

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Ron Schuman Dan Schroder
Jim Lamb Gretchen Dudney Christie Mathews-Leidal
Dave Pringle
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Leidal: On page 6, in regard to the Marvel house, Mr. Mosher added Condition 26 on the floor that was overlooked in the minutes. The minutes should read under staff recommendations at the end of the sentence: “with the addition of the new Condition 26 regarding a landscape covenant presented during the meeting by Mr. Mosher.” With no other changes, the February 2, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Puester noted a change to move the Town Council Report to first on the agenda. With no other changes, the February 16, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Thanks to Kate Christopher for working on the Planning Commission over the past several years; thank you to the service for the Town. We will miss you. We discussed replacing your position and that it had been a very short time since the last interviews. We had a lot of candidates from the last round, so we will look back to the list to find a replacement. The Council had some questions of staff to get some clarifications on candidate status, but the plan is to go back to the list to find a candidate if possible.
- Discussed the process to bring Pinewood 2 online (45 units of workforce housing). It will be done by this summer. Corum came to present on some logistics. Council approved this housing to allow pets, even though it wasn't Corum's recommendation. We hope to set some rules and are looking forward to making it a pet friendly unit. It will be 45 units of studios and one bedrooms. Targeting lower income; 50% AMI is the target, so the studio rental rate should be around \$800/mo and a one bedroom should be under \$1,000. Reservations will start to be taken around March 1.
- We had a primer on Parking and Transit from DTJ and Nelson/Nygaard before the public community forum this Thursday. We have a 7:30am session and a 5:00pm session at the Community Center this Thursday. From the preview we heard, I look forward to some good conversations. The consultants have information on how we can have a much more pedestrian friendly town, such as improving dark spots at night. There is some low hanging fruit to fix things and bring our congestion level to be more walkable. We aren't just focusing on a single solution; there are many things we can do to improve our existing conditions. (Mr. Pringle: Is Council prepared to change its position on “dark skies”? I think this sacrifices a lot of street lights and lighting in the past, but I'm concerned about health safety and welfare.) This was talked about but that there are some technological improvements and better down lighting that may not sacrifice the up lighting goal. The consultants showed us a map of what our town looks like at night and it is surprising how there are some places in the center of Town that are dark. (Mr. Pringle: The recycling center could have had some better lighting for those people who recycle at night, but it was rejected.) The Council decided to take a wait and see position on it but it is stubbed out for potential future lighting around the Recycling Center. I would like to hear more people's comments about this topic for the future. (Mr. Lamb: The pedestrian sidewalks that are heated are awesome.) (Ms. Christopher: I agree; I point these out to people who come to the Welcome Center.) (Mr. Schuman: How far outside the core did DTJ go?) They did discuss how the lodging is

located just outside the core and that there is a potential to improve lighting that could potentially prevent people from getting back in their car. Compared to other towns that DTJ has studied we could be in the more “walkable” category. (Mr. Pringle: I think that maintenance on the sidewalks that aren’t heated is critical. Also, Vail is a good example of encouraging people to park and then make it easy for people to take alternative transportation around town.)

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Village at Breckenridge Plaza Renovation (CL) PL-2016-0007, 535 South Park Avenue, (Liftside Condos, Peak Nine Inn, Lot 4), 555 South Park Avenue, (Plaza II, Shavano, Lot 3), 575 South Park Avenue, (Maggie Building, Lot 1, 645 South Park Avenue, (Plaza III, Wetterhorn Building, Lot 6), 655 South Park Avenue, (Plaza I, Antero Building, Lot 5), 405 Village Road, (Chateaux Condominium Hotel, Lot 12) (Note: These are the correct addresses as noted in the Staff Report.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I would like to look at this a little more because there are some significant changes. (Ms. Puester: Would you like an overview?)

Mr. Schuman made a motion to call up the Village at Breckenridge Plaza Renovation, PL-2016-0007, for an overview presentation. Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Chapin La Chance, Planner II for the Town of Breckenridge: The goal of this project is to improve some water leakage issues. The existing concrete will be removed and replaced with pavers; in addition the plan is to remove the gazebo, fire-pit and the planters. New metal railings and 6 new light posts are proposed. A new more energy efficient snow melt system will be installed. The existing concrete is visibly deteriorating and the planters and concrete are leaking into the parking garage below the plaza. Currently a 20’ utility and access easement runs through the plaza, with a 55.5’ radius in the approximate center of the existing plaza. 100% of this existing site is impermeable surface, perhaps except for the planters. The proposal is to install 3 outdoor firepits; one will be replacing an existing firepit in the existing gazebo. Staff is recommending negative two (-2) points under Policy 33/R for two new firepits. Also proposed is to replace the boiler plants with new energy efficient plants that are 23-26% more efficient, so we recommended positive two (+2) points under Policy 33/R, Other Design Features. Access and Circulation: primary access from downtown F Lot and to and from Peak 9 Quicksilver lift and ground surface of easements will both be improved. The existing planters encroach on the easement, so removing these planters will likely improve circulation but staff does not believe the conditions are changing enough to warrant positive points. Landscaping: 12 trees in 3,500 sq. ft. of multiple planters exist; the applicant has transplanted 7 other trees to a nearby location last year. Since the plaza is on top of a parking deck, and there have been numerous water leaks that could lead to structural problems. The plaza is internal to the site so no negative points are recommended. No concerns on architectural compatibility. Staff believes that this is harmonious. There are currently legal non-conforming light fixtures that exist but they don’t need to be replaced until 2022, and staff is recommending the applicant consider replacing these now as they will be required to be replaced in 6 years. The new fixtures that are proposed are LED, down cast, fully shielded. Drainage is the big issue; there is currently a sheet flow that flows eastward towards Blue River, and one of the design intents is to compartmentalize the drainage to reduce the water issues. New drains and new piping are proposed that will tie into the garage. Staff has no issues with this. Overall point analysis: negative two (-2) points for Policy 33/R and positive two (+2) points for Policy 33/R, so Staff recommended a passing policy with zero (0) points. All Absolute Policies are being met.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Does the policy that the lighting must be fixed by 2022 apply? (Ms. Puester: It will be required to be replaced in 2022, so our suggestion was to point out that this may be more financially viable to address the lighting now while the plaza was torn up.)

- Ms. Dudney: The planters will be removed, but no more planters, right? (Mr. LaChance: The applicant will speak to this, but there is a proposal for movable planters not tied into the concrete.) (Ms. Puester: I want to point out to you where the existing planters are currently on the plan.)
- Mr. Schroder: It read like the planters might be part of the drainage issue; are they causing the problem draining into the garage? (Mr. Nathan Nosari, General Manager, Village at Breckenridge HOA and Mr. Ed Scutellaro, Village at Breckenridge HOA Plaza Committee Chairperson: We've had problems with the planters; the rubberized membrane throughout the plaza and planters is old and not working. The planters are contributing to the problem. We will have mobile planters that are a seating bench and a ski and bike rack. If we have activities on the plaza we can move these, and we believe that it will provide everything we want including aesthetics. We have a prototype picture for you. It should give us back our landscaping and be more waterproofing with a tub; more functional. The pavers will look good; if we have a leak in our tubing we can pull the paver area up and repair the problem. This will be a fully functional water proof on top with edge to edge snow melt up top and better traffic flow for pedestrians. The issue now is the snow melts below the pavers and then freezes. There will be concrete, membrane and the tubing and the drains.) Why are the planters movable? (Mr. Nosari: We are designing the plaza to be multi-functional as it is currently underutilized and worn. We are adding facilities for this to turn into a stage or be used for art events.) (Ms. Puester: The moveable planters only have perennials, but no trees at this point?) (Mr. Nosari: Not sure there could be a tree in them but will depend on the final design.)
- Ms. Leidal: How many of the moveable planters? (Mr. Nosari: We are still determining this, but likely around six. These are not part of the application.) Would you be willing to add these to the project? (Mr. Scutellaro: We are worried about budget and worried about getting this project done on time. If it doesn't fit with our capital project, it will be planned for the future plans. The cost for these six planters as currently designed is \$120,000.) (Mr. Nosari: We need this project done by November 2016, and we want these racks included in the project.)
- Ms. Dudney: I really appreciate the improvement of this public space and it is much needed. It will look so much better and we will all enjoy it. (Mr. Scutellaro: It is self serving because we need the garage to be improved. We want it to look good too. Also, there will be a compass rose made out of pavers to replace the Gazebo.)
- Mr. Pringle: Mr. LaChance, will there be any analysis for the landscaping being removed? (Mr. LaChance: I can speak to that.) (Ms. Puester: We dug through the files and didn't see any points awarded to landscaping in the plaza area. The policy talks to negative points being applicable when it is not adequate from a public right of way, adjacent properties and other visual corridors. Because this is an internal plaza, and not along a public right of way or adjacent property we couldn't find any precedence for awarding any points in terms of landscaping. We saw staff reports, but didn't find any preexisting points awarded to the plaza either. That and since it was internal to the project, we didn't have any concerns with the loss of trees.)
- Ms. Leidal: Did you find an approved landscape plan? (Ms. Puester: We didn't find a formal approved landscape plan for the permit. Most of the staff reports on file through the years discussed the entirety of the master plan of this area which included the Bell Towner Mall and the Marriott (on the river); they primarily spoke to landscaping around the river, but not specifically this plaza. These plans dated back to 1978.)
- Mr. Pringle: I would be surprised if we didn't have a landscape plan, because it was a significant project back then. (Ms. Puester: We did find a master plan but that landscaping shown didn't tie landscaping to a site specific location, although there were trees depicted in the master plan.) Do we have an understanding / requirement for what they are proposing in terms of planters? (Ms. Puester: We didn't include that as the applicant doesn't want to set it in stone at this stage. If they want to present the planters as a Class D Minor, we would like to see

and encourage that.)

- Ms. Leidal: I have the same concerns as you with Absolute Policy 22 about replacing and maintaining trees in an approved plan, but we don't have a formal plan. I read this policy over and over and would like to see something added to the policy with regard to replacing landscape. I would like to revise this landscape policy and discuss at the end of the meeting; there is a provision about maintaining landscape but it doesn't talk about replacing the landscape which I would like to see in there.
- Mr. Pringle: This will be the first of many large plaza improvements and large development improvements; we need to have a solid policy going forward.
- Mr. Schuman: What is the thought on the fire pit on the east side over by the Maggie side, by Taddeo's? (Mr. Nosari: We would like to bring some level of activity to Taddeo's. We are trying to entice and it is a nice view of the river.) (Mr. Scutellaro: We'd like to improve the south end. We'd like to come back to the Planning Commission at the completion of this plan and propose the moveable planters and discuss the type of plants and ask you at that time for your approval. We want this to be a nice plaza.)

Commissioner Final Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: I am very appreciative of this effort. When a project is being developed the developer benefits, but when you have a homeowners association spending dollars on a public space and to have them refurbish it at no expense to the taxpayer it is great. They are replacing a giant firepit that was underused and they are replacing them with 3 smaller, nicer firepits and they are getting negative points associated with it.
- Mr. Pringle: I agree that this is a great upgrade. I would like to push for a modification to the plan to include a landscape plan with the new planters; I would like this to be a condition of approval. (Ms. Puester: Let's ask the applicant if they would be agreeable for the landscape plan to be a condition of approval.) (Mr. Scutellaro: We do not have a problem with coming back to you at a later time with a landscape plan since we are planning on it anyway.)
- Mr. Lamb: I agree that this is a huge improvement over what is there; I'm not worried about the landscaping because I think the applicant wants this to look good. I like the idea of a portable planter which makes this space more flexible. (Mr. Nosari: The gazebo is being donated to the Breckenridge Nordic Center.)
- Mr. Schroder: This is repairing a water leakage that could be destructive to adjacent buildings and could be a major problem if not addressed. I appreciate this being called up. I'm ok with the point analysis for negative points and positive points, and I look forward to this increasing vitality in this area. I didn't realize that the current planter boxes are an impediment, but I think this is a net zero. The lighting is not a concern; I think you will be focused on making it better. (Mr. Nosari: The light fixtures are the standard Town light that are LED and dimmable and also timed. There will be energy conservation tactics.) I support a passing score of zero (0) points and that there is a Condition for a landscape plan.
- Mr. Schuman: I think this is a great proposal; I don't think we would typically see the removal of 12 trees and like the added condition.
- Ms. Leidal: I support staff's analysis and I appreciate the applicant's taking on the drainage issue. Thanks for offering to come back with your landscape plan. (Ms. Puester: Mr. Nosari, is there a chance to relocate the trees to other parts of the property?) (Mr. Nosari: We did relocate 6 of the healthiest trees, but the others weren't salvageable. We did relocate some shrubs around the ski school and around the bus stop.)
- Ms. Puester: The new Condition will be "Condition 18: Applicant shall submit and obtain approval for a new Class D Minor permit for a new plaza landscape plan." Staff can take this to the Planning Commission as a memo to keep the Commission aware.
- Mr. Pringle: I'm fine with it just getting staff approval. (Mr. Nosari: It is a priority for us.)
- Ms. Christopher: I concur with the other Commissioners that this is a great project and will add value to the

town.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Village at Breckenridge Plaza remodel, PL-2016-0007, 655 South Park Avenue, as presented by staff, 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 Village at Breckenridge Plaza remodel, PL-2016-0007, 655 South Park Avenue, together with the presented Findings and Conditions and the additional Condition 18 that, prior to Certificate of Completion, the applicant provide a new landscape plan and get approval from the staff on that plan. Mr. Schuman seconded and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Hester Fence Variance (CK) PL-2016-0014, 432 Golden Age Drive

Mr. Kulick presented an application to request a variance to obtain approval for a 100 foot long fence to prevent snowdrift onto their property. In the summer of 2013, the USFS cut a section of trees to the south of the property. It also appears that the adjacent lot to the west has done wildfire mitigation, removing trees adjacent to the property. The Hester Residence was approved in 2011 and completed in March 2014. The rear outdoor living area in the southwest corner of the disturbance envelope includes a sitting area, recessed hot tub and gas fireplace. Upon the completion of the residence, the owners began having issues with snow accumulation at the outdoor space. The applicants constructed a 100 foot long fence between their property and Lot 58 (47 Peabody Terrace) to the west. The fence is 80 feet from the Peabody Right of Way and approximately 7 feet from the west side property line between the two homes (shown with the green arrow). The applicants constructed the fence without a development permit. They have stated that this is not a privacy fence and its intent is to avoid snow accumulation, large snow drifts and over hanging cornices that could result in a safety hazard to people using the outdoor space.

Section 9-1-19-47 Absolute, Fences, Gates and Gateway Entrance Monuments, details restrictions and exceptions for fences. One of the exceptions is privacy fencing to screen hot tubs. Fences are to have an open character and a maximum solid to void ratio of one to three (1:3). Privacy fences around hot tubs and spas shall not exceed six feet (6') in height and shall not exceed fifteen feet (15') in total length.

Variations may be granted if the applicant proves a physical hardship and the Commission finds ALL of the following:

- 1) There are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land, buildings, topography, vegetation, or other matters on the subject lot which would substantially restrict the effectiveness of the development in question; provided, however, that such special circumstances or conditions are unique to the particular use of which the applicant desires a variance and do not apply generally to all uses.
- 2) That such special circumstances were not created by the applicant.
- 3) That the granting of the variance will be in general harmony with the purposes of this chapter, and will not be materially detrimental to the persons residing or working in the vicinity, to the adjacent property, to the neighborhood, or to the public welfare in general.
- 4) The variance applied for does not depart from the provisions of this chapter any more than is required.

Staff does not support the variance request based on Section 9-1-11 (D) not being met. Staff finds no reason to assign positive or negative points under any Relative policies of the Development Code. The application fails Policy 47 (Absolute) Fences, Gates and Gateway Entrance Monuments and does not meet the Criteria for Approval for a Variance under 9-1-11 of the Town Code.

The Planning Department recommends denial of the Hester Fence Variance (PL-20106-0014) at Lot 57, Filing 10, Highlands at Breckenridge, 432 Golden Age Drive, with the presented Findings.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Would a temporary snow fence be allowed by the Town? (Mr. Kulick: I don't think so.) I built one in Blue River for this same purpose. I wonder if a snow fence for a road would ever be allowed in town?

Ms. Christopher: But if there are 15' snowdrifts, would it really come down? (Mr. Kulick: The issue is the overall length and design.) (Ms. Puester: If it was for a road, it would be deemed as a public improvement, but I don't recall this ever being a need before on roads in town or the highway.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Jim and Ms. Vanessa Hester:

Thanks for allowing us to have an opportunity to speak. I want to apologize for having the fence constructed without permission; this was our mistake and we just didn't know as we are new to the area. I think Mr. Kulick and Ms. Puester's report did a good job of describing what we are applying for but the real issue is safety. The winter of 2013-14, we had drifts that developed overhanging our hot tub and fire pit that were over 8-10' high as shown in your packet; we weren't living there during that season. This presented an obvious safety issue; if the snow came down on someone in the hot tub, it could bury them. The sole purpose of the fence is to prevent the obvious overhang. The fence is 40-50' from our hot tub and our fire pit. To ensure that the wind that comes down from the mountain, and we want to make sure that we block the wind, the 100' length was necessary to adequately address our safety concerns. Before we put in the fence we talked to a landscape architect to see if we could put in some landscaping, but the trees proposed were very costly and there was no assurance that it would fix the problem. We went with the fence, tried to go with something that was visibly appealing that was ok with the neighbors. We did integrate the fence with existing landscaping to make it more visibly appealing. There exists some heated pavement that contributes to the problem, so the snow wants to cornice over the heated area and over the hot tub. (Ms. Dudney: Could you explain the topography of the plan presented?) (The applicant described landscape and topography of this lot.) This has nothing to do with privacy, it has gaps between the rails; it is solely for safety. We discussed the 15' allowance for a hot tub privacy fence. 15' won't get us the protection we need from the snow drifting. In your packet there is a picture on pages 43-44 that shows the overhang on the hot tub. You can see how the snow caved in and damaged the hot tub. (Mr. Ethan Guerra, Contractor who built the house: I've lived in Breckenridge for 30 years and I took the picture. The previous winter we had no issues. The next summer they did the clear cut and then the huge cornice drifting snow came in after the clear cutting of the trees. It was jaw dropping how much the snow drifted in. My guys didn't want to clear it.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: The code doesn't allow this; are you the only homeowner that has this problem? (Mr. Hester: We are the only homeowner. I can't use the spaces as designed and approved and I can't have guests over to the home when I haven't been there because of the safety concerns. I do have snow removal responsibilities here but not this.)

Ms. Christopher: It sounds to me like it is a result from the adjacent clear cutting? (Mr. Kulick: It could be but it could be the location and the design of the space.) (Mr. Guerra: It was a result of the clear cut; as this problem did not exist before the clear cut. I was dumbfounded by this. I do avalanche control work at Breckenridge for the ski patrol. It provided the fetch area.)

Ms. Leidal: What direction is the clear cut? (Mr. Hester: It is to the south west of the property.) (Mr. Guerra: I'm a strong advocate for the fence, but my staff was afraid to climb in there and shovel the snow off. I don't see snow like that.) (Mr. Hester: Since the fence has been up, the depth is no more than the natural depth of the snow, no more than about 3'.)

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

Commissioner Final:

- Ms. Dudney: I understand how different things are here as opposed to Texas, but we have a zoning code and our job is to enforce the zoning code. And when you have an absolute policy a variance is very hard to get. We have to think about the precedent that is set and can you meet the variance requirements. I think you can solve your problem with spruce trees for about \$800 a piece. I can't agree with this variance; it is bad precedent. Even though it is dangerous, you don't have to go out to the hot tub. You can put up the hot tub fence, move the hot tub or put up trees.
- Mr. Pringle: I concur with Ms. Dudney's analysis. It is a bad precedent for us to grant this variance. Incidentally, in Kansas there are trees that are placed as a snow barrier all over the place.
- Mr. Lamb: I work for the forest service but I didn't cut the trees. I appreciate you working with the staff and your neighbors. I think the spruce trees are a good idea but I think if we approve this we will have a precedent. I don't think this is a special unique circumstance to this property; other people have this problem.
- Mr. Schroder: Maybe number 3 of 4 could be met but to grant a variance, it says that it has to be in harmony with the chapter. The condition was created by you and the design of your own property. The final condition of what the neighbor does is for you to deal with. We do feel badly for you. I'm not happy to see the cornice, but the code doesn't allow me to say ok to the fence based the four variance criteria.
- Mr. Schuman: I too agree with the other Commissioners. And I do support the denial to the variance.
- Ms. Leidal: I agree with the other Commissioners, and the staff analysis. We live in a unique environment and are bound to deal with these types of issues.
- Ms. Dudney: We have a quasi judicial role; the importance is that we need to be consistent to the code. We try very hard not to have variances so that others can anticipate what is going to happen. I know that seems harsh right now but it provides a fair process for all.
- Mr. Lamb: We sympathize.
- Ms. Christopher: I have compassion; I know that it is hard to live at 10,000 feet. I personally walk through 8' of snow to access my home. That is something we have to live through, but we must live with the code.
- Mr. Pringle: Point of clarification, if we find for denial, does this mean that the fence must be removed immediately? (Ms. Puester: We will work with the applicant on the removal date. That is where this all started when we sent a notice. We let them keep the fence up during the variance process so they wouldn't be possibly taking it down and putting it back up if it was approved. The removal of the fence may be in the spring now with the snow. With the neighbors not complaining I think that is acceptable if this is denied.)

Mr. Pringle made a motion to accept the point analysis showing no point assignment or zero points for the Hester Fence Variance, PL-2016-0014, 432 Golden Age Drive. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to recommend denial of the Hester Fence Variance, PL-2016-0014, 432 Golden Age Drive, with the presented denial findings and failure of Absolute Policy 47. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Hester: How will planting the spruce trees work with the defensible space requirements? (Ms. Puester: You can call me tomorrow and staff can work with you to discuss possible solutions using landscaping.)

OTHER MATTERS:

1) Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2016

Mr. Lamb made a motion to nominate Mr. Ron Schuman as Chair of the Planning Commission through October 31, 2016. Ms. Dudney seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0). (Mr. Pringle: Are

there Commissioners up in November? (Ms. Puester: Yes, there will be 3 up and if things change we could go through this again depending on who is appointed.)

Ms. Dudney made a motion to nominate Mr. Schroder as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission. Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Village at Breckenridge Plaza Renovation Call Up:

Ms. Leidal: I struggled with the Call Up because we work so hard to maintain landscaping and I don't see anything in the code that discusses replacement of landscaping. Section E, 1. and 2., Policy 22A, it talks about landscaping in an originally approved plan. I think we should consider adding "replacing existing landscaping". What if someone in the historic district wants to come down and cut down trees when they don't have an approved plan? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Why don't you allow us to take a look at this? Anyone who is coming to us with a remodel or addition, we would be working with a plan and point analysis and if they were modifying a property with a modern-day plan it would earn negative or positive points. This one was an oddball plan because it was initially approved in 1978, but we didn't have a real comparable code to what we have now.) (Ms. Puester: I found a point analysis from 1978 for a master plan for the entire area, but it didn't have a landscape plan.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The landscape policy and point analysis has changed since then, reconciling old plans with new point analysis during updates & remodels can be challenging. We will talk about it internally and come back to you.)

Mr. Pringle: If points were awarded for landscaping but the landscaping goes away with new modern point analysis, how do we reconcile it? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, I see your point. If someone came in wanting to put in parking with landscape this would be a problem.) (Ms. Puester: Yes, and Ms. Leidal makes a good point with the new defensible space requirement.) We should be ahead of the curve of this one.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair