

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Ron Schuman Dan Schroder
Eric Mamula Jim Lamb Gretchen Dudney
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:05pm
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison, was absent

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the October 20, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Town Council Report was removed. With no other changes, the November 3, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Cottage #1, Cottages at Shock Hill (CK) PL-2015-0466, 12 Regent Drive
- 2) Cirillo Residence (CK) PL-2015-0484, 30 Peak 8 Court

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Mamula: Is this the first Cottage to be built? (Mr. Kulick: No, this is one of the last Cottages to be built.)

With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

WORKSESSIONS:

- 1) McCain Master Plan Modification (MT) PL-2015-0501, 13965, 13215, 13217, 13221, 13250 Colorado Highway 9

2)

Mr. Truckey presented. In 2013 the McCain Master Plan was adopted by the Town Council through the Town Project Process. The Plan provided general guidance regarding the types of uses that would be allowed within the 128 acre McCain site. The McCain Master Plan identified two tracts for the property. A number of governmental uses were allowed on the larger 90 acre tract and the smaller 38 acre tract was limited to open space and trail uses. McCain was seen as the future location for a number of governmental uses that now are located closer to the Town core, many on Block 11 (e.g., overflow skier parking, snow storage). As the plan for Block 11 is implemented, affordable housing units will displace these uses. In addition, it was recognized that McCain provided the best location for other uses such as a second water treatment plant and solar gardens.

The Town is now actively pursuing locating several of the uses outlined in the 2013 Master Plan on the McCain site. In particular, the Town is moving forward with plans for the second water treatment plant and a second solar garden. In addition, the Town Council has subsequently identified a couple uses (affordable housing and service commercial) for the property that were not identified in the 2013 Master Plan. As such, it was felt that a more detailed site plan/master plan to identify the specific locations of these and other uses was warranted.

Mr. Truckey discussed Town Council and BOSAC review. The Town Council has given direction to include affordable housing and service commercial as uses on the McCain site. They also wanted to ensure that a placeholder is made in the plan for a reservoir, if a future Council determines that a reservoir is needed. The BOSAC has reviewed the plan twice and supports the proposed Open Space Plan and trail concepts.

The concepts for the plan from north to south include: water treatment plant, affordable housing residential use, public works storage, solar gardens, service commercial, snow storage, open space, river corridor / open space, overflow parking, and the recycling center.

This worksession is intended to get the Planning Commission familiar with the proposed McCain Master Plan Modification and to see if there are any concerns the Commission has with the proposed plan. Any feedback the Planning Commission has is appreciated.

Ms. Elena Scott, Norris Design:

We had a public meeting earlier today so it was good to see a lot of public interest. I'm showing you an image with existing conditions today. Three goals: create a functional and aesthetic campus for governmental uses, second goal is to make this look good as it is our gateway and third goal is to restore river and the natural characteristics pre-dredge mining. (Explained the map that was shown.) Thought process was that Open Space was a big stakeholder and so there is a large open space tract of 23.5 acres. The goal is to create a beginner bicycle loop that is scenic, picnic friendly, fishing, developed series of trails and a multi-use rec path that connects to the blue River bikeway and loops through. Also, would like to make better use of snow storage space that isn't used in the summer. The second main use is solar. There is an existing 2.7 acre solar field with a 50 year lease. We would like to locate another there so that the electrical lines can be shared but have it be screened from Highway 9. This could be moving forward sooner than later as it doesn't need a lot of grading. Snow Storage is the next largest space, as this will be moved from Block 11. We want it to make sense from an access perspective. It will have some screening to it with berms and landscaping and how we plan for water to leave the site is built into the plan. Overflow parking is another primary use on the parking plan. It will accommodate up to 500 cars on the site and allow buses to turn around. We want this to be accessible and visible from the highway. Recycling center is in southwest corner and is under construction now, with close in access. The water treatment facility location is driven by the proximity to the utility lines. We also want to design the aesthetics of this building well as it is in the gateway view of the property. The residential is 10 acre portion and is located near the future Stan Miller residential and close to the Summit Stage bus system. This would be planned out over time with future studies. Service commercial 1.6 acres similar to the amount of acreage that is being leased now, for landscaping and other services. The reservoir location is going to be maintained as a future option if the Town decided that it was needed. (Showed an overlay of how this could be accommodated in the future.) Lastly, here is an illustrative overlay to showing how the trails and landscaping could be laid out with dual use between summer and winter.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: What acreage is used for overflow parking now in block 11? (Mr. Truckey: What we determined was that in 5 acres you can get 500 cars, which is what the town is obligated to provide for the ski area.) So in terms of the amount of space for parking, do the lost cars tie into parking garage? Are we thinking about how much we should provide versus what is required? (Mr. Truckey: Yes, there is a lot in play here; it is still kind of up in the air. The issue of the extra spaces (beyond 500) has not been accommodated in the Plan.) (Ms. Scott: When we started this planning, we met with Police Chief Shannon Haynes and we started with the premise of 500 spaces.) Doesn't Block 11 also allow people to park trailers short term? (Ms Scott: Yes, I think there are about 16 permits and they can be accommodated.)

Mr. Schuman: How much of the trails get lost if the lake is put in? (Ms. Scott: If they do have a reservoir, then the trails plan will have to be completely looked at again.)

Mr. Truckey continued. The policies that will be addressed here:

2A , 2R and 3R. Land Use District (LUD) 43 covers the entire site and all the uses that we've described are

allowed in LUD 43. The 2013 McCain Plan didn't include things like housing. It did allocated density at 1 unit per 20 acres (6.39 units of density), but since then the 6.39 units were extinguished and moved to another site, Pinewood II. Council thought we wouldn't need the density on McCain. LUD 43 also recognizes about 3.7 units of density for affordable housing--you can also transfer additional density for affordable housing in and no negative points are accrued. The governmental uses such as water treatment plant are exempted from the density plan. We don't actually recognize the density for things like outside commercial storage—only improved structures. Staff recommends setting an FAR for service commercial uses at 1:25; we know we want something that is less dense than Airport Road and Block 11. The LUGs for the adjacent Tatro parcel allow up to a maximum of 1:25 FAR. We will be looking for some Commission input on this. As far as architectural review there is some standards already set in the 2013 Master Plan and we plan to continue these. Site design (Policy 7/R) there will need to be a lot of disturbance, but there has already been a lot over time and this will improve conditions. Placement of structures, we have good setbacks. We have 150' setback implemented along the highway as a visual corridor. We believe that the circulation is addressed well in this plan. Also a good system of pedestrian and biking trails with a good connection to Stan Miller Drive that will be good for cyclists, moving the road crossing back away from the roundabout. We believe circulation will be improved. Landscaping is anticipated to be a big part of the future restoration budget. This accomplishes a lot of goals of Town Council: open space on river corridor, recycling facility, water treatment plant and affordable housing. At this point, we haven't identified any negative points for the project and believe it warrants a passing point analysis.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: When BBC was approved there were 2 additional buildings approved. Are those parcels or buildings still there? (Ms. Puester: Yes, they are still there and they are north of the McCain site.)

Mr. Mamula opened the worksession to Public Comment, and stated to remember that the Planning Commission is tasked to see if this meets the code of the Town. It is to make sure that what is planned fits with the Town's development code. There was no Public Comment and the worksession was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I think it is a good, well thought-out plan. The one concern I have is do we have enough commercial service in the mix. I see service commercial uses on Airport Road getting squeezed in the future.

Mr. Schroder: I think this is a good forward thinking idea and we know that Block 11 will no longer be available for its current uses. I think the design is strong with a lot of opportunities and future opportunities. I think that the residential component is in question of does it fit, but I think that we do want to pursue it here and I'm not concerned about it being too far away from Town.

Ms. Christopher: I don't see any code based issues. I do think that the residential is a little far away from Town. I think it might be better if the area was used for service commercial uses instead of residential but that is a personal opinion. I do think that the aesthetic look of the water treatment plant is important and this needs to be discussed.

Mr. Lamb: This is an evolving process and I don't see any code related problems with this. I'm ok with the residential area especially with the river. I think that commercial could fit too, but we need the residential there also.

Mr. Pringle: This is one in a series of master plans that we've seen over the years for McCain. I don't have a problem with this presentation. I think we should look at the amount of parking because we already exceed a need for parking and if we further reduce parking, we better have a good plan. In the end, making sure we can accommodate our winter guest is the key to our future. At one time we started talking about does affordable housing work if we take it that far out of town, does this still work if it is far away from existing services and

amenities? But with other public works and commercial traffic, I think we really need to be careful of how many units we would put here on the 10 acres. I want to make sure we get the amounts correct.

Ms. Dudney: I have some concern about the parking requirements and I urge the Council and staff to study the parking needs of the town. I don't have an opposition for the residential. I applaud moving the bike path and I love the children's beginner biking areas.

Mr. Mamula: I agree that it meets the code for the uses. I think the parking is a little light. Once it is all residential on Block 11, I feel like having a chunk for residential here is too much. I do agree with 1 to 25 FAR for the service commercial uses. I think with the price that weed pays for spaces on Airport Road, it would be nice if there were no weed stores here on McCain. I would like to see height set at 2 stories period rather than just be discouraged off of the 150 setback. I would like to have a building height discussion at least in the first 200 feet setback from LUD 4. I want to see that sidewalks are contemplated early in the residential planning. The trail situation is something that we desperately need in town. We have no beginner mountain bike trails around town. It would be nice to have something at grade so that we don't become a mountain bike Mecca for the hard core.

(Mr. Grosshuesch announced that both local Breckenridge ballot measures have passed with an 80% plurality.)

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Casey Residence (MM) PL-2015-0310, 108 South Harris Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to remodel the interior and exterior of the existing house.

Changes since the September 15, 2015, Meeting:

1. Removal of the 5 aspen trees located on the Solar Easement located on Lot 6, Block 7 to the south.
2. Lowered the 6-foot tall fence at the south side of the yard to 36-inches.
3. The transom windows have been removed.

The requested modifications to the initial plans for this project were minor. The overall plans have remained as they were presented at the preliminary hearing. Staff welcomed any Commissioner Comments.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission support the presented Point Analysis for the Casey Residence Remodel, PL-2015-0310), showing a passing score of zero (0) points.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Casey Residence Remodel, PL-2015-0310, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Mr. Mamula opened the hearing to Public Comment. There was no Public Comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Great project.

Mr. Pringle: Thank you for making all the improvements.

Mr. Lamb: What's not to like? It is great to see the block get cleaned up.

Ms. Christopher: This is great.

Mr. Schroder: Let's do it.

Mr. Schuman: Great project.

Mr. Mamula: I agree too, great project.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Casey Residence, PL-2015-0310, 108 South

Harris Street, showing a passing score of zero (0) points. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Casey Residence, PL-2015-0310, 108 South Harris Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Tim Casey, Applicant: It was a pleasure working with Mr. Mosher, and with his help the project went smoothly.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Huron Landing (CK) PL-2015-0499, 0143 Huron Road

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a 26-unit workforce housing rental apartment building. All units are proposed as 2 bedroom units and range in size from 768 to 944 sq. ft. There will be 52 surface parking spaces for the project. The trash collection and recycling will be by way of a centralized dumpster enclosure. The exterior materials will include: cementitious vertical siding, cementitious lap siding, powder coated corrugated steel base siding, wood post, beams, rails and trim, and an asphalt shingle roof.

Summit County Government and the Town of Breckenridge are developing the Huron Landing workforce housing project at 0143 Huron Road. The 2013 Summit County Housing Needs Assessment suggests that between 200 and 370 additional rental units are needed in the Upper Blue Basin by 2017. Since the time of the study, Breckenridge has been proactively working on developing rental housing, including Pinewood II (45 units by end of 2016) and Denison Placer (60 units by end of 2017). With the completion of these projects, the estimated housing need in the Upper Blue Basin will be cut to approximately 95-220 rental units. On September 1, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed Huron Landing during a work session. During the work session staff received direction on relative policies. The property is currently going through the Town's Annexation process and is anticipated to be formally annexed on November 24th. Property annexation is required prior to the project being reviewed at a final hearing.

The only substantial changes from the work session to the preliminary hearing is a proposed retaining wall located behind the building and off-site grading and drainage improvements. Staff is looking for guidance on the possible assessment of points under Policy 7/R Site and Environmental Design related to the proposed retaining wall and off-site grading and drainage.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): Staff believes the proposal warrants the following points for a total passing point analysis of positive five (+5) points.

- Policy 24/R Employee Housing positive ten (+10) points and positive three (+3) points for meeting a Council Goal
- Policy 6/R Building Height positive one (+1) point for providing an interesting roof form that steps down at the edges
- Policy 16/R Internal Circulation positive three points (+3) for installation of a recreation path adjacent to Huron Road and the sidewalk that rings the parking lot
- Policy 20/R Recreation Facilities positive three points (+3) for the Flume Trail easement from Huron Road
- Policy 33/R positive two points (+2) for achieving a HERS score below 80,
- Policy 6/R Building Height negative ten points (-10) as the building height is more than one half (½) story over the land use guidelines recommendation, but are no more than one (1) story over the land use guidelines recommendation
- Policy 9/R Placement of Structures negative three (-3) points for not meeting the relative rear setback of 15'

- Policy 7/R Site and Environmental Design negative four (-4) points for a retaining wall over 4' in height

Matt Stais/ Tim Gerken (Architects) on behalf of Developers / Owners:

Concepts have not changed greatly from the September 1 worksession. Two driveway accesses, 26 units, the community needs and goals are still present. The revisions done since September 1 are the retaining walls on the back. We worked with some of the neighbors in the Highlands lots above to work with the existing grading and minimize impacts. We are also trying to improve some of the drainage issues. We want this to function better and in concert with the overall improvements to the road. Included an outdoor community area and worked with the County standards for a 10' paved walkway out front and continue to plan to take over the flume trail and revegetate the Kennington property. (Mr. Stais continued on to show 3D views, existing view with the massing of proposed buildings to better illustrate the proposal. The renderings displayed proposed roof, siding, fascia, with wood beams and base corrugated metal siding. Also went over the roof plan, 33' according to Town Code.) Plan to continue to work with neighbors and with staff and hope to submit for final review from the Commission.

Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Planning Commission agree with Staff's preliminary point analysis?
2. Did the Planning Commission have other concerns or comments on the proposal, specifically the proposed off-site grading and drainage improvements?

The Planning Department believes that Huron Landing, PL-2015-0499, located at 0143 Huron Road, Parcel E-1, Industrial Area Sub & Government Lot 45, 30-6-77, with a passing point analysis and addressing remaining staff concerns and easement approvals, is ready to be scheduled for a Final Hearing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: We talked about the sidewalks; will they make it all the way to the corner which I know is off the property, as we are horse trading are we getting the sidewalk all the way to the highway? (Mr. Jim Curnutte, Summit County: We are currently discussing sidewalks all the way for County Road 450 and we have money in 2016 for design.) This project has 50 more people in who will want to get to the bus stop who will have to cross to do so. (Mr. Stais: The project should be completed by 2017 and the plan is to have the sidewalk all the way down to the corner before the project is completed. There is a host of other issues with County Road 450 which is out of the scope of this project.)

Mr. Pringle: Please show picture number 2 with the proposed elevation of the West building but from the facing east perspective, this doesn't look like a 2 story building. (Mr. Stais: If you look back on the existing conditions, the low site is where the ambulance building used to be and this is where we snuck in the accessible unit with a garden level unit. We were able to give it a bigger footprint. I agree that we should massage this a little more.) (Mr. Kulick: The shed roof that is presented here; does make it look more like a 3 story. They have already received negative ten (-10) points for being between a ½ story and 1 over the recommended two-story height in LUD 5 in the North building.)

Ms. Dudney: Do you have anything to show us the 7' retaining wall area to show us the danger level? (Mr. Kulick: Overall, the wall is generally 4' or less but there are a couple places that I'll point out that are above 4'.) (Mr. Stais: Above the storage area is a fill area it will be 4-7'. Do you have any safety concerns? (Mr. Stais: Yes we will have a split rail on top of it as a visual deterrent. Additionally the neighbors want to keep the residents of Huron Landing from sheet flowing across their property as they go up to the existing trail. The retaining wall will be visible from the storage area but not CR 450. The wall is not a 7' wall all over the place, for the most part it is below 4'.)

Ms. Christopher: Is the corrugated metal tested for our weather elements? (Mr. Stais: It will be a powder coated treatment. We have used this type of finish before on corrugated metal.)

Mr. Mamula: Is there discussion at the County level about a crosswalk? (Mr. Curnutte: Yes.)

Mr. Mamula opened the hearing to Public Comment:

Ms. Barbara Campbell, Property Owner, Highlands, Lot 13:

I didn't know anything about this project until late September. I did meet with Don Reimer in late October. I do have concerns about the project. I have owned the lot since 1996. I am displaying pictures from the recycle center. I was notified by the County that the survey markers show that they were over the property line. We granted a trail easement to the Town of Breckenridge in 1998 so that they could connect the lower flume trail. We see a lot of usage on our lot. Trail users go around our fence on both sides; we can't seem to keep the traffic out even with the fence. The retaining wall of 4' won't be enough to keep people off our property. We would like to encourage you to build a fence that is higher, like the chain-link fence that is on the storage property. Also, we do have concerns with the 3 story building and the close proximity to the lot lines. (Mr. Schuman: Have you spoken to Breckenridge Trails about your ongoing concerns?) Yes, they put the fence up and now we have more traffic than ever. We are already having problems and I can't see how putting more people living in close proximity to our property would make it any better. The trail easement said that the Town would maintain and remedy the use of the trail on our property. (Ms. Dudney: Where is your home?) We haven't built yet, but we plan to build in the future. It is a little over an acre lot on Forest Hill. We might be open to selling the lower portion to you. (Mr. Mamula: That is not for us to decide.) (Mr. Kulick: Please point out on the plans the area you are having problems.) Yes (she proceeded to show on her photographs the areas of problems.) (Mr. Kulick: On behalf of the trails department, we would like to work with you to try and remedy these issues.) Thanks, but without a fence I don't think this will improve.

Ms. Betsy Ruskreig, Lot 14 at the Highlands:

We just have one favor to request, when we looked at the current and proposed pictures they were all taken on CR 450 but nothing was taken from either my lot or Ms. Campbell's lot. Could you also take the current pictures from our lot down so that we can see where the roof lines go? Then we could see what the roof lines do. (Mr. Stais: I would like to work with you to take the pictures.)

Ms. Katherine King, HOA President at Kennington Townhomes:

We appreciate our opportunity to comment and the efforts of staff and the efforts to screen this from Kennington. We were concerned about not having enough parking and so we thank you for addressing this. We would like to see as much screening landscaping as possible and if you are agreeable of planting the landscaping on Kennington property we will irrigate. Our main concerns are how this property will be managed but this is beyond the Commission. I think there could be issues with dogs going all over where there isn't fencing. We are looking forward to a long term improvement plan on CR 450. (Ms. Dudney: You feel pretty good about the proposed parking spaces?) Honestly, two per project is not enough but it is better than 1.5 spots. (Ms. Dudney: Can't you give a permit to your resident and then police it?) Yes, but it is hard to enforce.

Ms. Kim Bentley, Kennington Resident:

I disagree with Ms. King on the parking issue. Kennington has more than 2 spaces and it still not enough. People park at Kennington to use the Flume trail and that will increase even more with Huron. I would like to see more vegetation for screening. The setback is proposed at 10' off the rear property line instead of the recommended 15'. I feel like the building height coming up CR 450 is huge and doesn't fit in.

Ms. King: I agree that the east building does look really big and anything we can do to make it look less imposing would be appreciated.

There was no more Public Comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Lamb: This is how the point system works. I do agree with Staff's preliminary point analysis. I'm ok with the grading and draining changes. I think that Mr. Stais and others can come up with better screening. It may not be 100% of what everyone wants, but I think in the end it is important and good.
- Mr. Pringle: I'm not sure I agree with the point analysis. They were given positive three (+3) for policies 16R and 20R for dedicating the Flume and rec path; that seems disproportionately generous as far as taking care of the height that is a problem. The rear building seems to be proportional; the western building comes right out to the road and looms on CR 450. I think massaging this building is going to take some real effort to reduce the height impact. I think everyone is going to be disappointed with this if it remains. If all we are here for is to say yes or no it meets the code then you only need one of us, but I think it is our place to point out issues of aesthetics.
- Ms. Dudney: I like the project and I support it. I agree that it is more density and more height but I think it will tuck into the hillside. I think it would be interesting to have a view from the upper lots. I understand the concerns but I don't think that a chain link fence is the answer.
- Ms. Christopher: I like the project but as other Commissioners have said, I would like to see the height massaged coming up CR 450. I think the trail signage at the road would help a lot.
- Ms. Schroder: I do agree with the point analysis. Circulation seems good, employee housing and Council goals, we are good shape that the County is working with us on the height. We should probably be thankful that the height is only 33' because it could be more under the County's zoning. I would like you to be accommodating to the neighbors. Setback and retaining walls will earn negative points but I understand why these are here. I think the project looks good on the land that was once a recycling center.
- Mr. Schuman: I think it is a good project. I do support the preliminary point analysis. I do have concerns on policy 20/R I think the Town and the County have a responsibility to manage the trails. I think they have to address the unruly riders that get off the trail and abuse land.
- Mr. Mamula: I'm not buying policy 16/R getting three (+3) points. As far as the flume trail, somehow we've got to make sure that there isn't a problem with the neighbor or that this is a trailhead. This right now goes into emptiness; I worry about Ms. Bentley's problem with this becoming a trailhead and aggravating the parking and I want to see Mr. Kulick take this and talk more about this because it is going to be a Town problem, not a County problem. We need to make sure that our management is correct for this trail because the visitor center is sending people from out of town to go bike the Lower Flume. (Mr. Kulick: The answer is to park at the Rec Center.) But the people that come to this town are looking for an easier bike trail and this is the easiest and they won't park at the Rec Center. If this wasn't a governmental agency we wouldn't be tolerating this. You are asking people to put up with this on a trail that we are sending people from out of town to use. We need to have a good plan to handle this trail in terms of parking. Please make sure that we are working with the neighbors especially for neighbors on Lots 13 and 14 in the Highlands; now is the time to study it. Also, I have a problem with the side of West building; it is a blank wall, there are only 2 tiny windows, you are presenting a huge face to the road. (Mr. Stais: Maybe we can re-orient the end units. We will work on this.)

COMBINED HEARINGS:

- 1) Crepes a la Cart Exempt Large Vendor Cart (JP) PL-2015-0396, 309 South Main Street
Ms. Puester presented a proposal to issue a permit that classifies the existing Crepes ala Cart vendor cart as an "exempt large vendor cart" under Policy 49 (Absolute) of the Development Code. The vendor cart has operated at this location since 1982. The existing cart is yellow with white trim, measuring 14'2"x6', no changes are proposed to the exterior of the cart. A relocated and expanded deck has been recently constructed. A permit to relocate the cart 3' within the property boundary has been approved.

The Planning Department recommends that the Crepes ala Cart vendor cart, PL-2015-0396, located at 309 S. Main Street, Lot 5, Block 6, Stiles Addition Subdivision, be determined to be an "exempt large vendor cart" under Policy 49 (Absolute) of the Development Code with the attached findings and conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Christopher: This is a grandfathered item? Stella's? (Ms. Puester: Stella's also has a permit renewal timeline as well; 3 years.)

Mr. Mamula: The way the policy was written this has always been here, but at some time it will go away. (Ms. Puester: This was put originally on two lots, but was then combined on one lot.)

Mr. Schuman: I'm ok.

Mr. Schroder: I support.

Ms. Christopher: I support.

Mr. Lamb: I'm fine.

Mr. Pringle: I'm fine.

Ms. Dudney: I'm fine.

Mr. Mamula: I'm fine too.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Crepes a la Carte Large Vendor Cart, PL-2015-0396, 309 South Main Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Mamula: The house that is on the downside of Wellington (513) that is below Matt Stais; they've been doing a ton of work with a retaining wall. It doesn't have any windows, are they paving? (Ms. Puester: I will look into it.)

Ms. Puester: The chair election will occur at the next meeting, and we will be advertising the position vacated by Mr. Mamula and we will have a new Commissioner in January. I want to schedule a Planning Commission field trip recap with photos and discussion for the Town Council. I will have that hopefully on the next agenda. (Mr. Schroder: Will lifestyle centers be on the agenda too, not just parking?) Yes.

Mr. Pringle: I think that we learned a lot on that field trip and that it was very beneficial.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15pm.

Eric Mamula, Chair