

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Ron Schuman Dan Schroder Jim Lamb
Gretchen Dudney Christie Mathews-Leidal Mike Giller
Dave Pringle
Mayor John Warner, Town Council

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the February 16, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 1, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Warner:

- Capital projects: The Iron Springs highway project will happen this summer. Despite the fact that the highway department forgot that the portion of the hill down to Frisco will need to be widened as well; they are trying to figure that out now.
- Several meetings on Feb 18 with the parking consultants. In April the consultants will bring some suggestions and recommendations for Council to decide upon. A lot was discussed including management of vehicles, pedestrian crossing and lighting.
- Approved the Kingdom Park playground that will be built this summer. A roof will be placed on outside Ice Arena this summer. This won't be enclosed, but will be better for snow removal and improve use.
- The 4 O'Clock Road roundabout will happen this summer; all the easements were procured.
- Revenue for 2015 was up 11% over budget and expenses are down 4%. The only segment that was down was marijuana retail sales. More competition in the County may have lead to this decrease.
- We had a request for a license change from medical to retail marijuana.
- Passed a lift ticket ordinance that will create a way to collect money for the Town on day and multi-use tickets. This will be about \$3.5 million for transportation issues.
- We upheld your fence denial from a few weeks ago and it wasn't called up.
- This is my last month as Mayor and I wanted to thank you all for all of your hard work over my 8 years as mayor. This is one of the toughest jobs in the Town of Breckenridge and the Town is better for your efforts.

Mr. Schuman introduced Mr. Mike Giller, the newest member of the Planning Commission. Mr. Giller was appointed by the Town Council at the February 23 meeting and he will serve out the remainder of Ms. Christopher's term until October 31, 2018.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

- 1) Miles Residence (CL) PL-2016-0021, 2289 Highlands Drive
- 2) Budzynski Residence (CK) PL-2016-0044, 540 Highlands Drive

Ms. Dudney made a motion to call up the Budzynski Residence, PL-2016-0044, 540 Highlands Drive, for further discussion. Mr. Pringle Seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: My questions relate to the retaining wall, I was confused in the drawing. Is it an 8' retaining

wall on the uphill side by the driveway? Trail above. (Mr. Kulick: Yes, it is an 8 foot wall most all the way.) We've had cases with retaining walls like this like with Pinewood, where they put up a split rail fence for safety reasons when there was a trail above. Was this considered here? (Mr. Kulick: The Middle Flume trail is above the retaining wall and at its closest point it is about 20 feet away.) I know this area is heavily traveled, and an 8 foot drop seems like a lot. Also, I have a question about the line of the trail. (Mr. Kulick: Yes, this is the trail; it is marked on the plans with non-standard shading.) The high retaining wall seems unsafe and we just had a case last week of an example of a wall drop and the incredible blowing of the snow. (Mr. Mosher: Our fence ordinance allows them to put fences around public trails. So if this was to be considered the applicants could put a fence up along the edge of the trail.) So there are not any concerns about this height of a wall to be used as a warning? (Mr. Mosher: No, not a planning code issue but could possibly be a building code issue.) (Mr. Kulick: This is a 9 acre lot that has a section of the Upper Flume trail on it as well.)

Mr. Pringle: Is there no way to split this wall into two four foot sections? (Mr. Kulick: There is probably a way but the applicants were willing to take the points.) (Ms. Puester: Right where the hammer head driveway is they have a fence; they would need a variance.) (Mr. Mosher: A public easement is where you are allowed to have a fence.)

Ms. Dudney: I guess you are telling me that they are following the code, but I think they are making a design error where someone could fall.

Mr. Pringle: I know that the code now allows for one large wall, but I don't think it obliterates the idea of having two 4 foot sections of the wall and only where absolutely necessary have the 8 foot section. Then mitigate with landscaping to screen the large wall. (Mr. Kulick: They got the positive points for landscaping because they put the trees to screen driveway from the right of way. We pointed out that they would get the negative points for the 8 foot wall but they were willing to make it up elsewhere. Unfortunately, neither the applicant nor the architect is here tonight to ask them if they could change the proposed wall.) I'm not going to get down to locations of trees, but I was hoping they would screen the 8 foot wall better. (Ms. Puester: The fence could be allowed along a public trail on public property (by the Town) and not need a variance to be there. If this goes forward tonight, we have to have add a condition that the fence as shown on the applicant's property, be removed and then they can apply for a variance if they want it. Other option is to work with the Town to put a fence in the Town easement without a variance.)

Ms. Dudney: Our code is great, but this is one of the drawbacks where they can mitigate the 8 foot wall with landscaping, but I think we have to allow it. Per the code they should take out the section of split rail fence by the hammerhead.

Mr. Schroder: It would be easier to choose not to apply for the variance.

Mr. Pringle: I'm surprised that the building code doesn't require a fence around this 8 foot wall. (Mr. Kulick: I don't know if it is in the building code or not. They will have to meet building code to have their building permit approved.)

Ms. Dudney: What do the other Commissioners think?

Mr. Lamb: I think it meets the code.

Mr. Giller: The building codes deal with site safety, but I agree that it is much safer to have two 4 foot walls.

Ms. Leidal: I understand that this meets code and I think we should put a condition to remove the fence by the hammer head, unless they put it in the public easement.

Mr. Schroder: Would the Town pay for fence? (Mr. Mosher: The Town works on a case by case basis but they would waive the variance if they build the fence in the town easement with Open Space approval.)

Mr. Pringle: Is there any traction to ask them to put in place the two 4 foot walls? (Mr. Grosshuesch: They made up the points.) I thought we changed the policy to say that the 8 foot wall goes in

without points if it results in less site disturbance? (Ms. Puester: No we took that suggestion to Planning Commission and were directed not to change it.)

Ms. Dudney: I propose that we put this on our list to work on the 8' wall issue. (Mr. Grosshuesch: It is more of a disturbance to put in two 4 foot wall sections, so this isn't a simple issue.) (Ms. Puester: We do see homeowners come forward for variances when they see how much public uses the trails after they construct their house.) (Mr. Kulick: This section of trail is on grade and very close to the Highlands Drive crossing, it is not an area where people are traveling or biking at a very fast rate. Something would really have to go wrong for them to be pitched toward the 8 foot wall.) Could I just ask that you speak to the applicant and let them know of our concerns with the 8 foot wall and for them to consider adding a fence in the variance? (Mr. Kulick: Certainly.)

Mr. Schuman: It doesn't matter what policy we change, it is a cat and mouse game where they will be able to work around the situation no matter what. (Ms. Puester: I suggest an additional condition of approval: "Condition 22: Applicant shall remove the split rail fence on the proposed plan and may apply for a variance under Policy 47 (Absolute) Fences, Gates and Gateway Entrance Monuments, Subsection K, if desired.")

Ms. Dudney made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Budzynski Residence, PL-2016-0044, 540 Highlands Drive. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Dudney made a motion to approve the Budzynski Residence, PL-2016-0044, 540 Highlands Drive, with the presented findings and conditions and the addition of the Condition 22, as read into the record by Ms. Puester. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

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

COMBINED HEARINGS:

Mr. Schuman recued himself as he is the Manager for Gold Creek Condominiums. Mr. Schuman left the meeting and left Mr. Schroder to run this section of the meeting.

1) AT&T Gold Creek Condominium Modification (MM) PL-2016-0016, 326 North Main Street

Mr. Mosher presented an application to install permanent screening for the existing temporary canvas-screened wireless antenna array. The antennas are to be located inside three enclosed structures on the roof at the north, east and west elevations. The walls are to be constructed of fiberglass manufactured to appear the same as the exterior materials of the Gold Creek Condominium building. The roof forms are simple sheds with a standing seam finish.

The HOA at Gold Creek Condominiums are not acting on the approved remodel that showed gable enclosures for the antenna screening. Since AT&T is still subject to the deadline requiring permanent screening of the cellular antennae, the design of the roof structures has been modified. Instead of a gable roof form for each structure, a simple shed form was suggested in keeping with the existing, and very simple, Gold Creek Condominium architecture. If, at some time in the future, the HOA decides to act on a remodel, the AT&T screening structures may be redesigned and incorporated into the remodel architecture of the building.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): Staff finds no Relative policies under which positive or negative points should be assigned and that the application meets all applicable Absolute policies. Overall, the simple shed forms that match the finishes of the existing building provide the least visual impact to the building.

The Planning Department recommended that the Planning Commission approve the point analysis for the Permanent AT&T Wireless Communications Facility at Gold Creek Condominiums, PL-2016-0016, 326 North Main Street, showing a passing score of zero (0) points.

The Planning Department recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Permanent AT&T Wireless Communication Facility at Gold Creek Condominiums, PL-2016-0016, 326 North Main Street, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Have we been “had” on this deal? (Mr. Mosher: Not really. The whole legality of the equipment has gone through our attorney; staff did go back and asked AT&T if they could make them less intrusive.) Thank goodness you required them to go the first round as a “temporary” solution and make them come back to permanently screen. I don’t know what the homeowners were thinking, but we went through a lot of time and trouble to discuss their refurbishment. Is it possible that a building can have one of these installed and have it be 10’ high no matter where? (Ms. Puester: This will be a topic brought up under work session at the next Commission meeting. We were waiting for some court cases to come through so the policy had been put on hold and revised since you saw it last year. We will discuss aesthetics that also comply with the federal regulation.) There is no way to wait for this new policy to process this application? (Ms. Puester: No, there are some federal regulations on deadlines for this and they have applied prior to.)

Mr. Pringle: Is it necessary that we actually build these or can we live with these the way they are now? I think the structures will call more attention. (Mr. Mosher: The temporary fabric covering will not stand up in the elements much longer. The proposed are following the same line as the fabric covering just in more permanent material.) (Ms. Puester: The mounting structures that these are on are pretty deep. Priority Policy 261 requires mechanical to be screened on the roof. The new policy we are working on would have them look at more camouflage hopefully, working with what we have right now.)

Ms. Leidal: I took a picture; will the new proposed enclosure enclose the braces? (Mr. Mosher: The braces come down.) This is equipment screening as opposed to mass? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, and we spoke to the Town attorney about this.)

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Brendan Thompson, Pinnacle Consulting, representing AT&T:

Originally this was designed to match a remodel of the entire building. Unfortunately, the HOA didn’t move forward with that but we had hoped to put this in the originally designed gable-cupola. We are trying to match the existing material and character of the building. Plus we are trying hard to not draw attention to the enclosures as much as possible. The existing braces for the temporary covers will go away and the structural area will be the “box” enclosing the antennas. We can’t make the antennas lower because there aren’t a lot of tall roofs around Breckenridge and cell tower needs height for better signal service. Also, on the front there is a property line and a street so we couldn’t put it on the ground or over the edge of the building. (Mr. Mosher: I did put in the report that if the association moves forward with the remodel the original gable shaped enclosures could be brought back.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Leidal: Looking at the site plan, I’m assuming that the structures are at certain angles for best service. (Mr. Thompson: In order to provide the best signal, we had to put the antenna at angles but put them in the boxes squarely so that they could function properly.) Does the north box need to be that wide? (Mr. Thompson: We were trying to make all of the enclosures have architectural symmetry.)

Mr. Pringle: What is the likelihood that changing technology would make these go away? (Mr. Thompson: Most likely they won’t go away because the traffic for cell service is constantly growing so much.) If the Town developed a distributive network would that make something like this go away? (Mr. Thompson: This facility would likely fit into a proposed distributive network and

still be used. The sites around town would tie into a facility like we have in the basement of the building. The capacity issue is what will continue to make it necessary to have this site.)

Mr. Giller: The report mentioned that they sit 3 inches to 6 inches back from the roof, but the plan shows them hanging over 2 feet to 3 feet. In the North view the plan shows something different. Can they be inset a few feet from the edge? (Mr. Mosher: These are over the stairwell covers, behind the roofline.) (Mr. Thompson: They actually need to be set near the edge for the antennas to reach service users down below.) But on page 53 of the packet, the East and West are not on the edge, so the question is do they have to sit by the edge or could they set in a couple of feet? (Mr. Thompson: In order for this to work most effectively they have to be there; actually, the RF engineers wanted them to hang more over the edge, but we denied this based on visual impact.) So, not exactly like what is shown in the plan, but more in the rendering? (Mr. Thompson: Yes.)

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Final Comments:

Mr. Lamb: I think this is a public safety thing. During Christmas and Spring Break, I get dropped calls all the time. I don't think we are ruining the aesthetic appeal of the building. I think this design is better than the old one as it seemed like they were trying to mix two styles. We did the field trip to Vail and I would like to see the Town go that direction (DAS). I support it.

Mr. Pringle: I don't have any problem with the antenna up there but there was a lot of indigestion when they went up initially. I don't know why we can't have the cans stick up and call them what they are. I don't think that screening them is better. I would have rather seen the cans up there and call it good. The words "permanent" and "solution" go together here. I would like to see less structure up there. I don't think is the right way to go but I will support it.

Ms. Dudney: I don't love it, but I'm ok with it.

Mr. Giller: This is a necessary, I agree, but I would rather see it constructed as it was depicted on Sheet A1 on the east and west. I support it.

Ms. Leidal: I agree that in the name of trying to satisfy the code we are drawing more attention to this but I support it. I look forward to the Code change discussion in two weeks to address this situation and come up with a better policy for the future.

Mr. Schroder: Architecture standards and Policy 276 say that mechanical needs to be screened; hiding this is what the code requires and you've done a good job trying match. I agree that it is public safety.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis for the AT&T Gold Creek Condominium Modification, PL-2016-0016, 326 North Main Street, showing a passing score of zero (0) points. Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the AT&T Gold Creek Condominium Modification, PL-2016-0016, 326 North Main Street, with the presented Findings and Conditions (including the new addition presented this evening of Finding #7 to combine the hearings). Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Schuman rejoined the meeting and regained the role of Chair of the Commission for the remainder of the meeting.

2) Re-subdivision of Tracts C & D, Runway Subdivision (aka Colorado Mountain College) (JP) PL-2016-0038, 107 Denison Placer Road

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to re-subdivide Tracts C and D to create one new tract (Tract D-2) for a total

of three tracts. The plans for the Blue River reconstruction were recently finalized and there is little realignment on the Town owned Tract C therefore, the Town does not need Tract C. CMC was interested in acquiring Tract C because it is immediately adjacent to their campus and they can use that property as they work toward their campus master plan. As the Town did not have a use for Tract C, it was acceptable to swapping that Tract in return for an equal sized parcel which could incorporate future workforce housing.

The Town is currently working with Colorado Mountain College on the land swap. The land swap would reallocate the proposed Tract D-2, 1.05 acre piece of property at the south end of Tract D to the Town. The Town-owned 1.05 acre Tract C to the northeast of Tract D would be conveyed to CMC.

The proposed new Tract D-2 is the site of a potential workforce housing development by the Town of Breckenridge currently under review.

With the proposed re-subdivision, a portion of the 50 foot river and pedestrian easement on Tract D, adjacent to Tract C is being vacated and relocated on the eastern property line on Tract C, adjacent to Tract B. The river realignment plans for the Blue River in this area have recently been completed and approved by the Army Corps of Engineers with realignment work being started this summer. The new location of the 50 foot easement align with the approved river realignment plans and is contiguous with the existing 50 foot river and pedestrian easement. A new 5 foot public road easement runs along the north property line of both Tract D and Tract C to include the existing roadway alignment.

As this is a re-subdivision of a previously approved subdivision, Staff finds that no applicable subdivision codes have been modified that would alter the previously approved subdivision. Staff had no concerns with the resubdivision of the two parcels.

The subdivision proposal is in general compliance with the Subdivision Standards. Staff recommended approval of the Re-subdivision of Tracts C and D, Runway Subdivision, PL-2016-0038, 107 Denison Placer Road, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Is there any relevance that came up today at the field trip? (Ms. Puester: The field trip today didn't have anything to do with this topic.)

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Jason Ford, 452 SCR 672: What you are covering tonight is just the land swap? (Ms. Puester: Yes.)

There was no further public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Final Comments:

Mr. Schroder: It seems the pieces are in the right spot and it seems like the right thing to do.

Ms. Leidal: This is a technical requirement and it meets our standards. I support it.

Mr. Giller: This is a win-win.

Mr. Lamb: I also support it.

Mr. Pringle: No comments.

Ms. Dudney: I support it.

Mr. Schuman: I also agree with the comments and I support it.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve the Re-subdivision of Tracts C & D, Runway Subdivision (aka Colorado Mountain College), PL-2016-0038, 107 Denison Placer Road, with the presented Findings and Conditions. Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

3) Pho Real Large Vendor Cart (CK) PL-2016-0023, 429 North Park Avenue

Mr. Kulick presented an application to install a 96 square foot large vendor cart and deck on a section of paved parking on the undeveloped Parcel A, Parkway Center sub. Site upgrades include potted evergreen trees, and outside seating for customers. This proposal falls under Policy 49 (Absolute) Vendor Carts adopted May 2, 2012. This vendor cart is classified as a large vendor cart per Section 9-1-5 Definitions as it is more than 40 square feet (cart is 96 sq. ft., by this ordinance it cannot exceed 100 sq. ft.) and will not be removed each day. The proposed large vendor cart will complement the surrounding building character of the one existing building of the overall site to the east by use of 2 x Channel Lap Siding, Glu-lam Timbers, Glu-lam rails and 3 ½" lattice. The proposal also includes wrapping the vendor cart with 530 sq. ft. deck. The applicant proposes to paint the siding, trim and rails of the cart and use stain on the deck base. The landscaping proposed includes six potted evergreen trees of 2 to 3 feet in height. There are a total of 27 parking spaces currently on the property. The proposal will eliminate 4 of those spaces, resulting in 23 remaining spaces to accommodate customers and employees. There will be a propane tank on the property which would be considered commercial storage and we would ask that the Commission make an additional condition that this tank be screened.

Staff has advised the applicants that, separate from this development permit, an approval from Red, White and Blue Fire District is required for the cart and the propane tank. The proposal meets the requirements of Policy 49 (Absolute) Vendor Carts and all other Absolute Policies. Staff found no reason to assign positive or negative points under any Relative Policies.

The Planning Department recommended approval of the point analysis for the Pho Real large vendor cart, PL-2016-0023, 429 North Park Avenue, showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points and compliance with all Absolute policies.

The Planning Department recommended approval of the Pho Real large vendor cart, PL-2016-0023, 429 North Park Avenue, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Leidal: I didn't see any lights on the application. Would this happen later? (Mr. Kulick: None proposed. If with a sign application, it would be a separate application review.)
- Mr. Giller: Any furniture / seating with the plan? (Mr. Kulick: There is a proposal for some patio furniture: 3 tables, 12 seats.)
- Mr. Pringle: I thought we made an effort to get rid of propane tanks once upon a time? (Mr. Mosher: The vendor carts are more mobile so this may be the only choice.) But they are using water and sewer? (Mr. Kulick: Correct, they are hooked up to water and sewer. There is another large vendor cart that is using propane.) How big? (Mr. Kulick: A 500 gallon propane tank is proposed.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Chad Washenfelder: I think Mr. Kulick did a great job, but if anyone has questions, please let me know.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schuman: A 500 gallon propane tank seems large. (Mr. Kulick: Red, White and Blue will have to give approval as well.) Did you know there are no sandwich board signs allowed? (Mr. Washenfelder: Yes I saw that.)
- Mr. Pringle: Did you look at other options than the propane? (Mr. Washenfelder: On recommendation from the equipment manufacture, it was suggested that the propane was the best way to go for the equipment and the elevation.)
- Ms. Leidal: If after 3 years you are wildly successful, what is the plan, will it be to remediate the site?

Would you be opposed to add a condition of approval saying that if you move on, the site will be put back? I'm concerned that this temporary structure will become a permanent structure. (Ms. Puester: We have the ability to ask to make it a condition of approval that if you move elsewhere that you will remove the cart, deck and the propane tank.) (Mr. Washenfelder: We agree not to abandon it, but if we sell it we will leave it for the new buyer.)

Mr. Schuman: Is there anything in the application that requires them to remove it? (Ms. Puester: We can add it as a condition of approval under this policy.)

Ms. Dudney: This is a ground lease? The owner of the ground will not want let them leave it so I'm not concerned.

Mr. Schuman: This is dedicated parking so that when this pad gets developed the parking has to go back.

Ms. Dudney: I'm fine with adding a condition.

Mr. Schroder: I'm fine adding that too.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Final Comments:

Mr. Lamb: I think the vendor cart ordinance has served us well; this is a text book example of how to do it. I don't think the vendor cart would be left abandoned because they are too pricey. I support it.

Mr. Pringle: I still don't understand why we are allowing a 500 gallon propane tank; I don't think this appropriate. I would like us to consider looking at this issue in the future. I believe that the ground is too valuable to currently leave, but we don't know what the future holds, so I would support a condition to remove.

Ms. Dudney: I agree with Mr. Lamb; I look forward to seeing new businesses and wish you good luck.

Mr. Schroder: It meets all the code and I look forward to the installation.

Ms. Leidal: I support staff's work on this and thanks to agree the screening the tank and providing some landscape.

Mr. Giller: I too welcome the business; the 500 gallon tank is long and I would think you could get a trailer that is natural gas powered or smaller tank. I wish great success.

Mr. Schuman: I think that Red, White and Blue Fire will ensure that it is safe and staff will make sure it is screened. (Ms. Puester noted two new conditions: Condition #15 "Applicant shall screen the propane tank in a manner approved by the Town per the Development Code." and Condition #16 "Applicant shall remove the cart and all associated improvements once the vendor cart stops operating for a period of 6 months or the permit expires, whichever is sooner.") (Mr. Washenfelder: I am concerned that if the cart changes ownership that the new owner would not have to remove it. It was discussed that a new operator would have to apply for a business license that would carry the same condition as the new owner.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The land owner will have to sign the conditions. The condition will not limit a new owner to have it unless their permit expires.)

Mr. Pringle: I thought we talked about this already with the vendor cart ordinance? (Ms. Puester: A removal provision is in the policy under the grandfathered vendor carts but not included for new ones.)

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Pho Real Large Vendor Cart, PL-2016-0023, 429 North Park Avenue, showing a passing score of zero (0) points. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Pho Real Large Vendor Cart, PL-2016-0023, 429 North Park Avenue, with the presented findings and conditions with the addition of condition #15 and condition #16 as they were read into the record. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Puester:

- We have a site visit at noon on March 15 at Denison Placer and that evening we will be discussing the architecture.
- The tree mitigation that Ms. Leidal brought up last meeting has been added to Top 10 List.
- Lincoln Park Update: Things are moving and shaking out there that you are not seeing as the applications are Class D Majors. We are processing multiple applications. What was handed out on the map this evening in green has a building permit, there are 6 triplexes that are approved and there are 4 single family homes that are under planning review. Another 3 single families are under review and one more lot is left in Phase 1. Phase 1 is almost done and you will see a proposal to subdivide Phase 2 soon. We continue to have a lot of single families in general throughout Town right now being processed as Class D Majors. This will still be presented in the quarterly report for your review, but since Lincoln Park is a hot topic, we wanted to let the Commission know that project status in case you get questions. (Mr. Pringle: Will we see a plan for all the parks that were promised?) Vern Johnson memorial park is on Mr. Mosher's desk right now; that is in phase 2.
- (Mr. Schuman: Is it a good idea to give a good idea to let Commissioners to know Cucumber Creek Estates will be on the March 15 meeting?) We walked through the property and got a good understanding for trees, topography, trails; this will come before you on the 15th of March. If you have questions, let us know. That will be a preliminary hearing.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair