessory building is placed on the west. This building is located in the rear. Staff finds that the building is simpler and subordinate to the primary building. Staff finds compliance. Windows now include divided lights. Staff finds support for all other elements of the building, as proposed. Proper public notice has been given.

DRC: Davol and Alvarez Marti were members in December and Davol stated that the building was adjusted for setbacks. The primary module was discussed. The rear module was lowered and the middle module now acts as this primary module. This wasn't changed on the cover sheet. The front door was increased in size. Permeable surface amounts were discussed. The mullions were added to the windows on the accessory building.

Davol and Anderson were members in January and there was a need to confirm that the accessory met height requirements. The chimney was shifted.

Applicant Presentation: Hadley and Ryan were present and explained that trees were moved out of the right of way. Parking was outlined. Discussions were had about new fire codes and shrubs and trees were shifted away from the residence. An elevated deck won't be seen from the street. There aren't the topographic challenges on this lot.

Schmidt asked for clarification about the chimney. Ryan walked through the changes.

Ryan walked through all elevations.

Public Comment: NA

Close Public Comment

Board Questions and Deliberation: Nauman walked through the site plan and there weren't any questions. Overall support.

Mass/scale/form was discussed, specifically the primary module. Earley read GL 4.34 b. Nauman referred to many cruciform roofs and this follows that. Overall support, as drawn. Schmidt and Spann Labato still had concerns.

A straw pull vote for the mass/scale/form and primary module as drawn found Davol, Anderson, Nauman in support and Spann Labato and Schmidt against.

Windows were discussed for the east elevation. Spann Labato had concerns that it was too much glazing. Davol said it is pretty standard for new construction. Overall support.

Anderson brought up a concern about snow shed onto sidewalk for front door. Davol and Nauman said that this was a good point, but there wasn't a GL make a determination based upon. This was suggested to Hadley and Ryan, but this was for them to decide.

The north elevation was discussed specific to the chimney. There were concerns about the chimney. A straw pull vote, as drawn found Anderson and Davol in support and Nauman, Spann Labato and Schmidt against.

This change was supported to come to the BOZAR Chair and if there are concerns it could come back to the full Board.

The rest of the north elevation was supported.

On the west, the placement of the door was discussed and there was a drafting error.

The south elevations were supported.

The accessory building was supported, all elevations.

Materials were reviewed and supported.

*The Board finds that the application of **Augusta Park Partners LLC** to site a single-family residence and one cold accessory building to be located at 31 Augusta Park Drive, Lot T4, Slate River Subdivision in the R1F zone **will not appear excessively similar nor dissimilar** to residential structures within the surrounding neighborhood. The scale and forms of the home **are effective in incorporating** traditional forms seen within the surrounding R1F zone; and*

*The cold accessory building (garage) appears subordinate in scale to the residence by reducing the overall mass on the site and convey relationships with historic styles. The architectural design of the buildings can be **supported** based upon the application of Guidelines 4.25-4.26 (similarity/dissimilarity-context), 4.84-4.86 (location and massing/forms, scale), 4.89 and 4.90 (materials).*

*The architectural design and style of the residence can be **supported** per the application of Guidelines 4.25-4.26 (similarity/dissimilarity-context), 4.32-4.34 (mass/scale) and 4.35 (contemporary interpretation), 4.41-4.45 (roof form/scale), 4.49-4.52 (porches), 4.53-4.63 (windows), 4.64-4.66 (doors), 4.72, 4.75-4.76, 4.82-4.83 (materials), with the following conditions:*

- *Final landscape plan should be provided to the building department for Chair review and sign off if changes are proposed during the construction phase.*
- *The natural average grade for the purpose of measuring FAR will be 8878'3" for the primary building. The natural average grade for the purpose of measuring FAR will be 8877' for the accessory building (garage).*
- *Parking will be maintained and accessible on a year-round basis.*
- *Snow must be stored on the site or removed from the site. Snow may not be placed on the Town rights of way.*
- *The improvements will be constructed as per the approved plan on file at the Town offices.*
- *Requirements of the Colorado Model Electric Ready and Solar Ready code must be met prior to permitting, including EV ready parking space for the dwelling unit.*

If approved by the Board, the approval is valid for one year from the approval date with a request for extension of up to three years administratively through Staff.

Nauman made a motion to approve architectural appropriateness for the application of Augusta Park Partners

LLC to site a single-family residence and one cold accessory building to be located at the aforementioned address in the R1F zone, provided that the chimney revision will come back for review and approval by the Chair and based upon the findings, and per the plans and material list.

Davol seconded the motion. The vote passed in support with Spann Labato against per GL 4.53 and Standards.

Item No. 3

Miscellaneous:

- DRC for February 9 and 17 (Tuesday): Spann Labato and Schmidt BOZAR is February 24th
- DRC for March 16 and 23: Schmidt and Anderson BOZAR is March 31st
- DRC for April 13 and 20: _____ BOZAR is April 28th
- DRC for May 11 and 18: _____ BOZAR is May 26th
- Reminders:
 - Saving Places Conference 2026: Denver February 11-13th
 - February 2nd, 2026 5:00-7:00 pm: Joint Work Session with Town Council (Residential)
 - February 6th, 2026 9:00-11:00 am: Meet the new Chief Marshal and see plans for the addition/renovation
 - March 2nd, 2026 5:00-7:00 pm: Joint Work Session with Town Council (Commercial)
 - March 11th, 2026 3:00-6:00 pm: Save the date, Zoning Code and Design Standards Update Open House
 - Year end review: March 31st BOZAR
 - April 6th, 2026 5:00-7:00 pm: Joint Work Session with Town Council (Process/PUD)

Nauman adjourned the meeting at 9:51 p.m.