

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 7:04pm
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the November 17, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Truckey announced that the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building, PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road, had been withdrawn from this evening's agenda at the request of the Applicants earlier today. With no other changes, the December 1, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Last meeting was Tim Gagen's last Town Council meeting to run, so the meeting was quite short so that there was time to celebrate Tim's work.
- We passed the water rates and mill levy ordinances and also passed the 2016 Town Budget.
- We gave the report that we hired the team of experts who will help with the parking and transit issue which is the DTJ group out of Boulder. They have teamed up with a firm out of California, Nelson Niegard, who are highly regarded in the parking and transit arena. We feel this team is the right dynamic for where we want to go. We wanted them to be in place to experience the parking and transit issues between Christmas and New Year's. (Mr. Schroder: How will this team go about knowing what the parking is like?) The plan is to take a holistic approach with an analysis of everything, looking at existing parking today, where people are coming and going, pedestrians, summer, winter, roundabouts, and way-finding technology just to name a few. The experts employ a lot of data collection methods including computer modeling, traffic counts, past data collected, and they will do observations and interviews. The process will take a while. We hope to see preliminary thoughts around the end of January and then expect that it will be some months later before we have a clear direction. Reconfiguring F lot is not a foregone conclusion. It is exciting to have found people who know what is going on and who have had success with other communities around the country. The Council hopes that there is some low hanging fruit that can be done sooner, like with transit, or utilizing existing parking differently. There has been some feedback regarding the changes to employee parking around town. We hope that the experts will give us some early help with some low hanging fruit solutions. Nelson Niegard worked with Santa Monica and their results were amazing. They will leave no stone unturned in how to make parking and transit better. There are no two places that are anything alike, however, and they understand this. The hope is that there will be solutions to put in place soon. It is hard to say when we might build a structure; we want the expert feedback first. This is the team that we will be finding the solutions not just study the problem.
- There will be a call up of Breckenridge Grand Peak 8 and that will be at the first meeting in January.
- (Mr. Pringle: Regarding the employee parking situation in particular, is there a need to do a better job with talking points on why we are doing this?) There have been notices and articles in the paper, but until people started skiing they didn't tune into this topic. It is hard in this Town to get the word out. We've sold more employee passes than ever this year which is based on the new arrangements with employee parking. But that has rearranged the favorite places for the locals to park. The ice rink parking has been contentious. It will be interesting to see how full the lot will be with a fee of \$3 an

hour, but how this lot gets used will be interesting to see over the holidays. I think the ice rink will need a lot more study, if it doesn't fill up then we might drop pay parking. If this lot wasn't a pay lot then the employees wouldn't get a parking permit.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Gallagher Residence Renovation, Addition and Landmarking (MM) PL-2015-0362, 114 South Harris Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to renovate, restore and remodel the historic house, add a full basement beneath the historic portion of the house, and locally landmark the historic house.

Changes Since the October 6, 2015, Preliminary Planning Commission Meeting:

1. The front porch has been reduced in size to a form fitting to the Historic District.
2. The window wells are no longer heated.

Point Analysis: All absolute policies have been met. Staff recommended positive three (+3) points under 9-1-19-24R, The Social Community, for the restoration efforts to the historic house. The application has not incurred any negative points.

The proposed modifications to the house are modest but will strengthen the historic integrity. Staff is pleased to see the parking on the property too.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission endorse the presented Point Analysis for The Gallagher Residence Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0362, 114 South Harris Street, showing a passing score of positive three (+3) points.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve The Gallagher Residence Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0362, 114 South Harris Street, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Staff suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark the Gallagher Residence based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.

Ms. Christopher opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I support the motions and the work that has been done without any reservation.

Mr. Schuman: I agree.

Mr. Lamb: Me too.

Mr. Pringle: I appreciate what the applicant has done with restoring the historic nature of this house and I agree.

Ms. Dudney: I also agree.

Mr. Mamula: Great job and I also agree.

Ms. Christopher: I also agree with staff.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Gallagher Residence Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0362, 114 South Harris Street, showing a score of positive three (+3) points. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the Gallagher Residence Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0362, 114 South Harris Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Mamula seconded, and

the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to recommend the Town Council adopt an ordinance to landmark the Gallagher Residence based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2) The Old Enyeart Place Renovation, Addition and Landmarking (MM) PL-2015-0361, 112 South Harris Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to renovate, restore and remodel the historic house, add a full basement beneath the historic portion of the house, build a new connector and addition to the back of the lot and locally landmark the historic house.

Changes since the October 6, 2015, Preliminary Planning Commission Meeting:

1. The original log siding on the historic house will be restored and repaired. Chinking will be added to weatherproof the siding.
2. The replacement windows will closely match the style and size of the original windows.
3. Instead of moving the house 5'-0", the plans now show the house being moved 4'-11".
4. The window wells are no longer heated.

Point Analysis: Staff is showing all absolute policies have been met and the final point analysis as:

- Relative Policy 9 / Placement of Structures: Negative three (-3) points for the rear setback
- Relative Policy 24 / The Social Community:
 - Negative three (-3) points for moving the historic structure less than 5-feet
 - Negative three (-3) points for exceeding the 9 UPA above ground density
 - Positive six (+6) points for historic preservation
- Relative Policy 18 / Parking: Positive two (+2) points for placement and screening of all off street parking areas from public view
- Relative Policy 33 / Energy: Positive one (+1) point for obtaining a HERS Rating index

The result is a passing score of zero (0) points.

Overall, the proposed plans show a sensitive restoration of the Enyeart House with a compatible addition that should be buffered from the major views from Harris Street and the alley. Staff had the following questions for the Commissioners:

1. Did the Commission support the length of the connector?
2. Did the Commission support the massing of the addition?
3. Did the Commission support the recommended point analysis?

Staff recommended the Planning Commission endorse the presented Point Analysis for The Old Enyeart Place Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0361, 112 South Harris Street, showing a passing score of zero (0) points.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve The Old Enyeart Place Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0361, 112 South Harris Street, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Staff suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark The Old Enyeart Place based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schuman: Will this unit get a fence? (Mr. Mosher: No.)
- Mr. Pringle: Is the length of the connector of 17-feet meeting a strict formula? (Mr. Mosher: Based on past review with the Commission, there is some built-in flexibilities in this Policy. The “shalls” and “shoulds” in the policy define some minimums. Now the Commission has some latitude on how they interpret this as long as it adequately separates the historic house with the addition.) It appears that the connectors are getting longer. It seems, since you aren’t going to see it from the North or South, if this was shorter then you wouldn’t have to move the house. (Mr. Mosher: The applicant took this into consideration but this is now a kitchen here. There are examples of longer connectors screening new additions. If this connector was shorter it may have a greater impact on how it appears from the street.) I understand this but, you could shorten it up a little to give relief off the alley. (Mr. Mosher: The function of the house as presented really works well now. Plus, we don’t want to see cars parking on extra space along the alley in front of the garage doors. Many of the historic sheds along this alley about the alley too)
- Mr. Mamula: I have a question about the negative points for moving the structure which isn’t truly historic by the Code as it is outside of the Town’s Period of Significance. I think the negative points run contrary to the fact that, if the applicant chose to, he could demolish the building. (Mr. Mosher: The applicant is seeking a final approval this evening. Because this is a final hearing, it might not be appropriate for this discussion if there are significant changes proposed. I don’t know where we go with this right now. Let’s discuss.) I would like to have a discussion on this because this will set new precedence.
- Ms. Dudney: So, (to Mr. Mamula) you are saying that, because this is not historic, the negative points shouldn’t be given for moving it even though it might be landmarked?
- Mr. Mamula: The Town’s Period of Significance ends at 1942. If you can tear this house down, moving it shouldn’t incur negative points.
- Mr. Pringle: I don’t think people should be penalized for doing the right thing. We want to encourage people to fix up and preserve a historic home, like when a historic home is not in the proper setback.
- Ms. Dudney: Have we had other examples of homes outside of the period of significance that been in this situation? (Mr. Mosher: None that I can recall.)
- Mr. Mamula: There is Code that needs to be clarified or changed. The way that he is refinishing the home is different from the Historic Standards so that the home will be restored to when it was built in the 50’s not to falsely replicate the 1800’s.
- Mr. Lamb: At my own house, the initial survey was off five feet. There were some survey problems in the 1880’s and they put the house in the wrong place. (Mr. Mosher: We may want to have a conversation with the applicant to see what direction he would like to go.)
- Ms. Dudney: I agree that it shouldn’t take the negative points, but the Code should be rewritten for moving a structure that is landmarked. (Mr. Mosher: But we are allowing him to landmark it even though he is moving it.) I hear what Mr. Mosher is saying that the code is vague on this issue. (Mr. Truckey: We normally treat moving historic primary structures with negative three (-3) points, but this does not meet the Town’s period of significance for qualifying as a historic structure.) (Mr. Mosher: We will need to modify the findings and the conditions on the floor tonight to address this.) He may not want to take off the other positive points.
- Mr. Pringle: Mr. Gallagher should have an opportunity to address this. (Mr. Mosher: I think he would like to see this have closure tonight. If you want to establish precedence then the Commission needs to agree with this interpretation and then vote change the attached Point Analysis.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Michael Gallagher, Owner / Architect:

First I’d like to say is what is important is how we treat the cabin, I think restoring the log siding is the right way to do it if I’m getting the landmarking then we’ve landed on the right treatment. We’ve come to the right

conclusion. I don't want to see any precedent set that shouldn't be set so, I would support not being assigned the negative points for moving the building. With the newfound positive points, I wouldn't mind removing requirement for the HERS rating. (Mr. Mosher: If we strike the negative points from moving the structure and the positive points from the HERS, we will have two changes to the Point Analysis and then remove Condition number 23 "Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. There needs to be a motion to adjust the Points and a separate motion to strike condition Number 23.) (Ms. Dudney: What if he wanted to move it more than 4'-11", will he have to come back to the Planning Commission?) (Mr. Mosher: It wouldn't impact the Landmarking to move it a few feet; moving it more would possibly lose the landmarking.)

Ms. Christopher opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Mamula: I think this is great; I'm glad where we ended up with its appearance being in its own time and the decisions this evening are good for setting precedence. I think it is important that we interpret buildings for the period of time and not just the 1800's. I think this is the correct solution to the property.

Mr. Schroder: I do support the connector, I think the massing does work, and I do support the conversation about changing the point analysis.

Mr. Schuman: I do support the connector, I support the massing and I support the changed point analysis.

Mr. Lamb: I support the length of the connector and the massing of the addition. I also agree with not assessing negative three (-3) points and thanks for cleaning up our neighborhood.

Mr. Pringle: I do support the connector but I do think it could be shorter if that is what the applicant would like, I support the massing, and I support the new point analysis.

Ms. Dudney: I agree with the commissioners and I want to recognize and commend Mr. Mamula for bringing up this nuanced point regarding the points that shouldn't be given.

Ms. Christopher: I also agree and support the connector.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to remove the negative three (-3) points assessed under policy 24/R, Moving Historic Structures. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to remove the positive one (+1) point assessed under Policy 33/R for the HERS rating. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the amended point analysis, showing a passing score of positive two (+2) points. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve The Old Enyeart Place Renovation, Addition and Landmarking, PL-2015-0361, 112 South Harris Street, with the amended Findings and Conditions (showing the removal of Condition 23). Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to recommend the Town Council adopt an ordinance to landmark The Old Enyeart Place based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building (MM) PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road
(Withdrawn at the request of the Applicants.)

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1) McCain Master Plan Modification (MT) PL-2015-0501, 12965, 13215, 13217, 13221, 13250 Colorado Highway 9

Mr. Truckey presented a proposal to modify the Master Plan for the property known as the McCain property (owned by the Town of Breckenridge), identifying and distributing density and uses on a series of 13 tracts for the following uses: water treatment plant, residential affordable housing, Public Works storage, solar gardens, service commercial, snow storage, public open space and trails, overflow parking, recycling center, and existing gravel mining and processing operations.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I think there is a need for the commercial / service area, so I thought maybe there could be some adjusting to the acreage to allow for some more service commercial space, which I think there is a crying need for. You have 60,000 square feet designated which would only allow for a 2,600 square foot building based on the 1:25 FAR. (Mr. Truckey: It is pretty close to what exists today. There are 1.2 acres leased to 4 different contractors right now. The Plan designates 1.5 acres.)

Ms. Dudney: Are you questioning / thinking, Mr. Pringle, that there needs to be space for more industrial or uses with a yard?

Mr. Pringle: I was thinking more a place for more service commercial because this has dwindled on Airport Road when it went to residential needs.

Ms. Dudney: Do you want to replace businesses for outside storage yards or warehousing?

Mr. Pringle: I think either/or. I fought for the possibility for this on Airport Road. (Mr. Truckey: You are right; the SustainableBreck Plan supported finding more space for service commercial uses. Regarding McCain, we identified the 1.5 acre site but ran out of space here to allow any more. We had a desire to preserve at least 30% of the parcel for open space (that's how much the open space fund paid into the McCain purchase) and when you factor the Council's desire to provide for employee housing on the site, coupled with the other uses, there really isn't any more room for service commercial.) Could snow storage dovetail as open space? (Ms. Elena Scott, Norris Design: We are going to use snow storage as parking but the value of snow storage as open space is not great for open space because it has a lot of sediment. It won't work for landscaping, things won't grow on it.)

Ms. Christopher: If it is parking in the summer then it doesn't meet my interpretation of open space.

Mr. Pringle: I understand that, but could you dedicate that to open space?

Mr. Mamula: I would not trade you open space for service commercial.

Ms. Dudney: Then you could ask would you trade housing for service commercial? As a Realtor, I get calls every week for people looking for warehouse space for people to start businesses because the supply is so low in the County. I agree that there is a shortage, but there is also a shortage for housing. I think the Town Council should remain flexible so that when it is time to develop this they could assess where the greatest need is between service commercial versus housing.

Mr. Truckey continued with the proposal presentation.

Staff has found that the application passes all Absolute Policies in the Development Code. No positive or negative points have been recommended at this time. Individual points analyses will be undertaken as site specific developments are proposed on the property in the future.

Staff welcomed any further comments from the Commission. Staff suggested the Planning Commission make a recommendation that the Town Council approve the McCain Master Plan Modification, PL-2015-0501, with the presented findings and conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: I think I read that people wanted a rec path on the east side of the stream but it is already on the east side of the stream. I'm confused. (Ms. Scott: The rec path is proposed to have a safer crossing away from the roundabout and it will continue with its current location. There is another loop path that will go through open space that is asphalted and goes near the river.) Would we keep this concept on the east side? (Ms. Scott: So the problem right now is that people think they want to go to Frisco but then when they get to McCain they could just loop and go back to town. The loop would give people an option to do a short loop and still maintain a commuter path. We also want to recreate the river habitat and have it be more natural.) (Ms. Scott: Showed some photographs with existing and the simulated proposed conditions to show how much the site will change with the grading.)
- Ms. Dudney: Will the new solar fields be visible from Highway 9? (Ms. Scott: No, they shouldn't be. From the interior road, Stan Miller Drive, the solar fields will be visible. But from the highway and Coyne Valley road it shouldn't be very visible.)
- Mr. Schuman: The 1.2 acre service / commercial acreage, will this go away when the water treatment plant comes in? (Ms. Scott: No, this will remain and be increased by a 1/3 acre. The existing users of this space may not get automatic use of this space as they are town monthly leases. The Breck Bears store will be replaced by the water treatment plant.)

Ms. Christopher opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Eric Degerberg, 428 Silver Circle: I support this plan as it is a huge improvement to what we see now. I do worry about the roundabout as the yield sign and the pedestrian signs have been taken out in recent snowstorms. Crossing there as a pedestrian is very scary, and something that needs to be considered. I think a traffic light would be better than that. I don't think CDOT will go for this, but it is very scary especially with the additional housing. I really support the proposed bike loop.

Mr. Arthur Albin, 512 Shekel Lane and President of the Silver Shekel HOA: I'm here to echo the comments of Mr. Degerberg. We have 190 members of the Home Owners Association and a number have indicated interest in the McCain Plan. We've heard nine overwhelming positive comments from homeowners. Two other comments were negative and they focused on the traffic issues that Mr. Degerberg brought up. The concern is that there may not be enough entrance and exit space if there is additional housing here.

Mr. John Brownson, 265 Southside Drive, President of the Breckenridge Building Center (BBC) and former Director of Planning and Development for Breckenridge Lands: Wouldn't it be a nicer bike trail to follow the river and not be by the highway? I understand the use for commuters, but we only have 5 months of use of this trail, and I think 95% of the riders on this trail are recreational, but I think it is much nicer to be by the stream and not be right by the highway. I think it solves some of the bicycle/car conflicts near the roundabout. I think it would be a lovely trail. (Ms. Christopher: There is a loop by the stream.) I think this should be more incorporated into the existing bike path. I think this is a great opportunity to make it more natural. I do have concerns with the realignment with Stan Miller Drive to make it a T intersection. The primary users will be the proposed residences and the customers of the BBC with their trucks. By realigning it as proposed it adds an additional two turns for those user groups. Mr. Brownson showed a new drawing that depicted a change to the road that showed the service commercial users not having to stop but requiring traffic coming from the south on access road to stop. The movement of the bigger truck traffic would flow to the north and the residential from the south would have a stop sign. (Ms. Dudney: In approving the master plan, this is just schematic right?) (Mr. Mosher: Yes, but Mr. Brownson can voice his concerns now.) I would like to suggest you move the water treatment plant to the service commercial area so that we have compatible uses adjacent to each other (service commercial next to BBC) and so you can screen the water treatment plant away from the roundabout. This is a more desirable gateway to Breckenridge statement. This is a piece of land that the town and community have put a lot of resources and it is one of the few that remains undeveloped and I urge the Commission to consider the impacts carefully. I think the plan in general speaks well to the issues and

provides open space at the same time. (Ms. Dudney: Do you have opinion on residential versus industrial on the 10.2 acres?) Good question, but I don't think I am qualified to answer that right now. I do think that we need more opportunities for our trades, but that is self serving to me. We have done a good job providing a bed base but we need the trades too.

Mr. Jeff Zimmerman, 459 Lakeview Drive: I'm a resident of the community and it seems that this is about adjacencies and exclusions. It seems to be that the adjacencies aren't quite right. The relationship of the residential to the open space should be switched and I also think the commercial and the water treatment and solar be switched. I know you have spent a lot of time looking at grades, but I really wonder about the adjacencies and how they function together. I think if commercial, water treatment and solar panels were more consolidated it would be better. Knowing that this is a final hearing, I don't know if this comment is too late. I also think that the proposed service commercial is not enough. We are starting to push trades further out and rents are going up. Speaking for Vail Resorts, it is hard to find service commercial areas. It would be nice to see Tatro subdivision and what they can accommodate. I would like to see residential in the middle by open space. I'm also the Planning Director for Vail Resorts, regarding the overflow parking, what is the purpose is it for the Community, bus transfer station or is it for parking only? (Ms. Christopher: We discussed that Block 11 on Airport Road will someday be developed.) (Mr. Truckey: There are a number of moving pieces regarding parking, such as discussion of parking garages. We sized this area based on 500 spaces that the Town committed to providing at Block 11.) Is this possible to make this parking larger or to at least not exclude skier and guest parking as one of the functions of this space? Also, I would like to see a transportation system from the College area that is not bus oriented, perhaps like a gondola solution. I just don't want it to exclude other possibilities.

There was no further comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Is it possible to put on this master plan a little more flexibility like residential or industrial and we talked about the overflow parking as being flexible based on future determinations? (Mr. Truckey: You could make some of the spaces more flexible. That is essentially what the original master plan back in 2013 included. If you had suggestions you could make this proposal to the Council. We are going to pass along all the comments we have here. The other issue is the point analysis. The Council makes the business decision and will listen to comments they receive.)

Mr. Pringle: We are devoting a lot of space here for Open Space because Open Space dollars were used, could that be refinanced if necessary so that Town dollars could pay back the open space fund?? (Mr. Truckey: The river corridor is a pretty large area and the Department of Wildlife has recommended we limit all development west of the river. The other main open space tract is serving as a placeholder for a future reservoir, if that is needed.) I don't want to impact the river corridor, but I talked to others who say the reservoir will be the world's most expensive reservoir. (Mr. Truckey: The river corridor really satisfies the 30% so I don't think it would have to be a payback to the open space fund; it would really be up to Council to give up space on the reservoir.)

Ms. Dudney: What if we said in lieu of the words of residential we could say residential and/or industrial commercial and where it says open space we say open space/ and /or overflow parking? I like the water treatment plant where it is and the service commercial where it is and the bike path. I just don't want to have the Council limited.

Mr. Mamula: This is still just a master plan and the uses may not really end up being located where they are shown. It will change over time. All we are doing is approving these uses on this property. This is only a conversation for Council and they will see the comments.

Ms. Christopher: I like the uses, but I don't like how they are arranged, I have concerns for the adjacencies. I think the whole thing could be massaged more.

- Mr. Lamb: Master plans change all the time, I don't think our job is to change it tonight, but I agree with some of the comments. Our job is to run the point analysis.
- Mr. Mamula: The important thing will be to ask if the roads are in the right position. The real issue is that there are trucks going the other way to, to snow storage, the water treatment, etc. The road system will be the big deal, especially with the potential of residential use.
- Mr. Lamb: That intersection is just a disaster waiting to happen when you go to the BBC. My comment is that we need to take a look at that roundabout and decide to do something different.
- Mr. Mamula: There is a potential issue with traffic; there will be further issues when you dump trucks from Town that are bringing snow and into public works storage. These trucks will be using this roundabout during the busiest time of the year with snow. I don't know if the way that it is laid out that this traffic plan is feasible with all of this increased truck traffic. Then there are conflicts with overflow parking with a thousand people looking to get onto a bus. That is the part that concerns me the most.
- Ms. Christopher: Should we move forward with the point analysis and then it is very clear in the minutes that we have issues?
- Mr. Schuman: I think that this is a good master plan and the fits are reasonable. I think that the service commercial is light. I think affordable housing is dictating that we are going to push all service and trades outside of Breckenridge. Otherwise, I think it is a good master plan.
- Mr. Schroder: I like that we are actively planning this last piece of accessible land. By 2030, there are potentially 9 million people in the state and I'm glad we are planning now. I think the building height as an absolute within 200 feet of the highway is the right thing to do. I think it is a great plan to have an idea and vision. I recommend that Council approves this modification.
- Ms. Dudney: I can support this point analysis with the caveat that you may be sending a message by leaving things out and I do think that service commercial/industrial is too light.
- Mr. Pringle: I support the point analysis and I support the uses; I'm not sure if I support them as they are shown and at the amounts of them. I think we will see snow storage, water treatment and Town shop storage here relatively quickly. There may be enough uses in this that in a short time the parcel will be set in stone. I want to make sure that we get this right and the need to support service commercial will not be a problem in the future. How many tax dollars have been sent down valley because we don't provide the products and services that people are looking for and we might want to distribute the uses. I think that the water plant is set in stone. (Mr. Truckey: Yes, it is fairly set in stone in terms of that location.) I appreciate that we've seen a lot of master plans, but we are close.
- Mr. Lamb: As Planning Commissioners, our plan is not to redesign the plan and it is close to the original plan. I like the bike path. Yes, it does pass the point analysis.
- Ms. Christopher: I agree with the acreage and uses, but I don't think the adjacencies are correct and I think that there is not enough service commercial and too much residential and I'm worried about traffic by the Fairview corridor.
- Mr. Mamula: See my earlier comments.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the point analysis for the McCain Master Plan Modification, PL-2015-0501, 12965, 13215, 13217, 13221, 13250 Colorado Highway 9, showing a passing point analysis of no (0) points. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the McCain Master Plan Modification, PL-2015-0501, 12965, 13215, 13217, 13221, 13250 Colorado Highway 9, as presented with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously.

OTHER:

Mr. Mamula: Thank you to everyone for being on the Planning Commission as this is my second time around.

Ms. Christopher: Thank you, Mr. Mamula.

Mr. Truckey: Friday is Bright Friday and the Breckenridge Green Team is selling LED bulbs for a \$1 a bulb from 9am-3pm at the Breckenridge Police Station, 150 Valley Brook Road.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:24pm.

Kate Christopher, Chair