



Staff Report

To: BOZAR
From: Jessie Earley, Town Planner III
Meeting Date: DRC, March 17, 2025
RE: 422 and 422 ½ Sopris Avenue, Final Review

PROJECT TITLE: Breuer Residence (422 Sopris Avenue)

SUMMARY: 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 R1C zone. *Continued from the January 28, 2025 BOZAR meeting.*
(Ryan/Hadley)

- A conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling in the R1C zone is requested.
- Architectural approval is required.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Block 35, Lots 5-6

ADDRESS: 422 and 422 ½ Sopris Avenue

ZONE DISTRICT: R1C

OWNER: John Andrew Breuer and Amy Padgett Breuer

APPLICANT: Andrew Hadley

DRC MEMBERS: Staab and Schmidt (12/9/2024 DRC); Anderson and Alvarez Marti (1/13/2025); Schmidt and Davol (3/10/2025 and 3/17/2025)

STAFF MEMBER: Jessie Earley, Planner III

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Plans
2. Streetscape
3. GIS Map
4. Materials lists
5. Section 16-4-460 – 16-4-520 (R1C zone)
6. Section 16-8-30 (Conditional use)
7. DRC Notes (12/9/2024, 1/13/2025, 03/10/2025, 03/17/2025)
8. Arborist letter
9. Existing and proposed tree site plan

These packet materials are available at this [link](#). Staff can provide paper copies of the packet upon request.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION


1. Site a new single-family residence
2. Site a new accessory dwelling.

PUBLIC NOTICE



This item was properly noticed per Section 16-22-110 (c). The affidavit of posting is on file in the Preservation Department.

- I. Background/Overview:** Kyle Ryan of Andrew Hadley Architect submitted an application on behalf of the Breuer's for siting a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at 422 and 422 ½ Sopris Avenue. Siding is proposed as 4"x12" hand hewn log (natural gray) with stucco (light gray). The logs have 12"x12" log corners with dovetailed joints. There is a secondary siding which will be a 1"x8" board and batten wood siding (natural gray). There is a stone foundation cover noted at 18" (natural gray-brown mix).





② North East

The siding is proposed as 1"x8" board and batten siding (natural brown) and corrugated metal (rusty finish). Roofing is proposed as standing seam (dark bronze).



① South East Perspective



② South West Perspective

I. **Status:** The applicants met with the DRC at the 12/9 meeting. Notes are attached for more detailed information.

The following revisions have been made since that meeting:

- Site:



- Reduced the number of pavers in three ways.
 - Pulled them from the West property line at the parking area.
 - Added more grass West Side of the property under the snow storage.
 - Pulled the pavers back from the North side of the garage & added plantings.
- Added a Dry Well to the North of the property.
- Provided a “tree plan”.
- House:
 - Removed the exterior stone fireplace. Reduced the chimney to a 30”x30” stone square coming through the ridge. Increased the door & window width as well as adding a south facing window in its place.
 - Separated mulled windows by at least 6” between.
 - Separated three packs of windows by 12” between.
 - Unified the roofing material to Standing Seam – Dark Bronze Finish. Fascia’s, Shadow board, & Exposed rafter tails also to match Dark Bronze Finish.
- Accessory / Garage:
 - Removed the corrugated metal siding from the stair module & replaced it w/ siding & metal skirt to match.
 - Unified the separate dormers into a single “Roof Element”. Also adding a window to the center of the space.

The applicants met again with the DRC at the 1/13 DRC meeting. Notes are attached for more detailed information. The following revisions have been made to the plans based upon the discussion at that meeting:

- Site Plan:
 - Pavers further reduced by:
 - Adding gravel at the garage dripline.
 - Reducing the South West patio & adding grass.
 - Removing the pavers under the Hot Tub & surrounding its concrete pad with grass.
 - Limited the entire length of the North walkway to 4'-0" wide.
 - Additional Evergreen & Aspen trees have been added to the South West yard, formerly the patio.
 - Drywell Added.
 - Sewer & Water Lines Separated.
 - Two water lines shown by code.
 - Right Of Way dimensions and additional Building Departments notes added, see Astrid's initial review response.



- Note that further discussion of drainage impacts including the possibility of adding swails is expected with town staff going forward.
- Note: The neighbors at Lot 4 (EAST) have flagged some trees that they would like to see saved. We are cognizant of their wishes & will do everything we can to save them.
- House:
 - We have reduced the building height 2" to comply with the height limits.
 - Added a confirming 12" dimension to the Westerly stairwell windows & building corner.
 - Added solar panels & disconnects, Electric meter removed. located in the Garage.
 - Lift station notes added to the plan per Astrid's initial review.
 - Changed the Brown siding to Grey to match the log siding. This was changed in response to BOZAR discussion & the thought that multiple color siding was too much contrast for this zone.
- Garage:
 - Added a 2nd car charger per code.
 - Reduced the building height 2" to comply with height limits.

The applicants addressed the Board at the January 28th BOZAR meeting for formal review. During this meeting, there were concerns regarding the mass/scale/form for the primary building. Most of the concerns related to form and the contemporary nature of the north elevation, as presented. There were also concerns regarding the shed dormer as proposed on the ADU. The following revisions have been included:

- Site plan:
 - Largely unchanged
 - Open to wildflower & native grasses in the north yard
 - Developing a "Tree Survey and Replanting Plan" which will document and catalog every tree above 3" caliper.
- Primary building:
 - Simplification of the north elevation by removing the gable bump out.
 - Revised windows on the north elevation, second floor.
- ADU:
 - Revised the large shed dormer to be two shed dormers

The applicants met with the DRC at the 3/10 meeting. Notes from this meeting are attached for more detailed information. The following revisions have been included:

- Streetscape: Updated to reflect the below revisions to the primary building.
- House Design:



- North lower porch cricket removed.
 - The 2nd floor kitchen windows, reduced from three to two.
 - The loft level bathroom window has been eliminated.
 - The North gable roof (loft bathroom) has been brought down 12".
- Garage(s):
 - The applicants are showing three different roof proposals for the accessory dwelling to discuss.
 - (X.1) This garage displays what the applicants feel is the best option in terms of habitability of the ADU. They are showing two "Roof Elements" each with 4'-0" tall windows allowing for maximum light, ventilation, views & egress.
 - (X.2) This garage displays what the applicant's feel guidelines state as allowable. They are showing two "Dormers" each with the higher roof continuing through the exterior wall & thereby limiting the window size. This design to the applicant feels unbalanced with the expanse of wall below the roof & above the lower windows. Additionally these dormers get pushed up to the ridge, against the guidelines, to allow even a small window with very limited sky views & light.
 - (X.3) This garage has no dormers or roof elements. The applicants feel that it is the most unlivable.
- Site Plan: Matt has engaged an Arborist & they will be producing a tree viability report shortly.

Applicants met with the DRC at the 3/17 DRC meeting, notes are attached for more specific information. The following revisions have been made to the plan since that meeting:

- Streetscape:
 - As last presented
- Tree Plan:
 - Updated with a clearly defined overdig area that shows the areas of surface disruption.
 - The proposed tree plan & site trees show should be considered as "proposed". Such that the applicants will look to the arborist for final recommendations for sizing, species, & spacing.
- Accessory:
 - Showing the split roof element design. These account for less than 30% of that roof plane & increase livability to the living unit per guidelines.
- House:



- North: The bump out from the upper level at the dining area now continues down to the entry porch. The applicants feel that this better balances the top & bottom while simplifying the overall massing. Although it adds to the sq ft of the house it removes just enough of the porch to conform with the maximum allowable sq ft.
- South: High gable window removed, stovepipe to become interior chimney.

II. Context: Refer to guidelines 4.25-4.26. The buildings within the block includes all non-historic homes on the north and south sides of the block. The North side of Sopris Avenue includes single family residences and the Queen of All Saints church and parish hall. The property is bordered on the south the alley and then the south half of Block 35, which is R2C, which does house two historic buildings. The forms of the massing plan convey a modified T-shaped footprint with a step down in both the front and the rear.

The Board should determine whether the overall scale and forms of the residence and accessory building comply with the intents 4.25 and 4.26 (excessively similar or dissimilar) in relation to the neighborhood context.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.25 Excessive Similarity	The forms differentiate from newer residences located in Block 35 per context GL 4.25. No conflict.	Support
4.26 Excessive Dissimilarity	Discussion is encouraged to determine if what is proposed is a contemporary interpretation and variety or if the proposal is excessively dissimilar. An updated streetscape has been provided to assess if the revised forms better relate to the historic RIC zone surrounding the property. 3D massing for streetscapes have been provided for other projects, which may be necessary. This building is at the height maximum of 28' and below the width maximum of 32' per zoning requirements. The design goals of this zone district encourage infill to help preserve the character of the existing buildings. Discussion is encouraged to determine if revisions to the plans have been successful in better conforming the forms of this structure to the surrounding RIC zone. The applicant has removed the cricket, revised windows and reduced the height of the gable module by 12" from the previous application and finally, carried the previously cantilevered gable to the ground to emulated a more historic form, rather	<p>12/9/ DRC: Streetscape was encouraged to help evaluate this.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: A streetscape was provided for the DRC meeting. There was a lot of discussion about neighborhood context and the massing of this structure. One member could find support, as drawn. However, the other member had concerns regarding the proposed massing.</p> <p>The number of trees proposed for removal was discussed. It was asked if the trees could be relocated onsite and Matt Brezonik, contractor, didn't think so.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members were concerned regarding the forms of the building per GL, as seen from the north/street side due to the contemporary nature.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members had concerns regarding the trees.</p> <p>3/10 DRC: Members appreciated the responsiveness from the applicants for</p>



	<p>than contemporary.</p> <p>Discussion is encouraged regarding the number of trees being proposed for removal, as part of the proposal. It is understood that trees impeding access on the south and development in the middle of the lot need to be removed. However, trees on the east and west sides are in question and if they all must be removed per GL 2.18. The applicant has provided a letter from an arborist clearly outlining the requirements of the site based upon the construction that is proposed. The applicant based upon this letter has provided a site plan showing the recommendations from the letter. Staff appreciates this information, as it better outlines what can be done for the health of the trees.</p> <p>Discussion is encouraged regarding the revised dormers, as proposed for the ADU.</p>	<p>removing the front gable. However they felt that this change made the building look more massive and therefore did not fit with mass/scale/form GL It was discussed that the front gable helped to break up the mass, but revisions were encouraged. The applicant has provided revised drawings.</p> <p>A consultation from an arborist was encouraged and the applicants are working on this piece.</p> <p>Members supported the two dormers better than the large dormer, as previously proposed. They have provided options with the rationale behind their choice for this element.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members asked if the cantilevered gable could continue to the ground and the applicant has provided revised drawings.</p> <p>Members appreciated the letter from the arborist, but asked for a site plan representing these recommendations and this has been provided.</p>
--	---	--



1/28/2025 Streetscape





3/10/2025 DRC Streetscape



03/17/2025 DRC Streetscape



3/25/2025 DRC Streetscape

III. Land Use Code Review:

Residential Zone District (Sec. 16-4-460-16-4-520)

Dimensional Limitations	Required by Chapter 16	Proposed	Compliant
Minimum Lot Width:	31 ¼'	50'	Yes
Maximum Lot Area:	9375	6250	Yes
Minimum Lot Area:	3750	6250	Yes
# Dwellings:		2	Yes
Minimum Setbacks:			
Principal: Front: See Section 16-14-60:	20'	15' Front yard setback: 400 Block of Sopris are situated within the historic core zone. Front yard setbacks range between 7' to 22'3". Code Section 16-14-60 contains a provision that enables the Board to consider as to whether less than 20' setback is possible. The average front yard setback is 14'5" for the south side of Sopris. The allowable range for the South side of Sopris on Block 35 is 8' 5" to 20'5".	Yes
Principal: Side Yard (West):	7'6"-11'6"	7'6" (one story) 11'10" (two story)	Yes
Principal: Side Yard (East):	7'6"-11'6"	7'6" (one story) 14'9" (two story)	Yes
Accessory Building: Side Yard (West):	7'6"-11'6"	19'4"	Yes



Accessory Building: Side Yard (East):	7'6"-11'6"	7'6"	Yes
Accessory Building: Rear:	5' (Accessory) 10' (Principal)	6' (deck)	Yes
Distance between buildings:	10'	14'10"	Yes
Max FAR - Primary:	0.3-0.32	0.315 (1969.2 sf)	Yes
Max FAR – All Buildings:	0.48	990.17sf (accessory) 0.474 (2959.4 sf)	Yes
Height:	28' /20'/ 24'	28' (principal) 24' (accessory dwelling)	Principal – Yes Accessory – Yes
Roof Pitch	Minimum 4:12	10:12 (principal); 4:12 (secondary roofs) 10:12 (primary); 4:12 (secondary roofs) (accessory)	Yes
Width	35'	32' (principal) 20' (accessory dwelling)	Yes
Snow Storage	>33%	60.1%	Yes
Open Space	50%	68%	Yes
Parking	3 spaces	2 stacked (primary building) 1 interior (ADU)	Yes

b. Conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling (section 16-8-30): The accessory building use is a further defined as within Section 16-1-20:

Accessory dwelling means a detached subordinate structure or portion thereof subordinate to an existing or planned and approved residential structure on the same building site. In each of the residential districts located within the Town, the accessory dwelling must remain in common ownership at all times with the primary dwelling or principal building on the same building site. In the event the creation of condominiums or townhouses on the building site results in more than one (1) primary dwelling or principal building, the accessory dwelling must remain in common ownership with at least one (1) primary dwelling or principal building located on the same building site. Either the accessory dwelling, the primary dwelling, or both, shall be used exclusively as a long-term rental. If more than one (1) accessory dwelling has been approved for a site, then two (2) out of the three (3) dwelling units on the site shall be used exclusively as a long-term rental. The structure designated as the long-term rental must remain in common ownership with another residential use on the same building site, except in the "B3" Business District, where the primary structure may be nonresidential in character. To obtain the conditional use of an accessory dwelling, the applicant shall comply with the terms of [Section 16-9-70](#) respecting the recordation of discretionary approvals.

Please review the criteria to consider this use within Section 16-8-30. This use is a conditional use in the R1C zone per code section 16-4-480 (1).

Code Section	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
Sec. 16-4-480 (1) Accessory dwellings	The R1C zone provides this use as a conditional use. It must meet the criteria	Not applicable. Use changes do not go before DRC.



	below.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (a) Architectural approval	Discussion regarding this is outlined below.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) Compatible with neighborhood context and size	Discussion below, general support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) a. Size	The building has been revised to meet FAR requirements.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) b. Density of buildings	General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) c. Amount of open space	All zoning requirements are met.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) d. Scale	See discussion below. General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) e. Snow storage	Provided. General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) f. Snow removal	Provided. General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) g. Landscaping	Discussed further below. Concern regarding number of trees proposed for removal on east and west.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (1) h. Similar land uses	The RIC zone presents a variety of uses to which this could be included. General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (2) Consistent with zoning district objectives and purposes	General support	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (3) Congestion, automotive, or pedestrian safety problems or other traffic hazards	Parking is overviewed on the site plan. General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (4) Noise, dust, vapor, fumes, odor, smoke, vibration, glare, light, trash removal or waste disposal problems	General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (5) Adverse effects to public facilities, rights of way or utilities	General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (6) Adverse impacts on the uses of adjacent property	Pending any public comment. General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (b) (7) Adequate parking or PIL	General support.	
Sec. 16-8-30 (c) Net effect on any proposed use on the number of long-term housing units	This ADU will add a deed restricted long term rental.	

IV. Design GL Analysis

Purpose for the RIC District:

The RIC District was created to provide for low-density residential development along with customary accessory uses in the older residential areas of the town, where particular attention to the characteristics, size and scale of existing historic buildings is required. Residential and institutional uses customarily found in proximity to such residential uses are included as conditional uses. No more than two units, designed or used for dwelling by a family, are allowed on a site. Please refer to Chapter 16, Article 4, Division 6 of the Town Code for additional information about this zone district.

Design goals for the RIC district include:

- To encourage appropriate infill and changes to existing structures and preserve the historic residential character of the area.
- To place importance on the appropriate development of the entire property not just individual structures.




a. **Site planning:** Refer to GL: 2.16-2.40, 5.108-5.112.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
Topography	Provided on sheet C1. Slopes down from 8892' to 8891' to the East. For the primary building for the purposes of FAR the natural grade is 8891'6". For the accessory dwelling, the grade for the purposes of FAR would be 8891'6".	
2.8 Drainage	<p>Drainage swales are shown for the primary and accessory building to the east. However, drainage will need to be revised to encourage drainage to the alley or the street not the adjacent lot.</p> <p>A dry well is now shown on the north side of the lot. This will need to meet the specifications required by the Public Works Department.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Drainage cannot be to the neighboring property. Revisions needed</p> <p>1/13 DRC: Drainage cannot be to the neighboring property. Revisions needed</p>
Easements	NA	NA
2.16 Substantial landscaping	The plan is fairly general. Provision of a final landscape plan can be required, if changes occur.	
2.18 Preservation of existing mature trees	<p>This site is heavily treed. There are smaller existing trees in the middle of the lot that will need to be removed for the placement of the home and accessory. These trees are all less than the caliper noted within the code 16-15-10. The applicant has provided a letter from an arborist clearly outlining the requirements of the site based upon the construction that is proposed. The applicant based upon this letter has provided a site plan showing the recommendations from the letter. Both are attached to the packet. Staff appreciates this information, as it better outlines what can be done for the health of the trees.</p> <p>Also, there are trees along the edges of the lot to the west (11) and east (3) and that are noted to be removed and replaced.</p> <p>There are six trees on the south that are proposed to be removed to ensure access to the new accessory dwelling. Two trees will remain.</p> <p>It appears that all trees that exist on the lot with the exception of the two spruce trees on the southeast corner will be removed.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Members asked for a more detailed plan for what trees would be removed. This has been provided.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: Members appreciated the tree plan. They asked for the number of trees in the mid lot area and size.</p> <p>The trees on the south were supported for removal due to access for the proposed ADU.</p> <p>The trees on the east and west would be a topic of conversation for the full Board.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members had concerns regarding the trees.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members asked for a site plan to show what the arborist letter was reviewing, which has</p>



been provided.







	<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED TREE PLAN 1/8"=1'-0"</p>	
<p>2.19 New trees</p>	<p>The existing and proposed tree site plan based upon the letter from the arborist outlines the new trees that are proposed.</p> <p>There are a cluster of new aspen trees (3) on the northwest corner of the lot, west and southwest corner of the primary building and east of the primary building.</p> <p>There will be two new spruce trees one on the east and one on the west. There will be a total of 14 trees that are added to replace the 20 trees proposed for removal.</p> <p>Shrub buffers are noted on the west and east of the primary and the east of the ADU.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Members asked for a more detailed plan for what trees would be removed. This has been provided.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: Members noted that the existing and proposed trees would be a point of discussion for the full Board.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members had concerns regarding the trees.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members asked for a site plan to show what the</p>




		arborist letter was reviewing, which has been provided.
2.16 a./ 2.20 Native plantings	<p>Sod is noted on the north portion of the property and on the east side of the structures. Generally, the GL supports use of native grasses. Discussion is encouraged.</p> <p>The applicant has mentioned in an email that they would be willing to provided native grass mix on the north side of the lot.</p>	
2.16 e Pervious materials	<p>There is a small area of gravel on the south side of the lot adjacent to the alley.</p> <p>The south portion of the lot and between buildings is called out as sand set pavers and was reduced from (2125.07 sf – 12/9 DRC) to (1286.35 sf -1/13 DRC) to (916.39 sf – 3/10 DRC). It is appreciated that the material is pervious.</p> <p>There is a walkway and bike parking pull out on the north side of the lot, which extends into the right of way that is also noted as sand set pavers (182.11 sf). The width of the sidewalk on the north has been revised and does not exceed 4' into the ROW and cannot be heated.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Members expressed concerns regarding the amount of hardscape on the south. This was revised.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: The revisions were more well received. However, there was still a concern from one member about the amount of hardscape proposed. This has been further reduced.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: The reduction of the hard scaped areas was supported.</p>
2.28 e & f Parking substrate	Parking spaces are noted as sand set pavers, which meet the intents of the GL. General support.	Support
(2.37-2.40)/ 16-17-40 Exterior Lighting	Proposed lighting appears to comply with night sky requirements. General support.	Support
Solar	There is solar proposed for the west roof face of the ADU, south, east and west gables of the primary building, which meets the intents of the GL.	Support
Utilities	<p>Wet and dry utilities have been included on the site plan. Water and sewer lines should not be located on the same side of the home (east), and the plans have been updated to separate these. It now shows wastewater on the west and water on the east.</p> <p>If a lift station is required, it would need to be included on the interior of the structure. This has been noted by the applicant.</p> <p>Adjacent rights of way are included to scale.</p>	
2.7 Snow Storage	Snow storage is provided onsite and is over the minimum of 33%. The areas correspond with areas to be plowed.	Support



Proposed Site Plan (12/9/2024 DRC)



Proposed Site Plan (1/13/2025 DRC)



17



the street, which steps down (1'5") to a gable module and then a smaller shed module. The building steps down (3") to a gable module on the south (22'10"). There is a secondary shed module on the southeast. On the east elevation there is a step back in the gable with an extension on the south side, which gives the appearance of an asymmetrical roof.


GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.32-4.33	<p>Consideration of whether the forms better achieve relationships with historic buildings are in GL 4.32-4.34. The 3D drawings are helpful in the review. The simplification of the gable module perpendicular to the street, including carrying the module to the ground, and modification of the fenestration has helped to simplify this elevation.</p> <p>GL 4.32 conveys that new infill construction should relate with the predominate scale of historic neighborhoods. An updated streetscape has been provided to assess if the revised forms better relate to the historic RIC zone surrounding the property. 3D massing for streetscapes have been provided for other projects, which may be necessary. This building is at the height maximum of 28' and below the width maximum of 32' per zoning requirements. The design goals of this zone district encourage infill to help preserve the character of the existing buildings. Discussion is encouraged to determine if revisions to the plans have been successful in better conforming the forms of this structure to the surrounding RIC zone. The applicant has removed the cricket, revised windows and reduced the height of the gable module by 12" from the previous application and finally, carried the previously cantilevered gable to the ground to emulated a more historic form, rather than contemporary.</p> <p>Per GL 4.33, a diversity of forms is encouraged. Many of the homes on this south side of the block have a gable facing the street. The gable running parallel to the street varies this appearance.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Members requested a streetscape to better evaluate mass/scale and form as it relates to the context of the neighborhood.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: Members had concerns regarding mass/scale/form as seen from the street per GL 4.32 a. One member felt that they could support, as drawn, but gave a suggestion to revise materials to help make the building less complicated. Siding materials have been revised in color.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members were concerned regarding the forms of the building per GL, as seen from the north/street side due to the contemporary nature.</p> <p>3/10 DRC: Members appreciated the responsiveness from the applicants for removing the front gable. However they felt that this change made the building look more massive and therefore did not fit with mass/scale/form GL It was discussed that the front gable helped to break up the mass, but revisions were encouraged. The applicant has provided revised drawings.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members asked if the gable module could continue to the ground instead of cantilevering, which has been provided.</p>
4.34 Discernable primary module	The middle parallel module meets this	Support



	<p>requirement.</p> <p>This module is also the largest in relation to height and width.</p>	
--	---	--



Proposed 3D – 1/28 BOZAR



Proposed 3D – 1/28 BOZAR



501 5th St: 8917'-4"

424 Sopris: 8914'-4"

422 Sopris: 8919'-4"

420 Sopris: 8909'-9"


420 Sopris: 8921'-2"



Proposed Streetscape – 1/28 BOZAR




Revised 3D – 3/10 DRC



Revised 3D – 3/10 DRC



3/10/2025 DRC Streetscape





Revised 3D – 3/17 DRC



Revised 3D – 3/17 DRC



03/17/2025 DRC Streetscape





Revised 3D – 3/25 BOZAR



Revised Streetscape – 3/25 BOZAR

c. **Design and Style:** Refer to GL 4.35-4.40.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.35	<p>Discussion of whether overall building forms appear as a product of their own time while relating with historic forms seen in town is encouraged. An updated streetscape has been provided to assess this. 3D massing for streetscapes have been provided for other projects, which may be necessary. The applicant has removed the cricket, revised windows and reduced the height of the gable module by 12” from the previous application and finally, carried the previously cantilevered gable to the ground to emulate a more historic form, rather than contemporary.</p> <p>This building is distinguishable as new.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Members requested a streetscape to better evaluate mass/scale and form as it relates to the context of the neighborhood.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: Members evaluated the streetscape provided. There were some concerns that some of the details of the proposed primary building were contemporary for this infill within a core zone. Details such as: stone foundation cover, differing siding color treatments, window to wall ratio.</p> <p>3/10 DRC: Members appreciated the responsiveness from the applicants for removing the front gable. However they felt that this change made the building look more massive and therefore did not fit with mass/scale/form GL It was</p>



		<p>discussed that the front gable helped to break up the mass, but revisions were encouraged. The applicant has provided revised drawings.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members asked if the gable module could continue down to the ground, which has been provided in revised drawings.</p>
4.35-4.37	<p>Discussion is encouraged as to whether the design of the home relates with the overall styles within the neighborhood or appears incongruent. An updated streetscape has been provided to assess this. 3D massing for streetscapes have been provided for other projects, which may be necessary. The applicant has removed the cricket, revised windows and reduced the height of the gable module by 12” from the previous application. and finally, carried the previously cantilevered gable to the ground to emulated a more historic form, rather than contemporary.</p> <p>Per GL 4.36, the building is not an exact replication of a historic structure.</p> <p>GL 4.37 encourages contemporary interpretations. However, the concern is that the proposal may be too contemporary for this infill application within this core zone. The proposal for the log siding is something that was seen in the 1970-1980's. Our historic buildings within the core zones have primarily lapped siding relating to the period of significance for mining. The increased amount of glazing on the second floor versus first floor is a deviation from the historic character seen in the surrounding R1C zone. The matching siding and trim also is another element, which is contemporary and is seen in new construction, but historically buildings had contrasting trim details.</p>	<p>12/9 DRC: Members requested a streetscape to better evaluate mass/scale and form as it relates to the context of the neighborhood.</p> <p>1/13 DRC: Members evaluated the streetscape provided. There were some concerns that some of the details of the proposed primary building were contemporary for this infill within a core zone. Details such as: stone foundation cover, differing siding color treatments, window to wall ratio.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members had concerns about the contemporary nature of the forms of the building, as compared to the surrounding R1C zone and neighborhood.</p> <p>3/10 DRC: Members appreciated the responsiveness from the applicants for removing the front gable. However they felt that this change made the building look more massive and therefore did not fit with mass/scale/form GL It was discussed that the front gable helped to break up the mass, but revisions were encouraged. The applicant has provided revised drawings.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members asked if the gable module could continue down to the ground, which has been provided in revised drawings.</p> <p>Members looked at the log siding and voiced overall support, as proposed.</p>

d. Roof forms: Refer to guidelines *4.41-4.45.


GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.41 Roofs similar to those seen historically.	Most of the gabled roof forms are symmetrical and appear consistent with the intents of GL 4.41. Discussion is encouraged regarding the extension of	Support




	the gable on the south side of the east gable to determine if this is consistent.	
4.42 Shed roofs	The shed roof, as seen on the north and south, are subordinate. General support.	Support
4.43 Mix of roof styles	Discussion is encouraged regarding the extension of the gable on the south side of the east gable to determine if this is consistent.	
4.45 Roof pitches	The gabled elements present 10:12 and appear relational. The secondary roofs present 4:12 pitches meeting the intents of GL 4.45 b. General support. The secondary gable module is a 14:12 and conforms with the GL. Support.	Support
4.44 Ridge lines	The primary (35'10") ridge meets the intents of GL 4.44 a.	Support

e. **Porch features:** Refer to guidelines 4.49-4.52, 5.118.


GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.49/5.118 Primary entrance porch	These GL encourage clearly defining the entry, which is done in many cases with a porch as seen on many historic buildings and also on this building. General support. The cricket was removed from this porch to help simplify the elevation.	Support
4.50 Mix of porch sizes	The front porch is 8'x10'6", which meets the intents of this GL.	Support
4.51 Rear entry porch	The porch on the rear is simpler with the shed than the front porch, as asked for in GL 4.51.	Support



Front porch – 1/28/2025 BOZAR




Revised Front Porch – (3/10/2025 DRC)




Revised Front Porch – (3/17/2025 DRC)




Revised Front Porch – (3/25/2025 BOZAR)




Rear porch (12/9/2024 DRC)



Rear porch (1/13/2025 DRC)



Rear porch (1/28/2025 BOZAR/ 3/10 and 3/17/2025 DRC)



Rear porch (3/25/2025 BOZAR)

f. Windows: Refer to Guidelines 4.53-4.63.


GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.53 Window to wall ratio	Window to wall ratios along the front (south) elevation proposes 119.99 sf of glazing/659.57 sf wall space, which is	12/9 DRC: Members supported the overall window to wall ratio.



	<p>18.2% window to wall. This is relational to other applications.</p> <p>On the front elevation, first floor there are four single windows and door glazing (48.48 sf). There are two single windows and a two pack on the second floor (55.9 sf), which appears to conflict with the intents of 4.53 b, as there is more glazing on the upper floor. However, the glazing on the second floor was reduced and it now is closer to being balanced than it was before.</p> <p>On the west elevation there are four single windows and a two pack on the first floor and on the second floor there are three single windows and a two pack. There are two windows in the gable.</p> <p>On the east elevation, there are four single windows on the first floor. The second floor has four single windows. The gable has one window</p> <p>The north elevation proposes three single windows and door glazing on the first floor and a two pack and full light French doors on the second floor with a single window in the gable.</p>	<p>However, members voiced concern about the amount of glazing on the first floor versus the second floor in that it was top heavy.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Windows were not discussed in detail due to the requested changes in form.</p>
4.54 Vertical emphasis	<p>Windows are proposed as two over two, which is a consistent interpretation of historic windows. General support.</p> <p>A window and door schedule should be included.</p> <p>The windows are proposed as casement. Per GL 4.54 a. Casements should only be used for egress, which can incorporate the divided light appearance.</p> <p>There are small square windows proposed on the West elevation, which appear to meet the intents of GL 4.54 c.</p>	Support
4.56 Window material	<p>Aluminum clad windows are proposed, which are supported for infill development. When not needed for egress, double hung windows would be encouraged and should have simulated divided lights per GL 4.60. Casements should only be used for egress, which can incorporate the divided light appearance.</p>	Support
4.57 Fenestration pattern	<p>Windows as proposed are not closer than</p>	Support



	12" to the corner per GL 4.57 a.	
4.58 Groupings of 2 or more windows	There is 6" of trim between two packs of windows on the North, South and West elevations, as encouraged in this GL. These windows cannot be mulled. The three pack on the front was revised to a two pack.	12/9 DRC: Members asked for 3.5" of trim for 2 packs, which has been provided and separation of three packs. This has also been provided.
4.59 Window and door trim	2"x4" wood. General support.	Support
4.63 Window wells	Window well on rear elevation under the deck can be supported.	Support



Front elevation fenestration – 3/17/2025 DRC



Revised Front Elevation Fenestration – (3/25/2025 BOZAR)


g. **Doors:** Refer to GL 4.64-4.69.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.64/ 4.65 Primary door	The primary door is proposed as a wood, half-light door (red). General Support. A window and door schedule should be included.	Support
4.66 Secondary door	The secondary door on the first floor of the rear elevation is noted as a half-light metal clad door (bronze). There are full light French doors on the rear and the materials is not noted. These doors are roughly 9' in height. Discussion is encouraged to determine if this is consistent with the intents of the GL.	Support

h. **Lighting:** Refer to GL 2.37-2.40; 4.74.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
2.37 Exterior lighting	Goose neck fixtures at doorways are consistent with the GL and code. General support.	Support

i. **Materials:** Refer to GL 4.75-4.83.



*Standing Seam Metal Roofing:
Dark Bronze Finish*



*Fascia & Shadow Board:
Dark Bronze Finish*



*Metal Clad Windows:
Dark Bronze Finish*



*Metal Clad Door:
Dark Bronze Finish*



① South East




② North East



*Board & Batten Siding:
Natural Grey Finish*



*Hand Hewn Log Siding:
Natural Grey Finish*



*Wood Trim:
Natural Grey Finish*



*Stone Siding & Chimney:
Natural Grey Brown Mix*



*Fully Shielded Downlight:
Dark Bronze Finish*



③ North West



④ South West

Siding is proposed as 4"x12" hand hewn log (natural gray) with stucco (natural gray gray). The logs have 12"x12" log corners with dovetailed joints. There is a secondary siding which will be a 1"x8" board and batten wood siding (natural gray). There is a stone foundation cover noted at 18" (natural gray-brown mix).

Roofing is proposed as standing seam metal for roofs (dark bronze).



Fascia is noted as 2"x10" with a 2"x4" shadow board (dark bronze). There is a 2"x4' fascia (dark brown) with 4"x8" exposed D.F. rafters (dark brown) for lower roofs. Soffit will be a ¾" tongue and groove (Grey Owl). There will be 12"x12" log corners dovetailed joints (natural gray).

Window and door trim is proposed as 2"x6" on edge buck trim (natural gray) for log portions and 2"x4" (natural gray) for areas with vertical siding.

Windows are proposed as aluminum clad (dark bronze) in casements and fixed with simulated divided lights.

The primary is proposed as wood half-light doors (burgundy). There is a secondary door on the south, which is a half light metal clad door (dark bronze). The other secondary door on the south is shown as a full light, French style door and the material should be confirmed.

There is a natural stone chimney on the south end of the roof (gray/brown). There are 8"x8" D.F. posts (natural gray) for the front porch and rear deck. The deck proposes a 2"x4' wood top cap (natural brown), 4"x4" D.F. posts (natural gray) and 4"x4" hog wire panels (ruled). There is a 8" D.F. beam at the deck (natural brown).

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.71 Chimneys	The oversized chimney was removed and is now a small chimney from the roof, as would have been seen historically.	12/9 DRC: members voiced concerns regarding the large oversized chimney on the south. This has been revised. 1/13 DRC: Support
4.72 Eaves	Eaves are between 10" and 1'6", which meets the intents of the GL.	Support
4.75/4.76 Exterior materials	Per GL 4.76 c, plank and chink siding is not allowed in core zones. Discussion is encouraged to determine if this meets the intents of this GL. The proposed log siding is allowed by the GL. However, this is a contemporary siding treatment. It was a common siding in the 1970-1980's. The common siding treatment in historic zones like this one (R1C) was a horizontal lapped siding. The vertical siding meets the intents of this GL.	12/9 DRC: Members felt that the siding was a log siding not plank and chink and this was not a concern. 1/13 DRC: Support 3/17 DRC: Members looked at the log siding again and felt it met the intents of the GL.
4.75 Exterior materials	Per GL 4.75 e and 4.80 a, the dry stacked stone can be supported at 18". General support.	Support
4.79 Painted siding	Natural finishes are proposed, which appears to conflict with this GL, as it requires paint or stain.	
4.81 Mix of materials	The materials, as noted above should be discussed, but the proposed manner in which they are applied (horizontal and vertical) meets the intents of this GL.	Support
4.82 Roofing materials	Standing seam metal is supported.	12/9 DRC: Members voiced concern







		regarding the two materials in that it added complication for this infill building within the core. This has been revised to one material. 1/13 DRC: Support
--	--	---

j. **Accessory Dwelling:** Refer to GL 2.27-2.28, 4.84-4.86, 4.89-4.90.


GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.85 Placement	The building is set to the rear of the site.	Support
2.30/ 4.84 Mass/scale/form	The building is simple in form with a gable facing the alley. General support. The Board can determine if an alleyscape would be of help to assess this.	Support
4.86 Vary appearance	This building will vary in appearance from other buildings on this portion of the block.	Support
4.87 ADU Mass/scale/form	The two smaller, shed dormers, as proposed on the east appears to better meet the intents of GL 4.46-4.48. The Board has seen similar proposals on a few ADU's and discussion is encouraged. GL 4.87 b allows dormers to break the eave if the height is 3' below maximum, but this is at the height maximum at 24'.	12/9 DRC: Members suggested simplification of the two proposed elements on the east. This has been revised to one. 1/13 DRC: Members felt that although they understand the purpose and value the feature was in fact a dormer due to the application of GL 4.47 b. 1/28 BOZAR: members considered this proposal a dormer on the east. 3/17 DRC: members supported the revision to two shed dormers.
2.30 b/4.88 Mass/scale/form	This building has a gabled ridge (10:12) running north to south with a shed module on the north (4:12). The 3D perspectives are helpful to visualize this building within the neighborhood context.	Support
4.89 d Decks	This deck is located in the rear and is not highly visible. Support.	Support
4.53/4.89 e Fenestration	The south elevation proposes fenestration in the garage door and person door on the first floor and a two pack of windows and door glazing on the second floor with a small window in the gable. The east elevation proposes three small square windows on the first floor and two windows on the second floor.	Support



	<p>The west elevation proposes one single window and door glazing on the first floor.</p> <p>The north elevation proposes a two pack on the first floor and a two pack on the second floor.</p> <p>Windows are proposed as casements. Similar to the discussion above for the primary residence per GL 4.54. Double hungs would be encouraged unless needed for egress.</p> <p>Two packs of windows must have 3.5" of trim and cannot be mulled. It appears that this has been met with the 6" provided on the north. However, the two windows on the south must be revised.</p>	
4.41-4.45 Roof Forms	The 10:12 roof pitches are consistent with the existing roof pitch on the main house.	Support
4.64-4.66 Doors	<p>There are three half-light person, metal clad doors on the south and west (dark bronze). Support.</p> <p>The garage door is proposed with a wood veneer (natural brown). Support.</p>	Support



Elevations – 1/28/2025 BOZAR



Option 1: 3/17/2025 DRC

k. **Dormers on ADU's:** Refer to GL 4.66-4.67, 4.87.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.46 Dormers in new construction	There are two shed roof elements proposed for the east elevation, as was proposed in the original design. Discussion is needed to determine if the Board considers this a dormer. If so, it is a shed dormer, which is supported by this GL.	<p>1/13 DRC: Members expressed that this is a dormer.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members expressed that the large element was a dormer and needed to meet the GL.</p> <p>3/10 DRC: Members expressed support for the dormers as proposed. However they asked that the applicants provide justification. This has been provided.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members could support as drawn.</p>



4.47 Dormers	<p>The two shed dormers steps down 1'10" from the ridge of the garage module and achieves subordination.</p> <p>a. As proposed the two occupy 29.7% of the roof.</p> <p>b. The dormers are lower than the ridge. There is not a section of roof beneath either, as required in core zones.</p> <p>c. As proposed the two occupy 29.7% of the roof.</p> <p>d. The proposed shed dormers extend past the middle third on both the south and north sides.</p> <p>e. Met.</p>	<p>1/13 DRC: Members expressed that this was a dormer due to the language in 4.47 b. requiring it in core zones.</p> <p>With that in mind, it doesn't comply with GL noted.</p> <p>1/28 BOZAR: Members expressed that the large element was a dormer and needed to meet the GL.</p> <p>3/10 DRC: Members expressed support for the dormers as proposed. However they asked that the applicants provide justification. This has been provided.</p>
4.87 Dormers on ADU	<p>4.87 b. See above.</p> <p>c. Both break the eave line and aren't less than 3' than 24'.</p> <p>d. NA</p>	<p>1/28 BOZAR: Members expressed that the large element was a dormer and needed to meet the GL.</p> <p>3/17 DRC: Members could support as drawn.</p>

L. Materials: Refer to GL 4.75-4.83, 4.84-4.86 and 4.89-4.90.

The siding is proposed as 1"x8" board and batten siding (natural brown).

The roof is proposed as standing seam (dark bronze).

There is a foundation cover of rusted corrugated metal, which will not exceed 18".

Trim is noted as reclaimed wood with 2"x4" (natural brown). There is a 2"x4' skirt trim (dark brown). The fascia is shown as 2"x8" with 2"x4' shadow board (dark bronze) and corner boards of 2"x6" (natural brown).

Windows are proposed as casement and fixed in aluminum clad (dark bronze).

Person doors are proposed as a half-light metal clad doors (dark bronze) and the garage door is proposed with a wood veneer (natural brown).

Deck is proposed as a 2"x4" wood top cap (natural brown), 6"x6" wood posts (natural brown) and 4"x4" hog wire panels (rusted finish) to match the primary building. There is a 2"x2" rusty mesh screen at the heat pump.

GL	Staff Analysis	DRC Recommendation
4.90 Wood garage doors	General support.	Support
4.88 g Metal siding	The metal siding was removed.	12/9 DRC: Members voiced concern for the metal siding as proposed due to this being infill in a core zone. This has been revised.
4.88 f Simpler finishes	Other than the siding, this ADU proposes simpler finishes than the primary building.	Support.



V. Overview of DRC findings:

- **Residence: Review and recommendation to the BOZAR regarding mass/scale/form.**
- **Residence: Review and recommendation to the BOZAR regarding architectural appropriateness of the residence.**
- **ADU: Review and recommendation to the BOZAR regarding architectural appropriateness, specific to the dormers, as proposed on the east elevation.**
- **Residence/ADU: Review and recommendation to the BOZAR regarding materials, as proposed.**

VI. Proposed findings and motions:

1. Finding (Architectural Approval)

The Board finds that 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, continued from the January 28, 2025 BOZAR meeting, **will not appear excessively similar nor dissimilar** or will appear excessively similar or dissimilar to residential structures within the surrounding neighborhood. The scale and forms of the home **is effective in incorporating** or is not effective in incorporating traditional forms seen within the surrounding R1C zone per GL 4.32-4.34; and

(Accessory Dwelling)

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** or cannot be supported based upon the application of Guidelines 4.25-4.26 (similarity/dissimilarity-context), 4.46-4.47, 4.84-4.87 (location and massing/forms, scale), 4.88 and 4.90 (materials) and _____.

The architectural design and style of the residence can be **supported** or cannot be supported per the application of Guidelines 4.25-4.26 (similarity/dissimilarity-context), 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.
- The drainage plan will be coordinated with the Building Official and Public Works to ensure that drainage is not onto neighboring properties and also that the dry well meets the Town's specifications.



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.

Motion (Architectural appropriateness)

Motion to **approve** or deny the architectural appropriateness for the application of **John Andrew Breuer and Amy Padgett Breuer** to site a new single-family residence and accessory dwelling to be located at the aforementioned address in the R1C zone (with any changes specified _____) and based upon the findings, and per the plans and material list.

2. Finding (Accessory dwelling - Conditional use)

The Board finds that the conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling unit to be located at 422 ½ Sopris Avenue, Block 35, Lots 5-6 in the R1C zone **can be supported** or is opposed 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.

Motion (Accessory dwelling - Conditional use):

Motion to **approve** or deny the conditional use permit to construct an accessory dwelling located at the aforementioned address in the R1C zone, based upon the finding and per the plans.

3/13/2025

ARBORIST #RM-8556A REPORT: BREZONICK CONTRACTING 422 SOPRIS STREET CRESTED BUTTE, CO 81224

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Brezonick Contracting plans to build on an empty lot located at 422 Sopris St. Crested Butte, CO 81224. The lot contains Spruce, Aspen, and Cottonwood trees. Tomichi Trees was contracted to see if any of the trees on the edge of the building envelope & excavation over-dig limits could be saved.

Any trees within, or on, the border of the building envelope & excavation over-dig limits must be removed:

- i. In accordance with ISA (International Society of Arborists), no more than 1/3 of a tree's roots can be removed during construction.
- ii. ISA standard also reads that ideally less than 25% of a tree's roots should be removed during construction to guarantee vitality, and structural stability.
- iii. All trees within, and on the border, of the building envelope & excavation over-dig limits will be losing 100%-50% of their roots. This will cause them to be structurally, and biologically, unstable.

PROJECT PROPOSAL

All trees within, and on the border, of the building envelope & excavation over-dig limits should be removed prior to construction. Rather than focusing on 100% canopy replacement; the final landscaping should focus on utilizing the correct species, and spacing, of replacement canopy.

Kyle Warren

Arborist RM-8556A

970-901-6680

kyle@tomichitrees.com



ASPEN:


A1 = 4" CALIPER
A2 = 11" CALIPER
A3 = 9" CALIPER
A4 = 4" CALIPER
A5 =3" CALIPER
A6 = 10" CALIPER
A7 = 4" CALIPER
A8 = 4" CALIPER
A9 = 5" CALIPER
A10 =7" CALIPER
A11 = 8" CALIPER
A12 = 7" CALIPER
A13 = 7" CALIPER
A14 = 4" CALIPER
A15 = 4" CALIPER
A16 = 7" CALIPER

COTTON WOOD:


CW1 = 8" CALIPER
CW2 = 9" CALIPER

SPRUCE:


S1 = 9" CALIPER
S2 = 14" CALIPER
S3 = 4" CALIPER
S4 = 4" CALIPER



EXISTING TREE PLAN
1/8"=1'-0"



PROPOSED TREE PLAN
1/8"=1'-0"











427
Sopris
RESIDENT
PARKING
ONLY

427



BFS 835













3/17/2025 DRC Notes

Members; Davol and Schmidt

1. (Breuer 422 Sopris); Kyle Ryan and Andrew Hadley have submitted revisions to the plans, as seen at last week's DRC meeting. They have returned the front gable in an effort to break up the mass. The cricket was removed from the front porch and the windows were reduced on the front (north) elevation. They have also provided an updated streetscape for you to evaluate mass/scale/form. In the report, there are comparisons to the last two. Then, on the ADU, they have provided three options one being their choice, as it creates the most livable unit. The second two options show the requirements of the GL. Today, I would like to focus on the discussion of mass/scale/form for the primary building and the dormers, as proposed for the ADU.

The applicants provided an analysis of the trees on Friday, which was not included as part of your packet. I will further review this in the staff report for the 3/25 BOZAR meeting.

Hadley, Ryan, Matt Brezonik and Andy Breuer were present for the meeting either in person or via zoom. Hadley mentioned the following changes were made:

- Added north facing gable back
- Decreased the height of this north facing gable
- Window in gable removed
- One window on second floor removed
- Photos of structures across Sopris Avenue were provided
- Photos of structures from the alley side were provided

Trees: Hadley read members the report from Tomichi Trees, arborist. Members asked for a site plan showing the trees impacted by what was overviewed in the letter and also a healthy landscape plan, as overviewed within the letter. Hadley confirmed that they will provide this.

Mass/Scale/Form: Members mentioned that the gable cantilever is something that the Board has seen before. However, members asked if this element could be carried to the ground instead of cantilevered to make this as more traditional form.

Hadley mentioned that they will fix the rendering to represent the foundation cover detail to ensure that it is the accurate height. Right now, it is shown too high.

Fenestration: Schmidt mentioned the window in the gable with the flue behind for the chimney will likely be discussed by the full Board.

ADU roof elements/dormers: It was discussed the different options, as shown in the plans. Members suggested to only show what is proposed and not the GL perspectives. There was a discussion regarding roof elements and dormers. The GL don't speak to roof elements. Members felt the two dormers, as proposed met the GL and could support. Ryan expressed that it was originally two and they received feedback that it added complexity, which is why it was changed to one long element. Schmidt

referenced GL 4.47 b and c for the reason as to why the one long shed could not be supported, as this is a core zone.

Drawings will be submitted Wednesday, end of day, to ensure that the packet can go out to the Board by Thursday.

DRC Notes: 3/10/2025 Donny Davol and Ed Schmidt

Luz Spann Labato was also in attendance for the site visit.

1. (Breuer 422 Sopris); Kyle Ryan and Andrew Hadley submitted revised plans on behalf of the Breuer's for a new single family residence and ADU to be located at 422 Sopris Avenue within the R1C zone. The side yard setbacks must be revised to meet the 7'6" setback requirement. All other zoning requirements have now been met, as noted in the report. The applicant has mentioned providing a more in depth tree analysis and they can outline when this might be available. The area of hardscape was reduced to be roughly 990 sf. Staff feels that this better meets the intents of the GL. Discussion is encouraged about mass/scale and form for the proposed structure as compared to neighborhood context. The discussion with the full Board focused on form. The applicant has removed the front gable module. Staff asks members if this helps to simplify the structure as compared to the neighboring R1C context. A streetscape has been provided with the addition of a few additional buildings. 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.

Members discussed the site, onsite. The applicant was encouraged to get a recommendation from an arborist regarding existing trees.

The plans were reviewed once back in Town Hall. Members felt that the removal of the gable element was a detriment to the mass/scale and form, as it looked more massive. IT was encouraged to add it back with simplification of other elements.

The ADU dormers were discussed and members felt that they could support the elements. However they encouraged the applicants providing images and justification for how this was arrived at.

This project will return to the 3/17 DRC to get feedback.

Overview 1/13/2025 DRC

Roxana Alvarez Marti and Halley Anderson

1. (Breuer 422 Sopris); 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 R1C 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. FAR for the ADU exceeds the maximum for the zone district. Height for the ADU exceeds the maximum for the zone district. Otherwise, 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 be discussed at the full Board meeting. 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. 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. There is a large area of hardscape on the south side of the lot which was reduced from 2125 to 1286 sf, which is pervious. Discussion is encouraged to ensure this better meets the intents. The width of the sidewalk that extends into the ROW cannot exceed 4' in width. Discussion is encouraged about mass/scale and form for the proposed structure as compared to neighborhood context. A streetscape will be very helpful to assess this. 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. 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. Staff is asking the drc if this is a dormer or just a roof element. If it is considered a dormer, it appears to conflict with a few points within the GL.

Ryan mentioned that they would like to add additional soloar on the south face of the primary building.

Site: amount of pavers = Alvarez Marti thought this would likely be a discussion. She could support as proposed. Anderson thought this might still be an excessive amount.

Trees = Alvarez Marti understood why they are proposing the removal of all trees. The existing trees cannot be relocated. She supported the proposed coverage.

M/S/F: Alvarez Marti didn't feel that the height was out of proportion. It however does feel more massive than the neighboring structures. It is contemporary massing seen in new areas, not core. All neighboring structures have gables facing the street and this is parallel to the street. This adds mass. Alvarez Marti could support and doesn't find it excessively dissimilar, but it is dissimilar. It will be a point of conversation. Hadley mentioned that they limited N/S to prevent block of sun. A solar study was requested to help show this point. Also the north south got longer to provide the ADU for the accessory building, which in turn impacted the primary building.

Alvarez Marti suggested that the two tone look adds complexity, which is a new zone look. She suggested simplification. She suggested doing something more traditional.

On the east gable window, there will not be a bottom trim just log.

The west double windows in gable is unique.

The ADU roof element was seen as a dormer and does not comply with dormer GL.

Materials of ADU and fenestration were supported.

PRIMARY STRUCTURE

DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS TO BE USED

NAME John and Amy Breuer

LEGAL Lots 5 & 6, Block 35 Crested Butte ZONE R1C

ADDRESS 422 Sopris Ave Crested Butte, CO 81224

TYPE OF STRUCTURE

☒ Single Family

☐ Accessory Building

☐ Commercial

☐ Multi Family

☐ Addition

☐ Historic Rehab

☐ Accessory dwelling

☐ Other _____

ROOFING TYPE

☐ Shake Shingle

☐ Pro Panel style

☐ Galvanized, Corrugated
Metal

☐ Milled Shingle

☒ Standing Seam

☐ 5-V Crimp

☐ Other _____

EXTERIOR FINISH

Siding

TYPE

SIZE

LOCATION

COLOR

☒ Horizontal 4 X 12 Reclaimed timber siding natural grey, 12"x12" log corners with dovetailed joints

☒ Vertical 1 X 8 Board and Batten siding natural grey

☐ Other stone foundation cover 18" max (gray/brown)

☐ Stucco _____

☒ Trim 2 X 4 and 2"x6" To match siding

☒ **Fascia** 2 X 10 with a 2 X 4 shadow board to match siding

2"x4" with 4x8" DF rafter tails for secondary roofs

☒ **Corner Boards** 2 X 6 natural brown and 12"x12" dove tailed logs

DOORS

MATERIAL

STYLE

FINISH

Primary door Wood, half lite, Burgundy door

Secondary door Metal clad, half lite, bronze

Full light French door (south) (bronze)

WINDOWS

Type:

☒ Casement

☒ Casement, egress

☐ Double hung

☐ Awning

☒ Fixed

☐ Slide-by

Style:

☒ Simulated,
divided lite

☐ True, divided
lite (historic)

☐ Decorative
mullions

☐ Other

Material:

☐ Wood

☒ Aluminum
clad, wood

☐ Other

Glazing:

☒ Low E

☐ Heat mirror

☒ Tempered

☐ Standard

Other

Describe locations if a mix is used dark bronze

Other Exterior Features (i.e. railings, chimneys, posts, etc.) Natural stone skirt

natural stone chimney, grey brown mix.

8 X 8 columns/beams reclaimed grey

2"x4" top cap (natural brown) 4"x4" DF posts and 4"x4" hog mesh (rusted)

I agree to submit changes from the list above to the building inspector and BOZAR chairman for approval prior to implementation of the change.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER / REPRESENTATIVE Andrew Hadley

DATE Andrew Hadley
Digitally signed by Andrew Hadley
DN: cn=Andrew Hadley, o=BOZAR, ou=BOZAR, email=andrew@bozar.org, c=US

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS TO BE USED

NAME John and Amy Breuer

LEGAL Lots 5 & 6, Block 35 Crested Butte ZONE R1C

ADDRESS 422 Sopris Ave Crested Butte, CO 81224

TYPE OF STRUCTURE

- ☐ Accessory Building, heated and/or plumbed ☐ Accessory Building, cold
- ☒ Accessory Dwelling ☐ Addition ☐ Historic Rehab
- ☐ Other _____

ROOFING TYPE

- ☐ Shake Shingle ☐ Pro Panel style ☐ Galvanized, Corrugated Metal
- ☐ Milled Shingle ☒ Standing Seam ☐ 5-V Crimp
- ☐ Other dark bronze

EXTERIOR FINISH

Siding

- | <i>TYPE</i> | <i>SIZE</i> | <i>LOCATION</i> | <i>COLOR</i> |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Horizontal | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vertical | 1 X 8 board and batten | | natural brown |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stucco | 18" coreten | | rusty metal foundation cover |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trim | 2 X 4 reclaimed wood, | | natural brown |

☒ Fascia 2 X 8 with 2 X 4 shadow board (dark bronze)

☒ Corner Boards 2 X 6 natural brown

DOORS

MATERIAL

STYLE

FINISH

Primary door Metal clad, half lite, bronze

Secondary door metal clad, half lite, bronze

garage door 1/4 lite with wood veneer (natural brown)

WINDOWS

Type:

☒ Casement

☒ Casement, egress

☐ Double hung

☐ Awning

☒ Fixed

☐ Slide-by

Style:

☒ Simulated,
divided lite

☐ True, divided
lite (historic)

☐ Decorative
mullions

☐ Other

Material:

☐ Wood

☒ Aluminum
clad, wood

☐ Other

Glazing:

☒ Low E

☐ Heat mirror

☒ Tempered

☐ Standard

☐ Other

Describe locations if a mix is used dark bronze

Other Exterior Features (i.e. railings, chimneys, posts, etc.)

Metal railing 4 X 4 wire mesh with wood columns 6x6 and top cap 2x4 natural brown

2 X 2 rusty wire mesh as screen at heat pump

I agree to submit changes from the list above to the building inspector and BOZAR chairman for approval prior to implementation of the change.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER / REPRESENTATIVE Andrew Hadley

DATE Andrew Hadley

Digitaly signed by Andrew Hadley
Date: 2020.11.18 12:14:21
+0700

Overview 12/9/2024 DRC

1. (Breuer 422 Sopris); 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 R1C 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. FAR's for both the primary and all buildings exceed the maximum for the zone district. Height's for both the primary and ADU exceed the maximum for the zone district. The applicants are aware of the violations and may have updated plans for you today. Otherwise, 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 be discussed at the full Board meeting. The topography for purposes of measuring FAR for the primary and ADU is 8891', which differs from what was noted on the original plans. Drainage arrows were included but need to be revised to ensure that adjacent properties are not negatively impacted. Confirmation of the number and which trees will be removed is required. There are trees along the edges of the lot and staff would like confirmation that these will remain. There is a large area of hardscape on the south side of the lot 2125 sf, which is pervious, but the area is quite large. Discussion is encouraged. The width of the sidewalk that extends into the ROW cannot exceed 4' in width. Discussion is encouraged about mass/scale and form for the proposed structure as compared to neighborhood context with the understanding that the building will be reduced in height and FAR. 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 48.47 sf and second floor windows total 67.56 sf, which conflicts with GL 4.53. Ensure two packs of windows on the south and west have 3.5" of trim and they cannot 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 must be separated to be single windows. Doors appear compliant. Lighting appears compliant. The plank and chink material appears to conflict with GL 4.75-4.76. Dry stacked stone appears compliant for chimney and foundation cover. Standing seam and corrugated metal are noted for roofing. However mixing material on the same building has been avoided as it adds complication. The rusted metal finish has also not been supported on other applications. Otherwise, materials are supported. The ADU is located at the rear of the lot and is varied in appearance, as asked for. Discussion is encouraged regarding the two eyebrow dormers on the east elevation. Roof pitches and decks are compliant. Windows are compliant, but must ensure 3.5" of trim between two packs. Doors are compliant. Metal siding is not supported per GL 4.88 g in core zones. Otherwise, the materials proposed for the ADU can be supported.

Applicant Presentation: The applicants want to supply housing so they included an ADU and the primary home footprint kept to a minimum. There are a number of trees on the site that the applicants are hoping to keep as many as possible. Staff requested an existing site plan with the trees to determine how many total trees may need to be removed. There was discussion about what caliber to mark since there are a number of small trees less than an inch in caliber. The design is intend to look like a home that has been built upon over years. Proposed a timer siding with lap corners. Applicant would like to discuss the grade change. Staff noted that the grade

discussion is more of an internal discussion that the applicant can have with the Building Inspector.

Board Questions: Schmidt asked about the window ratio between the first floor and the second floor. Schmidt recommended to do a projected elevation calculation for the fenestration rather than a folded on; additionally, the ratio still does not to be comparable to one another in order to meet the GL. Schmidt recommended to not use the term “plank and chink” since it does not accurately represent the actual design. There was discussion about the percentage of permeable pavers in the rear. Staab felt the percentage was high when you consider the larger building footprint. Staab expressed concerns about the percentage of permeable pavers on the site. 2.9.6 was cited during the discussion. Applicant expressed confidence in the ability to reduce pavers. Staab question whether the shape of this building is common or allowed. Applicant and staff identified it as a modified T. Schmidt raised concerns about the number of materials on the building. 4.7.1.a was cited in the discussion of oversized rock chimneys. Staab did not express support for the mass. Schmidt also said that the chimney seemed too large for this zone. Massing of the chimney needs to be substantially reduced as well or moved to the inside. The eyebrow dormers on the ADU were discussed because they were interpreted as too complicated. GL 4.8.7b was cited during the discussions about the eyebrow dormers on the ADU.

DATE	FEES PAID	APPLICANT	APPLICATION #
------	-----------	-----------	---------------



DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

Town of Crested Butte Building Department
PO Box 39 Crested Butte, Colorado 81224
(970) 349-5338

*Return this completed application to the Building Department with all necessary documents as identified in the Building Permit Application Requirements form.

PROJECT PHYSICAL ADDRESS 422 Sopris Ave Crested Butte, CO 81224	LEGAL ADDRESS Lots 5 & 6, Block 35 Crested Butte	ZONE R1C	USE TYPE Residence
---	--	--------------------	------------------------------

APPLICANT/AGENT Andrew Hadley	MAILING ADDRESS PO Box 1294 Crested Butte, CO 81224	TELEPHONE 970-349-0806	EMAIL andrew@andrewhadleyarchitect.com
PROPERTY OWNER John and Amy Breuer	MAILING ADDRESS 4970 Lakeview Dr Fayetteville, NY 13066-9762	TELEPHONE 315-420-7966	EMAIL abreuer@hb1872.build
CONTRACTOR Matt Brezonick	MAILING ADDRESS PO Box 3665 Crested Butte, CO 81224	TELEPHONE 970-250-8085	EMAIL matt@brezco.com
ARCHITECT Andrew Hadley	MAILING ADDRESS PO Box 1294 Crested Butte, CO 81224	TELEPHONE 970-349-0806	EMAIL andrew@andrewhadleyarchitect.com
ENGINEER Dylan Brown	MAILING ADDRESS 60 Gillaspey Ave Unit 2 Crested Butte, CO 81224	TELEPHONE 406-396-2295	EMAIL dylan@kandbstructural.com

BUILDING CLASSIFICATION:
SFR ☒ DUPLEX ☐ MULTIFAMILY ☐ COMMERCIAL ☐ ACC.DWELLING ☒ ACC.BUILDING ☐ HISTORIC ☐

PROJECT TYPE:
NEW CONSTRUCTION ☒ ADDITION ☐ REMODEL ☐ PLUMBING/MECHANICAL ☐ OTHER ☐

PROJECT DESCRIPTION Construction of a 4 bedroom 4 1/2 bathroom single family residence with basement and accessory dwelling.	ESTIMATED PROJECT VALUATION MATERIALS \$2,400,000 LABOR \$1,600,000 TOTAL \$ 4,000,000
--	--

DEPARTMENTAL USE ONLY

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT <input type="checkbox"/> _____ CONDITIONAL WAIVER <input type="checkbox"/> _____ VARIANCE <input type="checkbox"/> _____ PUD <input type="checkbox"/> _____	SETBACKS <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>FRONT</td> <td>REAR</td> <td>SIDE()</td> <td>SIDE()</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Existing</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Primary</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accessory</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposed</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Primary</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accessory</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		FRONT	REAR	SIDE()	SIDE()	Existing					Primary					Accessory					Proposed					Primary					Accessory				
	FRONT	REAR	SIDE()	SIDE()																																
Existing																																				
Primary																																				
Accessory																																				
Proposed																																				
Primary																																				
Accessory																																				

EXISTING BUILDING SIZE (SQ.FT.) PRIMARY ACCESSORY TOTAL		PROPOSED BUILDING SIZE (SQ.FT.) PRIMARY ACCESSORY TOTAL	
EXISTING FAR	PROPOSED FAR	REQUIRED SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS Limited Power of Attorney <input type="checkbox"/> Recorded Conveyance Deed <input type="checkbox"/> Materials Lists <input type="checkbox"/> Plans (Full-Size & 11"x17") <input type="checkbox"/> Publication Fee Fee _____ <input type="checkbox"/>	
BUILDING WIDTH	BUILDING HEIGHT		
PARKING SPACES	% OPEN SPACE		
# OF LIVING UNITS	ZONE		
EXISTING EQR'S	PROPOSED EQR'S		

This Building Permit shall become null and void if construction is not commenced within 60 days of the date of issuance. The Building Permit shall expire one year after the date of issuance and all construction must be completed prior to the expiration of the permit; provided, however, that the building inspector may renew the Building Permit for additional six month periods FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN and without additional cost to the applicant.

I hereby certify that all the information provided in this application is true and correct. I understand that submittal of this application does not constitute a right to perform the work or establish the use requested. I understand that the request may be denied, approved or approved with changes or conditions. Fees that are associated with the application are not refundable. I understand that the application, if approved, must be constructed in accordance with the approved plans and conform with the Town's architectural approval and applicable building codes. I understand that any approval will become null and void 180 days after the approval date if a permit is not purchased, or three years if a vested property right is purchased.

Andrew Hadley Digitally signed by Andrew Hadley
Date: 2024.11.19 12:00:34 -07'00'

Signature of Contractor/Authorized Agent

Date

Signature of Owner/Authorized Agent

Date

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS TO BE USED

NAME John and Amy Breuer

LEGAL Lots 5 & 6, Block 35 Crested Butte ZONE R1C

ADDRESS 422 Sopris Ave Crested Butte, CO 81224

TYPE OF STRUCTURE

- ☐ Accessory Building, heated and/or plumbed ☐ Accessory Building, cold
- ☒ Accessory Dwelling ☐ Addition ☐ Historic Rehab
- ☐ Other _____

ROOFING TYPE

- ☐ Shake Shingle ☐ Pro Panel style ☐ Galvanized, Corrugated Metal
- ☐ Milled Shingle ☒ Standing Seam ☐ 5-V Crimp
- ☐ Other dark bronze

EXTERIOR FINISH

Siding

- | | <i>TYPE</i> | <i>SIZE</i> | <i>LOCATION</i> | <i>COLOR</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Horizontal | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Vertical | 1 X 10 board and batten | | natural brown |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Other | Coreten rusty metal corrugated | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Stucco | 18" coreten rusty metal foundation cover | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Trim | 2 X 4 | | natural brown |

☒ Fascia 2 X 8 with 2 X 4 shadow board (dark bronze)

☒ Corner Boards 2 X 6 natural brown

DOORS

MATERIAL

STYLE

FINISH

Primary door Metal clad, half lite, bronze

Secondary door metal clad, half lite, bronze

garage door 1/4 lite with wood veneer (natural brown)

WINDOWS

Type:

☒ Casement

☒ Casement, egress

☐ Double hung

☐ Awning

☒ Fixed

☐ Slide-by

Style:

☒ Simulated,
divided lite

☐ True, divided
lite (historic)

☐ Decorative
mullions

☐ Other

Material:

☐ Wood

☒ Aluminum
clad, wood

☐ Other

Glazing:

☒ Low E

☐ Heat mirror

☒ Tempered

☐ Standard

☐ Other

Describe locations if a mix is used dark bronze

Other Exterior Features (i.e. railings, chimneys, posts, etc.)

Metal railing 4 X 4 wire mesh with wood columns 6x6 and top cap 2x4 natural brown

2 X 2 rusty wire mesh as screen at heat pump

I agree to submit changes from the list above to the building inspector and BOZAR chairman for approval prior to implementation of the change.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER / REPRESENTATIVE Andrew Hadley

DATE Andrew Hadley
Hadley
Digitally signed by Andrew Hadley
DN: cn=Andrew Hadley, email=andrew.hadley@bozar.org, o=BOZAR, ou=BOZAR, c=US

PRIMARY STRUCTURE

DESCRIPTION OF MATERIALS TO BE USED

NAME John and Amy Breuer

LEGAL Lots 5 & 6, Block 35 Crested Butte ZONE R1C

ADDRESS 422 Sopris Ave Crested Butte, CO 81224

TYPE OF STRUCTURE

☒ Single Family ☐ Accessory Building ☐ Commercial

☐ Multi Family ☐ Addition ☐ Historic Rehab

☐ Accessory dwelling ☐ Other _____

ROOFING TYPE

☐ Shake Shingle ☐ Pro Panel style ☐ Galvanized, Corrugated Metal

☐ Milled Shingle ☒ Standing Seam ☐ 5-V Crimp

☒ Other Coreten rusted corrugated metal

EXTERIOR FINISH

Siding

	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>SIZE</i>	<i>LOCATION</i>	<i>COLOR</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Horizontal	4 X 12	Reclaimed timber siding	natural grey
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Vertical	1 X 10	Board and Batten siding	natural brown
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	stone foundation cover 18" max (gray/brown)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stucco			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Trim	2 X 4 and 2"x6"	To match siding	

☒ **Fascia** 2 X 10 with a 2 X 4 shadow board to match siding

2"x4" with 4x8" DF rafter tails for secondary roofs

☒ **Corner Boards** 2 X 6 natural brown and 12"x12" dove tailed logs

DOORS

MATERIAL

STYLE

FINISH

Primary door Wood, half lite, Red door

Secondary door Metal clad, half lite, bronze

Full light French door (south) (bronze)

WINDOWS

Type:

☒ Casement

☒ Casement, egress

☐ Double hung

☐ Awning

☒ Fixed

☐ Slide-by

Style:

☒ Simulated,
divided lite

☐ True, divided
lite (historic)

☐ Decorative
mullions

☐ Other

Material:

☐ Wood

☒ Aluminum
clad, wood

☐ Other

Glazing:

☒ Low E

☐ Heat mirror

☒ Tempered

☐ Standard

Other

Describe locations if a mix is used dark bronze

Other Exterior Features (i.e. railings, chimneys, posts, etc.) Natural stone skirt

natural stone chimney, grey brown mix.

8 X 8 columns reclaimed grey

2"x4" top cap (natural brown) 4"x4" DF posts and 4"x4" hog mesh (rusted)

I agree to submit changes from the list above to the building inspector and BOZAR chairman for approval prior to implementation of the change.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER / REPRESENTATIVE Andrew Hadley

DATE Andrew
Hadley

Digitally signed by Andrew
Hadley
DN: cn=Andrew Hadley, o=BOZAR, ou=BOZAR, email=andrew@bozar.org

Division 6 - "R1C" Core Residential District

Sec. 16-4-460. - Intent.

The purpose for which this District is created is the provision of areas for low-density residential development along with customary accessory uses in the older residential areas of the Town, where particular attention to the characteristics, size and scale of existing historic buildings is required. Recreational and institutional uses customarily found in proximity to such residential uses are included as conditional uses. It is intended that no more than two (2) units, designed or used for dwelling by a family, shall be allowed on a site.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §9, 1994)

Sec. 16-4-470. - Permitted uses.

The following uses shall be permitted in the "R1C" District:

- (1) One-family dwelling units.
- (2) Accessory building, nonresidential use, not heated or plumbed.
- (3) Home occupations.
- (4) Private garages as accessory buildings to the principal permitted uses.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §9, 1994; Ord. 10, 2000; Ord. 4 §1, 2009)

Sec. 16-4-480. - Conditional uses.

The following uses shall be permitted as conditional uses in the "R1C" District:

- (1) Accessory dwellings.
- (2) Two-family dwelling units.
- (3) Historic primary dwelling redesignated as accessory dwelling, of a size not to exceed one thousand (1,000) square feet of floor area, under the conditions as are set forth in Section 16-8-70 of this Chapter.
- (4) Public playgrounds and public recreation areas.
- (5) Churches and church schools.
- (6) Nonprofit libraries and museums.
- (7) Farm and garden buildings.
- (8) Public and private schools.
- (9) Shop crafts.

(10) Bed and breakfast establishments, provided that the granting of such conditional use shall be subject to the requirements for short-term rentals in the "R1" District as set forth in Subsection 16-14-90(c) of this Chapter.

(11) Parking areas.

(12) Accessory building, nonresidential use, heated.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §3, 1994; Ord. 5 §10, 2000; Ord. 10, 2000; Ord. 21 §3, 2004; Ord. 4 §1, 2009; Ord. No. 2, § 3(Exh. A), 3-6-2023)

Sec. 16-4-490. - Lot measurements.

The following shall be lot measurements for property located in the "R1C" District:

- (1) Minimum lot area: three thousand seven hundred fifty (3,750) square feet.
- (2) Maximum lot area: nine thousand three hundred seventy-five (9,375) square feet.
- (3) Minimum lot width: thirty-one and one-quarter (31¼) feet.
- (4) Minimum front yard: twenty (20) feet.
- (5) Minimum side yard: seven and one-half (7½) feet for single-story and flat-roofed buildings, and as much as eleven and one-half (11½) feet for sloped-roofed buildings, dependent upon snow storage guidelines.
- (6) Minimum rear yard:
 - a. Principal building: ten (10) feet.
 - b. Accessory building: five (5) feet.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §9, 1994; Ord. 5 §§1, 2, 2000; Ord. 4 §1, 2009)

Sec. 16-4-500. - Floor areas.

The following shall regulate measurements for floor areas located in the "R1C" District:

- (1) Minimum floor area: four hundred (400) square feet for each residential unit; provided, however, that the minimum floor area for an accessory structure built before July 1, 1942, which is being converted to a residential unit, historic accessory structure shall be two hundred twenty (220) square feet, plus a closet, a bathroom and one hundred (100) additional square feet for each occupant in excess of two (2), only if the following conditions are met:
 - a. The residential unit must be an accessory dwelling used exclusively as a long-term rental unit;
 - b. The occupants of the dwelling must have been residents of the County for three (3) consecutive years of the preceding seven (7) years;
 - c.

At least fifty-one percent (51%) of the occupants' income must be earned from work for an employer situated within the County or from work actually performed in the County; and

- d. The above limitations for occupants and the limitation of the term of rental shall be recorded pursuant to Section 16-9-70 of this Chapter.

(2) Maximum floor area:

- a. Accessory building, including an accessory dwelling, if any: one thousand (1,000) square feet or two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) of the floor area of the principal building, whichever is smaller.
- b. Accessory dwelling: one thousand (1,000) square feet of floor area or two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) of the floor area of the principal building, whichever is smaller.

(3) Maximum floor area ratio:

- a. Principal building: 0.3 as a matter of right up to 0.32, depending on neighborhood context and lot size, provided that no principal building shall be larger than two thousand five hundred (2,500) square feet.
- b. All buildings: 0.48, provided that all buildings shall not be larger than three thousand five hundred (3,500) square feet in the aggregate.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §3, 1994; Ord. 4 §1, 2009)

Sec. 16-4-510. - Building measurements.

The following shall regulate measurements for buildings located in the "R1C" District:

(1) Maximum building height:

- a. Principal building: twenty-eight (28) feet.
- b. Accessory building: twenty (20) feet or the height of the principal building, whichever is less.
- c. Accessory dwelling: twenty-four (24) feet or the height of the principal building, whichever is less.

(2) Maximum building width: thirty-five (35) feet.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §§11, 32, 1994; Ord. 4 §1, 2009)

Sec. 16-4-520. - Additional provisions.

- (a) Open space required: fifty percent (50%) of the lot area shall be open, unencumbered and free of any building or structure.
- (b) Minimum exterior wall height shall be seven (7) feet.
- (c) Minimum vertical distance from eave line of roof to the finished grade level shall be six (6) feet.
- (d)

Slope of roof shall be a minimum of 4:12. A flat roof must contain a parapet on the side facing a street, and as otherwise required by the Board.

(e) Stream margin review: all uses within twenty (20) feet of a designated water source shall meet the requirements of Section 16-11-10 of this Chapter.

(f) Minimum lot street frontage shall be thirty-one and one-quarter (31¼) feet.

(Prior code 15-2-6.7; Ord. 11 §1, 1993; Ord. 3 §§10, 11, 32, 1994; Ord. 5 §3, 2000; Ord. 4 §1, 2009)