

**Town of Crested Butte
Board of Zoning and Architectural Review
February 25, 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, Yemma, and Fillmore.

Staab made a motion to approve the agenda for the February 25, 2025 BOZAR meeting.

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

Nauman made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 28, 2025 BOZAR meeting.

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

Item No. 1

*Consideration of the application of **Denise Liebl and Todd Liebl** to site an addition at the existing contributing historic primary building and accessory building and to site a new cold accessory building to be located at 226 Sopris Avenue, the west 75 feet of lots 1 to 5, both inclusive, except the west 12.5 feet thereof, Block 33 in the RIC zone.*

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Anna Rhees and Jim Jose of SHM Architects submitted plans on behalf of the Liebl's for an addition to the existing contributing SFR at 226 Sopris Avenue within the RIC zone and to lift the existing historic accessory building and shift it to the north 5' to accommodate parking in the rear. Then, there is a proposal for a new cold AB on the east. The AB and SFR have always been lumped together due to proximity and shifting the building closer will still have that condition. So, it is an accessory building but it is considered part of the primary building because there is less than 10' setback. So, it doesn't meet the requirement for a heated building. There is an existing easement on the west and the adjacent owner has provided a letter of support for the addition onto the existing AB. Zoning requirements have been met. There is support for the addition. A rendering of the southeast corner before and after has been provided to ensure that the Board has context of what is proposed. Roof pitches are compliant. There is a proposal to switch the two pack of windows on the south to the east to accommodate a new French door on the south. Windows and doors for the primary building are supported.

The addition to the existing accessory building appears subordinate and a connector module wouldn't be needed. It steps in from the north and south and also steps down from the ridge. All historic materials must be kept on the existing historic building. Windows must be discussed, as they are historic, but do not fit within the openings properly. They were likely something that was found and just placed into the openings because they fit. The new addition proposes materials to match, but it would seem that a change in materials would be more GL compliant to cleave the difference between old and new. There is a large amount of windows on the west that appears to conflict with window to wall GL. The windows/doors on the north and south comply but do appear cramped within the addition. Discussion is encouraged to determine if this is dissimilar.

The new accessory building is set to the rear of the site and is simpler than the existing primary building, as the GL as for. The two gable modules mimic two small structures. Windows and doors appear compliant, as well as roof pitches. Again, materials are proposed to match the existing historic structure. GL suggest differing materials for this building to honor the original structure.

Rusted material was revised for bonderized.

Lighting was added to elevations and appears to comply. Any existing fixtures that are not in compliance would need to be upgraded as part of this proposal.

Proper public notice has been given.

DRC: Alvarez Marti and Anderson were members at the January 21, 2025 meeting and explained that they talked about window materials and differentiation between old and new. They discussed lighting and that everything was fairly straightforward. Members talked about how the fence would get moved and how close the building it is. They confirmed that they talked more about the accessory than the main building.

Davol and Staab were members at the February 10, 2025 site visit and didn't have anything to add.

Applicant Presentation: Anna Rhees and Jim Jose explained that they are proposing a small addition to existing building, shed and garage. There is an encroachment from the neighboring property, and there is a 10 foot easement (west). They explained that the expansion to the back room of the primary building falls within the roof lines. There weren't a lot of conflicting items. Specific to the existing accessory, it is in need of significant improvements, and they will add a basement. This back room will be a great art studio. The new cold accessory building will serve as a garage and storage, storing bikes and snowblowers and a car. They have varied the material for the new addition and accessory to a similar color tone, will still have an antique look, similar to the next property.

Public Comment: Bob Browne (Owner of 503 Third Street) said this project is great!

Close Public Comment

Board Questions and Deliberation: The parking on the rear was discuss. It was decided that the east gravel area needs to be revegetated, while the middle gravel area can stay. An area for snow storage was confirmed. The number of trees to be removed was confirmed and the applicant explained that there was only one tree that would be relocated.

Elevations for the primary building were reviewed and supported.

Members voiced overall support the mass scale and form, for the addition to the existing accessory building. There was discussion over whether it was or was not an accessory building, due to the proximity of the primary building. They discussed the windows for the building, starting with the west and members had concerns with the four windows, as proposed. They discussed the revised plan for the west elevation and appreciated the three windows but thought they still needed to meet the 2:1 ratio. The Board discussed windows overall for the building and took a straw poll vote for the building as drawn on the north and south on the A3.02 elevation, which found all members against the proposed design.

There was overall support for the mass scale and form of the new accessory building. The elevations were reviewed and supported. The small garage door on the west was discussed but supported in the end. Materials were discussed and clarified and supported for both the new accessory building and the primary building.

*The Board finds that the application of **Denise Liebl and Todd Liebl** to site an addition at the existing contributing historic primary building and to site a new cold accessory building to be located at 226 Sopris Avenue, the west 75 feet of lots 1 to 5, both inclusive, except the west 12.5 feet thereof, Block 33 in the RIC zone and the addition **is** small in scale with FAR of 0.318.*

*The Board finds that the proposal for the southeast addition to the historic primary building does not require separation by the discernable connector module because the addition **is** successful in preserving the scale and form of the historic resource; and*

*The Board further finds that the size and scale of the addition **will not** be larger than the historic building and **can be supported** by the application of the following standards and Guidelines: GL 3.17 (b) and (c), 3.18 (a-c).*

The proposal **can be supported** per the application of GL 3.2 (original footprint), GL 3.8 (significant features); GL 3.22 (existing alterations), 3.39 (design and style), 3.17-3.17 (additions), 3.28 (replacement materials), 3.49-3.51, 4.53-4.59 (windows), 3.47, 4.52 (porches and decks); 3.58, 4.64, 4.66 (doors), 2.7-2.8, 2.16-2.19, 2.28, 2.37-2.40 (site plan, landscaping and lighting); contingent upon the following:

- A meeting with Building staff, BOZAR Chair or DRC, architect and contractor to discuss the method of preservation of the historic building prior to permitting is required.
- During construction, the architect, homeowner and/or contractor will notify the town of any proposed changes based upon discovery.
- The final landscape plan submitted to the Chair for approval if changes are proposed after permitting.
- 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.
- The following information must be included on the site plan prior to permitting:
 - Topography, if required by the Building Official.
 - Existing utilities
- If existing exterior light fixtures do not meet requirements, they will be required to be upgraded as part of the work to be done per GL 2.37-2.40 and Sec. 16-17-40.

Accessory Building (cold garage): The form and style of the accessory building (garage) **will appear** relational with historic placements and building forms per 4.25-4.26, (context) 4.84-4.86, 4.89-4.90, and 4.83 (garage door).

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 for architectural appropriateness Denise Liebl and Todd Liebl to site an addition at the existing contributing historic primary building and to site a new cold accessory building to be located at the aforementioned address in the R1C zone, provided that the area to the east of the new cold accessory building will be re-vegetated, based upon the requirements in the finding, per the plans and material list.

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

Nauman made a motion to continue the application of Denise Liebl and Todd Liebl for the addition to the existing accessory building at the aforementioned address in the R1C zone to the March 25, 2025 BOZAR meeting.

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

Item No. 2

Consideration of the application of 1 Gothic LLC, a Texas limited liability company to propose variance(s) specific to:

1. Alteration of building site finish grade

for the property located at 1 Gothic Avenue, Block 7, Lots 17-18 in the R1 zone.

Staff Presentation: Earley explained that Ben White submitted revised plans on behalf of the 1 Gothic LLC for a variance to the previously approved plans for the single-family residence and accessory building. At the November 2023 BOZAR meeting, the Board approved the variance from natural to finished grade from 3' to 8'6". Now, the applicants are requesting for this 8'6" to be increased to 13'9". This application is governed by Section(s) 16-9-10-30 relating to variances and 16-10-20 relating to excessive slope review. This proposal meets the requirements of both sections, as it is located interior to the site and is also not visible from public ways. The one suggestion staff has would be that a fence is required to prevent snow from shedding into the stairs/walkway. Proper public notice for this hearing has been given.

DRC: NA

Applicant Presentation: Ben White explained that there was a snow study on Treasury Hill portion of the lot. A letter was provided from Art Mears. This prompted them to provide a six foot snow fence, to hold back the wall of snow. The intent of lowering the grade is to protect the stairs and walkway and to be able to remove snow. Lowering the area will make it more accessible to snow removal equipment. Without lowering it, you could not get to the area.

Public Comment: NA

Close Public Comment

Board Questions and Deliberation: The Board discussed the pertinent codes and Nauman had concerns about engineer's letter that was part of the application, which alluded to concerns about this area in winter, and snow shed in this area. Other members questioned if this concern was relating to a specific criteria or not and it was determined that the project could be supported but there were concerns about snow shed in this area. Ultimately, the applicants were making the situation better. So, the Board found support for this proposal.

Nauman questioned the proposal for the artificial turf and a few members were sure that this was not reviewed/approved in the previous application. White said he would confirm and bring back to the Chair.

*The application **does** comply with Municipal Code Sections; 16-9-30 (c) pertaining to variances provided that the following conditions are met:*

- *Revised drainage plans are submitted and approved by the Building Official and Public Works Department.*
- *Any changes to the Stormwater Management Plan must be reviewed and approved by the Building Official and Public Works Department.*
- *The applicant provides a snow fence separating the snow storage area from the walkway and stairs.*

*The application **does** comply with Municipal Code Sections; 16-10-20 b. (1 -8) pertaining to excessive slope review.*

*The application for the retaining walls **can be supported** by the application of Guidelines 4.25 and 4.26 (context).*

Nauman made a motion to approve the application for the variance specific to:

1. **A variance to the alteration of building site finished grade in the R1 zone is requested; the maximum is 8'6" and 13'9" is proposed.**

of 1 Gothic LLC, a Texas limited liability company 3 Gothic Avenue, Block 7, Lots 17-18 in the R1 zone. for its ability to satisfy Municipal Code Sections 16-9-30 (c) and 16-10-20;

Anderson seconded the motion. The vote passed in support with Spann Labato voting against.

Item No. 3

Miscellaneous

- DRC for March 10 and 17: Schmidt and Davol BOZAR is March 25th
- DRC for April 14 and 21 Anderson and Schmidt BOZAR is April 29th
- DRC for May 12 and 19: Schmidt and _____ BOZAR is May 27th
- DRC for June 9 and 16: Spann Labato and _____ BOZAR is June 24th
- DRC for July 14 and 21: _____ BOZAR is July 29th
- DRC for August 11 and 18: Spann Labato and _____ BOZAR is August 26th

Nauman adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.