

**Town of Crested Butte
Board of Zoning and Architectural Review
January 28, 2025**

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 6:00 pm.

Members present were: Nauman, Alvarez Marti, Davol, Anderson, Spann Labato, Schmidt, and Staab.

Staff members present were: Earley and Yemma.

Schmidt made a motion to approve the agenda for the January 28, 2025 BOZAR meeting.

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

Nauman made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 17, 2024 BOZAR meeting.

Alvarez Marti 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. I have been in contact with Erik and Donny 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 I would ask if there are others that would be willing to step into these positions.

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

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

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

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

Item No. 2

*Consideration of the application of **John Andrew Breuer and Amy Padgett Breuer** to site a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at 422 and 422 ½ Sopris Avenue, Block 35, Lots 5-6 in the RIC zone.*

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Kyle Ryan and Andrew Hadley submitted plans on behalf of the Breuer's for a new single-family residence and ADU to be located at 422 Sopris Avenue within the RIC zone. For those members that remember, an application came through for this property in 2021, but this is a new application, which would replace the previous application which is now expired. All zoning requirements have now been met, as noted in the report. The new ADU will have a conditional use permit and will be required to meet the definitions within Section 16-1-20, which will require a deed restriction for the unit. The topography for purposes of measuring FAR for the primary and ADU is 8891'6". Drainage arrows and a dry well were included but need to be revised to ensure that adjacent properties are not negatively impacted, specifically on the east. A tree plan has been provided, small trees in the middle are not included and it should be confirmed that they are not larger than what the code section (16-15-10) outlines. For the trees on the east/west and south, it appears that all trees on the site but one will be removed. This is substantial and seems inconsistent with other applications and GL 2.18. Staff wonders if larger trees could be kept, thinning out smaller trees instead. Soil nails have been used on other projects with close proximity to work. Staff understands removal of the trees on the south to gain access to the ADU. Trees in question are on the east and west. I have put in the proposed finding three areas addressing each area of trees, mid lot, south and east/west. The Board can discuss if this is supported or if there are changes. I have also suggested consultation from an arborist to determine which trees could remain and which trees must be removed and/or relocated. There is a large area of hardscape on the south side of the lot which was reduced from 2125 to 1286 sf to 1150 sf, which is pervious. Staff feels that this better meets the intents of the GL. The width of the sidewalk that extends into the ROW has been revised to not exceed 4' in width. Discussion is encouraged about mass/scale and form for the proposed structure as compared to neighborhood context. A streetscape has been provided but may appear a bit skewed. The perceived/apparent mass of the proposed primary building appears substantially larger than other adjacent structures and in turn in conflict with GL 4.32. The design goals of this zone ask infill to help preserve the character of existing buildings. GL 4.33 asks for a diversity of forms, many homes on this block have gables facing the street. The siding material, stone foundation and first floor to second floor fenestration all add complication to the proposed structure, which may add to the perceived mass and contemporary nature of the structure. Roof pitches are compliant. Porches and decks are compliant. Overall window to wall ratio on the north (front) is 19.6% which is relational to other applications. However, the first-floor windows total 49.16 sf and second floor windows total 68.46 sf, which conflicts with GL 4.53. Two packs have had 6" of trim and will not be mulled. GL 4.58 doesn't allow for groupings of more than two windows because this is a core zone. So the two three packs on the north were separated to be single windows. Doors appear compliant. Lighting appears compliant. Previous DRC found support for the log siding and did not consider it plank and chink which is not allowed in core zones. Log siding is supported by the GL. However, it is as treatment that was seen often in the 1970's-1980's, not historically. The period of significance is represented by largely horizontal lapped siding. This is a topic of discussion for context, as seen with the surrounding RIC zone. Dry stacked stone appears compliant for chimney and foundation cover. The large chimney on the south was removed and now exits from the roof, which is more consistent with historic homes within the core zones. Standing seam are noted for roofing. Otherwise, materials are supported. The ADU received overall support from the previous DRC with the exception of the metal siding, which has been removed, as it is not allowed in core zones. Also, the two roof elements were revised to be one large roof element. This element was discussed in DRC and considered a dormer per GL 4.47 b If it is considered a dormer, it appears to conflict with a few points within the GL. Materials for the ADU were supported. Proper public notice for this hearing has been given.

DRC: Schmidt and Staab were members of the 12/9 DRC and said they suggested revisions to the chimney. Schmidt said they reduced the impervious cover on the site plan and overall incorporated DRC's questions into the final application.

Anderson and Alvarez Marti were members of the 1/13 DRC. Anderson addressed the changes to the trees, which staff discussed. Alvarez Marti brought up what they discussed with the dormer roof feature on the ADU and noted there were challenges to bring light into the ADU, and there was a crux to balance the guidelines with livability of the unit. Anderson discussed contrast of the colors to the finishes and noted it had been revised. Nauman asked if there was support for the dormer feature. Alvarez asked to find a way to support it to improve the livability of the unit and allow for egress.

Schmidt noted the interesting context of the area, with smaller homes, larger homes, the parish hall/church, and topography changes.

Applicant Presentation: Andrew Hadley explained he thought four members participating in DRC helped improve the project and gave a nod to the process. He gave background on his clients and why they love this property. They wanted to make the house as efficient, as possible, and they also jumped at the need for affordable housing by including an ADU. He explained the east-west ridgeline was driven by a desire to include solar panels. It also allowed the house to be shorter to better accommodate the ADU. They brought windows into compliance. He noted a discussion of the trees. They think they can only save one tree in the back due to site access and they are willing to bring in an arborist and work with the neighbors. They simplified the colors of the siding and roofing. They changed the chimney based on DRC feedback but noted that there are two large street facing chimneys on the block. He said this block is a hodge podge of different styles. He noted the site context of a large building behind it. He discussed the ADU, which he views as more of a roof extension instead of a dormer and he agreed with Alvarez Marti's thought on bringing light into the ADU. He noted how one of the windows is an egress window.

Public Comment:

1. Genetta and Greg Adair (owner of 420 Sopris Avenue) stated via email: "We're happy to learn about the new Historic Preservation Plan for buildings constructed between 1961 and 1984! That will include our house at 420 Sopris. We're grateful for the consideration Crested Butte gives to preserving its historic aesthetics.

With that in mind, we are concerned about the 422 Sopris construction project. We hope BOZAR will consider this new Historic Preservation Plan when reviewing the current plans for 422 Sopris.

Thanks so much for including Greg and me in the information concerning the BOZAR process for reviewing the proposed plans at 422 Sopris. We plan to view the BOZAR meeting on January 28th via zoom.

2. David Atkins and Deborah Wuttke (owner of 424 Sopris Avenue) stated via email: "We are writing to support the views of Doug Dickey on the proposed project for 422 Sopris Ave. Our reading of the design standards and guidelines is that the proposed structure is not consistent with the mass, scale and form and setback criteria for the R1C zone as Doug describes in detail.

Thanks for letting us know that the Town has adopted the Historic Preservation Plan which includes a preservation strategy for buildings constructed from 1961-1984. Our house was constructed in 1977 in a Victorian style so will likely be included when the survey is complete. We support this Plan. We appreciate that the Town considers parts of the R1C like our unique and eclectic block worth preserving and think most houses in our part of town would likely be included in the Historic Preservation Plan upon survey.

We think the decision by the Town to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan critically highlights the importance of carefully assessing how this new home would fit with the rest of the block and the R1C, particularly since our understanding is that 422 Sopris Ave is the last undeveloped lot in this zone. Approving construction of the proposed 422 Sopris Ave structure (which is most consistent with the newer parts of town) sets a bad precedent for parts of Town that are now acknowledged to be worth preserving. We strongly urge BOZAR to take the implications of the Historic Preservation Plan under consideration in addition to the design standards and guidelines during the review discussion.

Thanks for providing information, helping us understand the process and facilitating the opportunity to comment.

3. Doug Dickey (owner of 424 Sopris Avenue) stated via email: "Thank you for the access and ability to attend the BOZAR meeting. We are again impressed with how you provide detailed information and review, facilitate the discussion and include the views of neighbors allowing the Board to focus on important issues. It was nice to see the diversity of the BOZAR members and different points of view. It

was interesting to see there was unanimous agreement on the lack of support for the current project design. It seemed to be based on some very specific form issues and/or mass and scale issues depending on the Board member. It was mentioned more than once that this house looks like it should be on the other side of the highway. It was also stated that it is difficult to separate the form, mass and scale elements to know what visually does not look right. Very telling about all of our perceptions of why this does not fit.

Our feedback on the meeting is focused on the unanimous decision and possible way forward. We feel the issue of form became prioritized above mass and scale. This could be partially due to misconceptions created by the 3D streetscape shown. We understood that Andrew Hadley was asked to provide a 3D view of the street. The 3D streetscape Andrew showed looked to be the one done by Jennifer Barvitski who designed a different house for this lot in 2021 and the 3D view was noted on the design plan to be 'not to scale' (we believe Ms. Barvitski's name was on the image projected during the meeting). Consequently, we are concerned that the 3D streetscape shown during the meeting does not reflect this project nor is it to scale.

The streetscape discussion also implied that some older houses on the block were of similar scale, particularly the log house at 501 5th St. The above grade square footage of the homes on the south side of Sopris between 4th and 5th as listed in Gunnison County Property records are: 408 Sopris - 1189 sq. ft; 412 Sopris - 1664 sq. ft, 416 Sopris - 1592 sq. ft, 420 Sopris- 637 sq. ft, **422 Sopris as proposed - 2000 sq.ft.**, 424 Sopris - 1760 sq. ft, and on the corner, 501 5th street - 1696 sq. ft. Unlike the current proposal, these houses all have >10ft. standoff from the lot line giving the neighborhood a more open and spacious look, not jammed to the maximum on the lot. Notably, the two houses discussed during the meeting as being large and with chimneys facing Sopris - 416 Sopris and 501 5th - are 1600-1700 sq. ft and within the norm for the block in side yard setback and square footage.

We would appreciate seeing an accurate street view and 3D view of the proposed plan after modifications resulting from the meeting. Another useful visual would be to place the proposed 422 site plan on the aerial view of the block which shows the current homes as green filled outlines with the address (page 2 of the January 13th, 2025 DRC Staff Report).

In our opinion, the project does not meet the totality of the Mass/Scale/Form design standards and guidelines, specifically SITE PLAN 4.27 and 4.31. And MASS SCALE AND FORM 4.32 and R1C DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES 5.108. All of these standards and guidelines address the street view and spacing to typical and historical neighborhood buildings. This is why we are concerned that design revisions may only focus on Form when they should focus on Mass, Scale and Form.”

Close Public Comment

Board Questions and Deliberation:

Labato Spann clarified the process of the ADU being a deed-restricted unit. Earley explained the process.

Nauman fact checked the letters. He clarified the east-west setbacks and how what they are proposing is allowed in that the setback can be 7.5 ft if the roof does not shed. Hadley clarified the setback is to the eave of the roof, not the wall.

Schmidt clarified the new period of significance isn't currently in place and the Board is working with the current guidelines. Nauman said the comments and Historic Preservation Plan do speak to the neighborhood context, which they can discuss, but there are not any new rules yet with the preservation plan.

Staab asked about the chimney being inside the house and with a window next to it. Schmidt said he wanted to discuss it.

The Board discussed the site plan and Nauman noted the changes made. Schmidt said he supported consulting an arborist, Nauman disagreed and said he supported the tree code and asked to see a more robust tree plan to see as many saved as possible. Ryan explained more trees were added and he noted the site constraints. Members discussed how design influences the trees and acknowledged the difficulties of the site. Alvarez Marti brought up how roots will be impacted no matter what since it is an older lot. Nauman raised concerns about removing the trees can impact the neighbors' trees, Alvarez Marti deferred to an arborist as the Board can't answer these questions. Earley brought up past projects that have exposed the roots during excavation to further investigate. Schmidt asked what the Board's purview is. Earley explained how BOZAR does have purview over requiring trees to stay and shared examples of past projects. Nauman suggested saving feedback on the footprint to the mass, scale, and form review. Nauman suggested trying to save every tree possible and consulting an arborist. Earley pulled up the code language regarding trees. Earley clarified the Board's role tonight; in that they are essentially approving the tree permit tonight. The Board continued to discuss the tree plan and how to move forward. Nauman stated they would evaluate the number of trees to be removed and replaced and return back to the chair to confirm this.

Nauman noted the pavers removed from DRC. Schmidt clarified the type of pavers. Hadley stated all of the pavers are pervious. Nauman explained the rest of the landscaping. Davol stated he would prefer more native grasses but understood their proposal. Staab expressed support for reducing the amount of pavers.

The Board discussed mass, scale, form. Nauman brought up the comment letters on neighborhood context and how this is the core zone. He shared the house feels somewhat out of place for the neighborhood context. Spann Labato brought up how every project is maxing out square footage and shared a passage from the guidelines to curb the design from maxing out. She is concerned about how its size doesn't conform to neighborhood context. Schmidt brought up how there isn't mass, scale, or form consistency along the streetscape. He appreciated Spann Labato's point, but he acknowledged how property owners are trying to maximize their investment, and the Board can't criticize them for that. He said their job is to ensure it follows the guidelines and code. Nauman semi agreed but said they do need to look at mass, scale, and form. Staab agreed with each. Davol brought up the context of the scale related to existing structures, and he thought it was beyond the other houses on the street and thinks it could better relate. Alvarez suggested if the front module was taken out then it might better relate to the scale. She said that the design feels contemporary, as seen like in the newer part of town, which makes it seem more unrelatable, rather than the mass. She noted that DRC didn't deem it to be extremely out of context, but they didn't have the streetscape at the time. Staab and Davol agreed, it's more about the form and less the mass and scale. Schmidt stated it's dissimilar to the eclectic nature of the street, where this building feels like it's from a different era. Nauman led a straw poll vote on supporting mass, scale, and form, as drawn. The vote found no members in support and Spann Labato, Anderson, Staab, Alvarez Marti, Schmidt, Davol and Nauman against.

The Board started discussing more details to help with revisions. Spann Labato and Nauman raised the side setbacks. Anderson brought up the front massing. Alvarez Marti noted the complexity of the front module and to simplify the roof from the street but doesn't mind more complexity in the back. Davol and Schmidt agreed with Alvarez Marti. Schmidt said it came down to the simplicity of the buildings on the street and how this is different.

The Board explained process understanding the lack of support for mass/scale/form. Hadley asked for further feedback on the ADU and clarity on the consistency of what was approved three years ago for the site versus now. Earley clarified it's a different Board and they aren't far off from the design but it's about the complexity currently. She explained it comes up often in the core and different Boards may interpret the guidelines differently. Davol expressed that public comment has an influence too. Nauman and Staab agreed. Schmidt brought up that it can influence but they still need to interpret and make decisions based upon the guidelines.

Hadley requested a continuation and expressed his concerns about the feedback regarding how architecture needs to be a reflection of its time. He also brought up the building code with all electric requirements leading to more east-west ridgelines to better accept solar. Alvarez Marti suggested straw polling the east-west configuration. Nauman didn't want to go into more specifics.

The Board discussed the ADU to give feedback. Nauman ran through the elevations. The Board discussed if the roof extension is a dormer or not. Earley showed the Board the guideline and photo that the guideline is referencing.

Schmidt believes this is a dormer. He and Alvarez Marti support breaking it into two. They discussed the potential of a shallower roof. Hadley expressed he had enough feedback. Hadley asked to continue until March.

Nauman made a motion to continue the application of John Andrew Breuer and Amy Padgett Breuer to site a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at 422 and 422 ½ Sopris Avenue, Block 35, Lots 5-6 in the R1C zone to the March 25, 2025 BOZAR meeting,

Alvarez Marti seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously in support.

Item No. 3

Consideration of the application of Agosto 2023 Management Trust to site a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at 320 and 320 ½ Gothic Avenue, Parcel 2, Booth Minor Subdivision, Block 15 in the R1 zone.

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Chris Penfield and Andrew Hadley submitted plans on behalf of the Agosto's for a new single-family residence and ADU to be located at 320 Gothic Avenue within the R1 zone. A streetscape has been provided to better help determine this proposed structure's relationship as compared to the existing neighborhood. The gable roof element on the rear of the primary building is a large feature and modifications were made to lower the subordinate roof and to break up the dominant roof overhang. Discussion is encouraged. Zoning requirements have been met. The new ADU will have a conditional use permit and will be required to meet the definitions within Section 16-1-20 which will require a deed restriction for the unit. The topography for purposes of measuring FAR for the primary would be 8892' and ADU would be 8893'. Roof forms are compliant. Porches and decks are compliant. Window to wall ratio on the north is 18.06%, which is relational to other applications. However, the first floor is 46.66 sf and the second floor is 55.03 sf and appears to conflict with GL 4.53. The upper windows were reduced by 6". Otherwise fenestration, as proposed appears compliant. Doors and lighting appear compliant. Materials appear compliant. Overall the primary building was supported, with discussion needed regarding the south gable feature. Overall the ADU was supported with the revision of the sliding door which was provided to be a French door. Proper public notice has been given.

DRC: Schmidt and Staab were members of the 12/9 DRC and said they asked to specify snow storage better as well as the roof lines.

Anderson and Alvarez Marti were members of the 1/13 DRC and explained their discussion on the dormer/roof feature. They discussed more glazing on the second floor than the first and the window groupings. They discussed trees on the site plan, as well as gravel and parking. Alvarez Marti brought up discussion on the parking set up in the back and snow storage.

Applicant Presentation: Andrew Hadley explained the only comments of the gable facing south was a dormer or gable element, which was designed to add egress to the bedroom and to shed snow. He said it's a traditional house in mass and scale, likes the color scheme, and has a nice front porch. Earley pulled up a proposed revision they put together that day and he explained the changes. Nauman clarified if there's minimum square footage for livable space in an ADU, Earley specified 400 sq ft. He asked about the kitchen constraints. The ADU is 625 sq ft. Nauman brought up a concern about the livability of the unit and the Board discussed if that was their purview.

Public Comment:

Sue Navy (owner of 324 Gothic Avenue) wrote via letter: I'm writing in regard to the house proposed at 320 Gothic, and in a larger sense, regarding the rule that alleys should be used for garages and off-street parking. I live on a unique block, the 300 block of Gothic. My home is at 324. The alley between Gothic and Maroon is a dead end, not a through alleyway. There are currently several homes in the alley, with vehicles regularly using the alley for access.

The proposed house at 320 includes an ADU with a one-car garage. There are two outdoor parking spaces in the design as well. This would add the potential for three more vehicles using the alley year-round.

Soon to come, I believe, will be a proposal for a major remodel (with possible re-siting) at 322 Gothic. This property already has a one-car garage in the alley. The new house, when approved, would likely require another one or two outdoor parking spaces. I believe there is presently enough traffic in this narrow, dead-end alley, and don't want to see it become a heavily-used thoroughfare – busier than the street – or an accident waiting to happen. I watch daily as cars and trucks, including UPS and FedEx, go backwards in one direction or other to accommodate the dead end. The larger trucks block the alley while there, blocking vehicular access/egress.

People, on foot or bike, also use the alley as the main access to their homes, often with their dogs. I believe they (we) should receive greater consideration as you contemplate traffic in the alley. It needs to remain pedestrian-and-bike-friendly. In this particular situation, the rule doesn't benefit the residents.

On my block, on the south side of Gothic, we don't have garages. Everyone parks in the setback in front of their houses, myself included. This has the added benefit of making the houses look "lived-in." Cars parked in front yards and driveways add to the feeling that houses are occupied, something we should be encouraging as we talk about "human scale."

My simple solution for this one block and one house right now is to create two designated parking spaces in the 20' street/front setback, rather than in the alley. Access is definitely easier from the street. I realize that the ADU at 320 ½ will have a one-car garage contained within it, which isn't likely to change. One more car in this alley is better than three. More generally, I believe that one-car contained garages facing town streets can blend in well (there are four in my immediate neighborhood), but that's a topic for another discussion. When the proposal for a house/renovation at 322 Gothic comes up for review, I advocate the same solution, which will be easier and safer for all.

Thank you for considering my comments, and hopefully incorporating my recommendation."

Neil Windsor (owner of 208 Third Street) agreed with Sue's comments on the alley being at capacity for cars. He asked to clarify the changes made since the DRC meeting. He is concerned about the size of the house.

Jim Starr (owner of 323 Gothic Avenue) commended the owner for building an ADU and he believes all new houses should require that. He is concerned about the height and size of the building, as it would clearly be the tallest and largest building on that side of the block. He also thinks a lighter color makes a building appear larger and asked the Board and applicant to consider a darker color.

Sue Navy thanked the Board for hearing her letter. She explained how the alley is getting crowded. She likes the house but wants the block to feel consistent.

Close Public Comment

Board Questions and Deliberation:

Schmidt asked about purview and guidelines preferring parking to be off the alley. The Board discussed the guidelines and past precedent. The guidelines encourage parking off the alley. Hadley said his client is open to one parking space on the front. Nauman thought this was a reasonable compromise. He said it helps with tenant management of the ADU. They discussed how moving one to the front can also help with snow storage.

Nauman discussed how the guidelines require for two streetside trees (only one is shown). The Board reviewed the rest of the site plan, and there were no further comments.

Staab asked if heights and FARs meet requirements, Earley clarified yes.

The Board reviewed the north elevation (street side). Anderson asked if the building to the west is several feet higher. Hadley clarified that it is correct. Davol said this is proposed as 1 foot less than the allowed.

The Board reviewed the east elevation and Nauman expressed how it doesn't appear to step down to the rear much. Schmidt stated they have approved houses that don't step down. Earley read the guideline about this. The Board discussed the guidelines as it relates to the project.

The Board reviewed the west elevation and discussed the proposed update from Andrew Hadley. There were no further comments.

The board reviewed the south elevation and there were no comments.

The board reviewed the ADU:

South Elevation: No comments.

West Elevation: No comments.

East Elevation: No comments. Nauman asked to clarify the height, which is 24 ft.

North Elevation: Nauman brought up the livability of accessing the unit and the indoor space. He brought up the criteria of conditional use and his concerns. Hadley clarified it's a studio apartment. Hadley clarified he will revise the plan regarding access to the unit and will include a bed instead of a sofa in the drawing. There was a discussion on its livability and BOZAR's purview.

The Board reviewed materials: Nauman raised the public comment on color. He doesn't think BOZAR has purview on color. Staab noted there are dark accents. The Board could support the colors. Anderson asked about lighting over the garage. Hadley said they are planning on recessed lighting and will update the plans.

*The Board finds that the application of **Agosto 2023 Management Trust** to site a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at 320 and 320 ½ Gothic Avenue, Parcel 2, Booth Minor Subdivision, Block 15 in the R1 zone **will not appear excessively similar nor dissimilar** to residential structures within the surrounding neighborhood. The scale and forms of the home **is effective in incorporating** traditional forms seen within the surrounding R1 zone; and*

*The accessory dwelling appears subordinate in scale to the residence by reducing the overall mass on the site and conveys 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), 4.84-4.87 (location and massing/forms, scale), 4.88 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), 4.71-4.72, 4.75-4.76, 4.80, 4.82-4.83 (materials), with the following conditions:*

- *A profile will need to be shown of the final grades on the lot with foundation details for each building in relation to the alley and the adjacent right of way on the north pertaining to drainage.*
- *Final landscape plan should be provided to the building department for Chair review and sign off if changes are proposed during the construction phase.*
- *Requirements of the Colorado Model Electric Ready and Solar Ready code must be met prior to permitting, including EV ready parking space for each dwelling unit and solar ready for the primary building.*
- *An additional tree is required on the north (front) elevation, as per GL 2.19.*

*The South gable roof element **can be supported with the 2 ft extension in the wall**, as drawn per the application of GL 4.25-4.26, 4.41 and 4.45.*

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 the application of Agosto 2023 Management Trust to site a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at the aforementioned address in the R1 zone, provided that one parking space will be added to the front that does not interfere with streetside trees, and based upon the findings, and per the plans and material list.

Alvarez Marti seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously in support.

*The Board finds that the conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling unit to be located at 320 ½ Gothic Avenue, Parcel 2, Booth Minor Subdivision, Block 15 in the R1 zone **can be supported** based upon criteria contained in Code Section 16-8-30 (b), with the following conditions:*

Provided this use is maintained as defined in code section 16-1-20 of the Crested Butte Municipal Code thereby requiring that a long-term rental unit as defined in Code Section 16-1-20 must be maintained on the property. This approval results in the granting of a vested property right.

Nauman made a motion to approve the conditional use permit to construct an accessory dwelling located at the aforementioned address in the R1 zone, based upon the finding and per the plans, with the change to adjust the site plan to allow for the walkway.

Alvarez Marti seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously in support.

Item No. 4

Miscellaneous

- DRC for February 10 and 18 (Tuesday): Davol and Staab BOZAR is February 25th)
- DRC for March 10 and 17: Schmidt and Davol BOZAR is March 25th
- DRC for April 14 and 21: Anderson and Staab (tentative or May) BOZAR is April 29th
- Discuss digital agenda and packet link change

Nauman adjourned the meeting at 9:44 p.m.