

# THE KEYSTONE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

April 23, 2007

## I. Call the Meeting to Order

The Keystone Design Review Board meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. in the Neighbourhood Company conference room on Monday, April 23, 2007.

Board Members Present Were;

Paul Duxbury, Member  
Gene Baker, Member  
Todd Weber, Member  
Ken O'Bryan, Member

## II. Approve Previous Meeting Minutes – April 2, 2007

The previous minutes dated April 2, 2007 were reviewed and approved as presented.

## III. Lot 4 Keystone Ranch – Remodel (Randy Hodges Architect, VanBrunt residence)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed and approved the remodel at Lot 4 at the Keystone Ranch with the following comments:

- Written approval from the Homeowners Association for access to the site within the footprint of the lot has been provided.
- Complete a survey of the site to ensure that all disturbances occur within the foot print.
- Provide the \$1,000 refundable construction compliance deposit.

## IV. Keystone Ranch Mailboxes Replacement (John Pringle, President of Keystone West Ranch)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed the replacement of the existing mailboxes at the Keystone Ranch. While the Board agrees with the initial concept it would like to review this submittal pending receipt of the following information:

- Determine whether or not a building permit is required through the building department.
- Utilizing a corrugated, pre-rusted metal roof is allowed. Shiny metal roofs are not allowed.
- Provide a survey of the area which will also be required for the Vail Resorts easement agreement.
- Provide construction details including soffit and beam sizes.
- Provide dimensions as it relates to the site plan.
- The concrete pad should stick out to the drip line of the roof.
- Provide elevations of all sides of the structure.

## V. Lot 14 Settlers Creek – Schematic Review (Dick Clark, Solar One Builders)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed the schematic phase for Lot 14 at Settlers Creek. The Board would like to see the schematic phase again on 4/30/07 with the architect present due to the following reasons:

- There are still large expansive walls on three of the four sides of the home.
- The entry remains weak.
- The roof can step towards the back of the lot while keeping a flat floor plan.
- There are still long, unbroken ridge lines.
- The upper level of the north elevation projects only 6 – 8 inches which makes it appear accidental.
- These comments specifically relate to section VII. Items B & C – Design and Configuration. Please carefully read and adhere to that section found on pages 22, 23 & 24 of the Estates at Settlers Creek guidelines.

VI. Lot 13 Settlers Creek – Preliminary submittal for 4/30/07 review (Euthenics West Architecture)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed and approved the Preliminary phase for Lot 13 at Settlers Creek with the following comments:

- Identify on the elevations where the materials and colors are to be applied
- Clarify the rusted metal panels at the chimney. If it is not the same as the cor-10, provide material details.
- The applicant may submit all requirements for both Preliminary and Construction Document phase at the same time.

VII. Lot 17 Settlers Creek – Schematic Review round two for 4/30/07 review (Steve Harrison, Architect)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed round two of the schematic phase for Lot 17 at Settlers Creek for review at the 4/30/07 meeting. While the Board appreciates the applicant flipping the house and relocating the driveway, the board would like the applicant to bring additional revised drawings to the next meeting since what was provided today still does not meet the intent of the guidelines and risks remaining at the Schematic phase due to the following reasons:

- There are four or five different treatments to the gable ends.
- The architecture is a combination of different styles that are not appropriate for the Settlers Creek environment.
- The Board disagrees with the concept and still feels that additional stepping with the lot is appropriate.
- Please review and adhere to section VII. item B regarding Design and Configuration ... The residences shall have exterior elevations, roofs and details that are coordinated and consistent in their architectural treatment. Care shall be given to proportion, scale and massing qualities.

VII. Lot 21 Elk Run – Schematic Review round two for 4/30/07 review (Steve Harrison Architect)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed round two of the schematic phase for Lot 21 at Elk Run for review at the 4/30/07 meeting. While the board appreciates revisions made since the last meeting, the board would like the applicant to bring additional revised drawings to the next meeting since what was provided today still does not meet the intent of the guidelines and risks remaining at the Schematic phase due to the following reasons:

- See Section C, especially the last paragraph on page 11 of the Elk Run design guidelines. The intent of the 75% rule is not being met. The calculation should be the combined square footage of levels +5 and +10 which needs to be 75% or less of the combined square footage of levels 0 and -5. The home currently steps out as it increases in height instead of stepping in as it increases in height which is the intent of the guidelines.
- The driveway needs to be 12 feet maximum in width at the street entry.

VIII. Lot 6 Elk Run – Schematic review for 4/30/07 meeting (Steve Harrison Architect)

The Keystone Design Review Board reviewed the initial submittal for the schematic phase to be reviewed on 4/30/07 for Lot 6 at Elk Run. The board will officially review this submittal at the 4/30/07 meeting however it recommends that the applicant bring additional revised drawings to the next meeting since what was provided today does not meet the intent of the guidelines and risks remaining at the Schematic phase due to the following reasons:

- There are currently large, unbroken wall planes. See Section C, especially the last paragraph on page 11 of the Elk Run guidelines. The intent of the 75% rule is not being met. The calculation should be the combined square footage of levels +5 and +10 which needs to be 75% or less of the combined square footage of levels 0 and -5. The home currently steps out as it increases in height instead of stepping in as it increases in height as is the intent of the guidelines.
- The driveway needs to be 12 feet maximum in width at the street entry. The Board suggests placing a hammerhead in the driveway.

- The grading on the site plan looks un-natural. See section VII. Item B number 2 on page 10 regarding Design and Configuration of the Elk Run design guidelines. The Board has concerns with the grading necessary to create a walk-out basement.
- The gable on the east elevation is not a true gable.

IX. Lot 11 Elk Run – Set Back Questions (Gus Boughton)

Based on the drawing by Range West dated 04/11/07 and submitted at today's meeting, the Keystone Design Review Board approves the revision to the set back lines at Lot 11 in Elk Run. Homeowners at Lots 10 and 12 have submitted written approval of the change. The applicant was asked to inquire with the county regarding whether or not a re-plat will be required.

X. Lot E-18 Keystone West Ranch (Barbara Shepler Architect)

The Board reviewed the initial Schematic submittal for Lot E-18 at the Keystone West Ranch for formal review on 4/30/07. The board had the following initial comments:

- There are no variances for lot lines. The entire home must be kept within property lines including roof overhangs and window wells.
- Provide a topo of the lot including existing and proposed grading.
- Provide driveway details.

XI. 90 Potentilla Lane – Hot Tub Addition (Kaupus Water)

The Board reviewed the proposed hot tub addition to 90 Potentilla Lane at the Keystone West Ranch. Prior to making a final determination the board needs the following information:

- Provide a site plan including proposed screening from adjacent properties. Also include existing vegetation at the access route to determine the need for revegetation.
- Any access over common area needs prior, written approval from the Homeowners Association.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.