
MEETING DATE: Thursday, April 10, 2008
MEETING TIME: 7:30 a.m.
MEETING LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 125 East 3rd Street, Salida, CO

Present D. Heigele, S Whittington, A. Gentile, K. Karnuta, City Planner Dara MacDonald.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Gentile called the meeting to order at 7:43 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Karnuta made a motion to approve the minutes of March 13, 2008 with the correction. **Heigele** seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS

There were no unscheduled citizens.

IV. AMENDMENT (S) TO AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Rico-Silver Variance Application – 229 E Street - The request is to receive two (2) variances from the minimum setback of five (5') feet required for both side yard setbacks for a primary structure. The applicant is requesting a minimum allowed setback of zero (0) feet on both sides of the structure to build an addition on the rear of the structure.

A. Open Public Hearing- 7:45 am

B. Proof of Publication - Yes

C. Staff Review of Application – Supplied in the staff report.

D. Applicant's Presentation – Sarah Whittington, explained that the existing structure is a zero (0) setback townhouse. Seven of the eight townhouses in the block of homes have additions on the rear similar to what the applicant has proposed. The setback to setback design follows traditional building lines and will follow the line of the existing mudroom on one side and the fence on the other. She noted that the applicants have a letter signed by the neighbors on each side which support the application. The walls would be one-hour rated walls and would be sided with a low maintenance material.

E. Public Input – None

F. Close Public Hearing - 7:50 am

G. Commission Discussion – MacDonald explained the recommended condition of approval that would require a party wall agreement with the adjacent property owners. **Heigele** asked if this addition would resemble those on adjacent units. **Whittington** explained that it will in that the roof of the addition will be located below the upper windows on the existing residence. **Karnuta** asked if there was a lot of precedent for approval of this type of application. It was discussed that the continuation of an existing building line is commonly approved with the required showing that maintenance is possible. In this case the party wall agreement would address maintenance of the walls on the lot line.

H. Commission Action - A motion was made by **Gentile** to approve the variance request with the recommended condition that the applicant have a party wall agreement with both neighboring properties to allow for maintenance of the addition. **Heigele** seconded the motion. **THE MOTION CARRIED.**

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business on the agenda.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business on the agenda.

VIII. BOARD COMMENTS

None.

IX. Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 am.