

**ILIUM PARK OWNERS ASSOCIATION
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Date Tuesday, October 22, 2019 at 12:30 p.m. MDT

Location Full Circle HOA Conference Room
560 Mountain Village Blvd., 102B
Mountain Village, CO 81435
and via Conference Call

DRB Present: Tegan Jones, Amy Schilling, Josh Blakeman, Mike Balser

Owners Present: Anita Cody, Ray Cody, David Allen

Others Present: Chris Chaffin, Kristina Lamb, David Ballode, Nicole Pieterse, Scott Landefeld, Elyssa Krasic,
David Allen, Barbara Ludwig, Dan Witkowski, Barbara and Stan Ludwig

Meeting called to order at 12:35 PM

Roll call. Determination that a quorum of at least 3 members is present.

Notice and Agenda was sent on October 17, 2019.

Motion by Josh Blakeman, second by Mike Balser to approve the September 24, 2019 Design Review Board meeting minutes with the following changes. *All in favor, motion passes unanimously.*

Remove lot 425-4 from motion. Application is only for lot 440-6.

Lot 440-6 Application

July 31, 2019 PUD application with the intention to move density from 425-4 to 440-6.

August 8, 2019 - applicant met with IPOA board.

August 16, 2019 - IPOA Board of Directors provided a letter from the Association attorney not opposing the PUD Amendment.

August 29, 2019- applicant met with the DRB clarifying the application process.

September 17, 2019 – Lot 440-6 was staked.

September 24, 2019 – the DRB provided conceptual approval.

Today, October 22, 2019- final approval is being sought.

Applicant expanded on comments received from the September 24, 2019 DRB meeting:

1. Parking: Parking is under the matrix requirement. 17 parking spaces are being requested. The PUD Amendment requests to move density from lot 425-4 to lot 440-6 and in the DRB application they tied the parking to this move which equaled 81 parking spots to the site. IPOA may reduce parking on a case by case basis, 5-702- commercial practices standard. To support this request the applicant met with the San Miguel County it was recommended they follow ITE guidelines. ITE advises at least 15 parking spaces for self-storage facilities. They completed a case studies of 4 other self-storage facilities they own and found 3 - 5 parking spaces are enough. This proposal includes 17 spaces and the applicant hopes the DRB will approve. Peak traffic is 2 - 3 cars per hour.
2. Square footage. The application is over the square footage in the PUD amendment density transfer. The PUD amendment moves 22,340 sq ft of density from lot 425-4 to lot 440-6” [40,000 becomes to max total floor area for lot 440-6...plus the bonus basement allotment = 56,000 sf total allowable]
3. Office square footage. SD 105. Shows 400 square feet of office space for someone to be on site and sell boxes ext. Adjacent to the office are 2 bathrooms.
4. Bathroom details: Each bathroom has 1 toilet and 1 sink.

5. Business signage SD-101 & 104 located on East and West of the building. Applicant will comply with San Miguel County signage guidelines.
6. Window Materials- SD 105 and Trash enclosure details on page 17 and 18.
7. ADA access- Ramp located in front of the office and there is one handicap parking space.
8. Solar panels- Applicant requests the DRB consider the application without solar. Preliminary reports say the solar would work but the grant process will take 9 months.
9. Is the final PUD Amendment approved by the County? The final step for County approval is a formality. The county commissioner presents to the board based on all the approvals. It will happen when the property is owned by one owner and is subject to the final approval of the HOA.
10. Pavement cuts - To the county road and right turn only out of the property. 2 points of egress are desirable. SET engineers provided a traffic study of the county road and site distances. There will be a stop, one way, right turn only and do not enter signs. The County, and Road and Bridges Departments provided approval. Exceeded the sight distances.
11. Survey markers went up September 17, 2019
12. Building site location and property boundaries are indicated. There are not story poles. Set-backs are indicated on the plans.
13. Zero set back on the east side. All set backs are compliant.
14. Not proposing to remove any trees. There are some trees that could be moved.
15. Parking area is required to be paved. Everything that is shaded on the map will be paved.
16. Owners received a first notice stating the proposed density and the second notice stating the amended density, as approved by the IPOA Discussion of parking which includes 17 spaces and a handicapped.

Discussion of renting out parking spaces. The applicant is not considering renting parking. This could be a usage consideration for lot 425-4.

Discussion of 2-way traffic and widening road. The design needs to be investigated by an engineer.

The applicant would be happy to contribute to widening the street.

Discussion of Tom Kennedy's recommendation.

Motion by Josh Blakeman, second by Mike Balse to approve the 440-6 application as presented with the parking change per note D of the matrix to 17 spaces with the following conditions:

1. The approval by the DRB, including the approval of 17 parking spaces, is specifically tied to use of the site for only mini-warehouse and associated offices and restrooms purposes, as the scale and level of activity stated in the application and written materials presented to the IPOA.
2. All parking for the proposed use must occur onsite and shall not occur on IPOA roads or other property. If the amount of onsite parking proposed by Applicant is inadequate to accommodate users of the project, the Applicant must present a plan to IPOA addressing how onsite parking will be accommodated.
3. In the event that the uses and/or building/improvements on the site change and/or the scale of the activity increases, the Applicant must present an application to the IPOA describing and showing the proposed changes and a statement indicating any resulting changes to the proposed onsite a condition of any IPOA approval of any new or differing use of the site. The IPOA retains final decision-making authority concerning the adequacy of parking for any further or differing uses of the site. If additional parking is required for a change in or enlargement of the use, including the size of the building/improvements, the Applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the IPOA where and how the required parking will be accommodated onsite to serve such changes as a condition of the IPOA approval of any such proposed changes.
4. Applicant shall note pavement in parking areas on the drawing.
5. Execution of the PUD amendment by San Miguel County.

Discussion of motion:

Lot 440-5 owners support the project.

The applicant notes the neighbors within 200 ft. have been notified.

All in favor, motion passes unanimously.

Q-28, Q-27, Q24R Construction Deposit Return Request

Barbara and Stan Ludwig have met with Gregg Anderson of Alpine Engineering and amended drainage onsite and work is almost complete.

Discussion of the drainage remedies. Unit 1 is shedding water onto the driveway.

Discussion of the estimated expense to concrete the remaining drive. Stan estimates concreting the area would cost \$30,000 and the project is out of funding.

The DRB suggest concrete or pavement is the best option and recommends the applicant come back with a pavement plan.

The request to change pavement to road base has been denied.

The applicant will come back with another parking / road surface proposal.

Lot 899 Deck

Lot 899 owner is requesting to increase the square footage of the upper deck to match the square footage of the lower deck. The lower deck is slightly larger than the average TR deck because it covers Bill Riley's 1 story unit below. Lower deck is 258 square feet and the upper deck is 164 sf.

“The request is to increase the upper deck by 94 square feet to match the same footprint as the lower deck. In addition to this request, if approved, I would like to add corrugated roofing material as a siding to the east end of my lower deck to be flush with the wood siding of my attached storage shed. The goal would be to provide a dry corner on the lower deck to store patio furniture during the winter. Please let me know if you have any more questions and thank you for your consideration.”

Motion by Amy Schilling, second Josh Blakeman to approve Lot 899 deck request provided an application and \$25 fee is submitted.

Discussion to collect an application and fee of \$25 following the insubstantial application guideline and provide notification to the neighbor below.

All in favor, motion passes unanimously.

Old Business

DRB Noticing Requirements Guidelines

Discussion of current DRB neighboring notice requirements and review of language and procedures.

Discussion if DRB has authority to amend Guidelines.

New Business:

December 3, 2019 at 12:30 pm MDT.

January 7, 2020 at 12:30 pm MDT.

Motion by Josh Blakeman, second by Mikey Balsler to adjourn the meeting. *All in favor, motion passes unanimously.*
Meeting adjourned at 2:32 pm.

THE FOREGOING MINUTES WERE APPROVED BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AT ITS MEETING HELD ON January 28, 2020.