

MINUTES
Meeting of the
Ross Advisory Design Review Group

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

1. 6:04 p.m. Commencement

Advisory Design Review Group members Peter Nelson, Joey Buckingham, Mark Fritts, Mark Kruttschnitt, and Jim Kemp. Heidi Scoble was present representing staff.

2. Open Time for Public Comments-

Peter Nelson is requesting that the ADR Group have an agenda item to discuss the cancellation of the October 2016 meeting.

3. Approval of minutes- *November 15, 2016 and December 6, 2016 Minutes Approved*

4. Old Business-

a. ADR Group Purpose, Applicability, Composition, and Process

Staff Planner Scoble provided a presentation regarding the creation of the ADR Group, its purpose, the perceived expectations of the role of the ADR Group, and proposed modifications to the ADR process, composition, and expectations.

The ADR Group provided the following feedback:

1. It is important to provide conceptual design review early on in the process in an informal setting whereby applicants can use the ADR Group as a sounding board before submitting an application. All ADR Group members wanted to retain the conceptual ADR review.
2. Concerned that the ADR Group would be acting more like a Planning Commission.
3. Consider no fees for preliminary ADR Group review to encourage use of the Group early in the process.
4. Important for the ADR Group to provide the Town Council with a clear advise and/or a recommendation.
5. Supports a smaller ADR Group with the majority of the Group members being design professionals/architects.
6. Consider including an Alternate in the composition of the ADR Group
7. Emphasized the importance of neighbors being involved early in the process.

The ADR Group continued its discussion to the February 28, 2017 meeting and asked staff to revise the proposed ADR Group purpose, applicability, composition, and process to include the comments made by the ADR Group.

5. New Business

a. Tincher Residence- 124 Winding Way

The project applicant provided a presentation to the ADR Group which consisted of a substantial remodel, including lowering the legal nonconforming roof height from 32 feet to 30 feet. The ADR Group supported the lowered roof, however, the ADR Group also encouraged the applicant to maintain the existing 32 foot roof height to provide for a better and more balanced design aesthetic. The ADR Group discussed the issues of providing more articulation in building design and/or details, however, due to a lack of visibility of the project, the ADR Group determined it was not necessary. The ADR Group also discussed the possibility of the deck being designed to be larger, however, the applicant found the decks to be sufficient in size and requested to maintain the proposed deck design. In closing the ADR Group unanimously approved the project, including a lowered roof, or a modified roof design that would maintain the 32 foot nonconforming roof height.

6. Communications- *None*

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.