

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Ron Schuman Dan Schroder Gretchen Dudney
Christie Mathews-Leidal Mike Giller Dave Pringle
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison
Mr. Lamb was absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schuman: On page 6, when I recused myself from the meeting, it says “the applicant / owner for the AT&T Gold Creek Condominiums.” Please change to “the Manager of Gold Creek Condominiums.”

With no other changes, the March 1, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Puester added the topic of Worker’s Compensation Policy to Other Matters at the end of the meeting.

With no other changes, the March 15, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

- 1) Breckenridge Grand Vacations Seasonal Tent (CK) PL-2016-0040, 1979 Ski Hill Road
- 2) Beaver Run Summer Tent (MM) PL-2016-0027, 620 Village Road
- 3) Budzynski Shock Hill Residence (MM) PL-2016-0034, 104 Penn Lode Drive
- 4) Hermanson Residence (CK) PL-2016-0052, 220 Briar Rose Lane

With no requests for call up, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- A couple things to report. Lift ticket tax ordinance following up on 2A vote. Rules and procedure for Breckenridge only lift ticket. Close to having ordinance finalized. A lot of procedural work goes along with what we already passed.
- Interesting discussion on marijuana ordinance. Applicant who had a medical marijuana license is interested in trying to convert into retail license. At first it seemed easy thing to do and reasonable, but when we looked into it more and realized we had a moratorium that ends in May and whether it will remain or if new applicants will be allowed to apply; by allowing this applicant to get a retail license there could be unintended consequences. The applicant could sell at an inflated value. Evening session Mayor Warner asked if anyone was willing to make a motion to allow the applicant to get license, motion failed. Next time marijuana will be visited will be in May with new Council, which could encompass this request.
- The other thing discussed at length is that the ski area came to us requesting extended hours on gondola. We got into a lengthy discussion. We talked about leverage and other things including the paving of the south gondola lot. We would consider those extended hours; however, there is always concern with environmental impact with Cucumber Gulch. The ball is back in the ski area’s court to come back and finalize. We expect to have a new agreement regarding extended gondola hours. Gondola is a great ski area transportation system. It certainly should not be at the expense of our preserve in Cucumber Gulch. Anytime we can get more people out of cars and lighten up the use of Ski Hill Road that is a plus. Who would rather have a pleasant ride into town and not have to look for that elusive parking space? All those things in the works.
- One more announcement: Given that I am a candidate for the upcoming election, I will not be in attendance on April 5th, election night. Thank you all for serving on the Commission and it has been a

pleasure.

- (Ms. Dudney: What about the Peaks trail not being done until 2018?) The idea is hopefully it will lighten up the use elsewhere. They have to approve it and they have a plan for doing that. I don't know where it comes down. (Mr. Kulick: It has to stay on grade and has to stay above the alpine slide. The ski area built a flow trail. We built one parallel next to Timber trail. This will be the piece in between. We don't want people on bikes where we have to create a dismount zone. All parties have been in agreement that it will be a good solution. It just means we have to start it further back.)

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Denison Placer (JP)

Ms. Puester presented. The Planning Commission reviewed the two Denison Placer projects as a work session item on October 20, 2015 and on February 2, 2016 as a preliminary hearing. At the preliminary hearing a Commissioner voiced the desire for additional time to review the project before the final hearing, which is schedule for April 5th. Specifically the architecture as there were multiple building types proposed, and it is a pretty large project. Staff arranged a Planning Commission site visit (earlier this afternoon) and tonight's work session to focus on the architecture to allow more time for review.

The Denison Placer development consists of two phases. Phase 1 is the Low Income Tax Credit (LITC) project and contains 66 workforce rental townhome and apartment units (43 single family equivalents) in fifteen buildings, a neighborhood community center including manager office and associated parking on approximately 4.5 acres. Phase 2 consists of 30 workforce rental apartment units (13 single family equivalents) in three buildings on approximately 1.05 acres. Phase 1 has a Community Building and six building types (Two are type A, two are type B1, four are type B2, three are type C, two are type D and two are type E with three stories; eight 2 bedrooms each). Phase 2 has two building types (two are type F1 with 6 studios and 4 one bedrooms; one is type F2 with 8 studios, 2 one bedrooms with balconies, and 31 storage lockers).

I wanted to talk about a few things that apply to all the buildings first and then delve further into the individual unique aspects on the buildings. Over the entirety of this land use district, we have a 35' height max mean height. These buildings are all below that. Ranges 24'3" to 32'6" for all buildings in phase 1 and in phase 2 is 33'11" to 34'-11". Even if you measure to the ridge versus the mean, they are below 35'. We Highway 9 is running on east side, and then you have the river and where the parcel starts, Airport Road to the west. To reduce the appearance from the highway, the road design is angled to help break the appearance of buildings from the highway as well as provide solar gain. Remember that this is 5.5 acres of a 28 acres developable parcel and this is the first two phases. There will be several more phases on this 28 acre parcel to the south with different building types and massing. Flora Dora Drive and Denison Placer Road will be more of a formal streetscape. There is articulated color, fenestrations, and varying roof forms, all providing more of a pedestrian scale at street level. Materials are common among the buildings types. Corrugated metal wainscot, vertical and horizontal fiber cement siding. Colors are richer, earth tone colors. In front of you is a modified unit plan layout. There will be some mirrored building plan facades. As this is a work session, I will have Coburn Architects run through this building by building, give you staff thoughts on individual buildings and speak up if you have questions or comments as we do.

Three trash enclosures are located on Phase 1 and one in Phase 2. The enclosures are 17 feet tall, cementitious siding, asphalt shingle gable roof and corrugated metal shed roof over the man door. The architecture is consistent with the rest of the development being proposed.

Staff has no major concerns with the architecture and wanted to give the Planning Commission additional time with the review of this aspect of the project. Two identified questions posed to the Commission:

1. Did the Commission find that Building Type B2 right elevation needs additional articulation?

2. Did the Commission find that a color change for two of the four Building Type B2s should be made to ensure there is not excessive similarity?

Staff would like to hear from the Commission if there are any comments.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Nice massing. When I look at storage, I think there is more room for development. Bike wash, etc. Some question about internal lighting with skylights. Probably isn't the light you would need in storage place, seems expensive.

Ms. Dudney: Those are good comments.

Mr. Peter Weber, Coburn Architecture: One of the things we have done is increase the size of overhangs since last meeting at your suggestion. Also moved meters on the side between buildings, not next to street. Building has not a lot of color variation. (Ms. Puester: Staff thought there was relief provided in building front façade on type A. There is a pedestrian arcade that wraps the corner, mixture of roof forms. The side elevations have smaller windows because it faces another building and where there are bathrooms and bedroom headwalls.) I want to point out a window thing. We changed the windows. We had small square windows. Most logical way to do this with bedroom design. We kept the others the way they were. Either way works for us but we like them high. (Mr. Pringle: I want to be clear: view southbound from Flora Dora Drive; is this the building we see. Is that the front elevation?) Correct, the way we have the streets set up, that view is really the front of house. Backside faces the parking. (Mr. Pringle: The backside looks bleak. It will be a formal entry?) From our perspective, the front side is the public side. (Mr. Pringle: I like what you have done to the front. Back side needs work.) We haven't made much modification. (Ms. Puester: Are you talking about the entry way?) (Mr. Pringle: You really want to make a warm and inviting entryway. In my opinion, it needs to be spruced up. It needs to have more relief in the back. We want to be careful with cost, but we want to have buildings that look good over time and that we are proud of.) This one has the least detail. (Ms. Christie: Is there any way to add columns to the rear?) We can take the comments, and go back to our client.

Ms. Laurie Best, Long Range Planner III: Our re-submittal deadline for the final hearing is Friday. In terms of what we can do, I am not sure of how many changes we have time for as we are going to final April 5th. We are interested in hearing the comments, and then we can go back and reevaluate. We have a year before we are going to build this to figure out pricing, design. (Mr. Schroder: It is good to know that we have year. I have a question about the front. Is there going to be any landscaping to delineate entry ways and units?) (Ms. Puester: You have trees lining Flora Dora and Denison Placer Road, in front yards of units, between buildings as well as fenced back yard areas similar to Valleybrook fences. There are small landscaping areas in parking lots. Landscaping buffering from property lines. Park planned which is separate from this project.) Everyone has their own walkway to their entry. (Mr. Schroder: That really helps me.) (Mr. Schuman: Let's go back to the buildings and we can make comments after.)

Mr. Pete Weber, Coburn Architecture: Building B1 has more articulation on back side. (Ms. Puester: Both of the elevations that face the highway step down to one story. (Mr. Giller: Are these backyards fenced?) Yes. (Ms. Puester: Staff liked pedestrian scale and stepping down the roof. Broken up massing.) (Mr. Schroder: Staff gave us a question about the color scheme between B1 and B2?) (Ms. Puester: B2 had the color question. The right elevation is pretty flat and unarticulated on B2. That is what you are going to see as you come around the corner of Flora Dora Drive. So that is one of the issues we had, the other was more color schemes needed as there are four B2 types.) (Mr. Schroder: Maybe it is the same conversation the other way as you driving down Flora Dora drive north one day.) (Ms. Puester: When you look at B2 right elevation, Xcel is going to require that these meters are covered. The issue could be solved by having the shed roof extend. One thing I wanted to point out on Building C was that the designers have decreased the ridgeline to under 50' so no negative points. This addresses Gretchen's concern from the preliminary hearing.) (Mr. Schroder: Is that hard to change that length?) (Mr. Mosher: Could I add something? In the front elevation, it

was similar to Building B; the back, is it the same plane where the material changes?) No, there is a plane change there. We try to keep our siding where there is a plane change. (Mr. Pringle: Is there any way to pull those gables out at the entries?) We have the same floor plan in these units. In some of those instances we have a flatter rear elevation. (Mr. Pringle: If we spend more time on the front end, we have to look at these for a long time. My issue is on the back doorway. Could it have more relief?) There are two D Buildings. They are both on corners. (Ms. Puester: These are the longest building types. The floor plans are arranged for townhomes, but that shorter end is what you are going to see as you drive in; they are turned sideways which breaks it up more. Great breakup of that building for the side view which is a primary view from Flora Dora.) (Ms. Dudney: I think this is a good example of what Ms. Leidal was saying. You guys have to make the decision based on your budget. Front entry way looks nice on D as well. If there was any way to have columns elsewhere, that would look really nice also. Don't you want it to look nice?) Yes, I do. (Mr. Giller: I would screen with trees.) (Mr. Pringle: How far are those buildings from each other?) It varies. (Mr. Pringle: It looks tight.) (Ms. Puester: They are about 20 feet eave to eave at the pinch point.) (Mr. Pringle: It seems like that would need some relief. That is really tight, don't you think? It seems like there should be better separation between those two buildings.) (Ms. Dudney: Why? For privacy?) (Ms. Puester: They are taking negative points for setback.) (Mr. Pringle: I think they should. I think it would be better if there was more relief. Could the other building flip flop with the parking lot?) We thought it would be more beneficial to have more green space between the units rather than parking.

This is the E Building. (Ms. Puester: These are the only 3 story buildings in this phase. Four sided architecture. Balconies, pedestrian arcades. Landscape plan shows that there is a lot of buffering at the property lines. They have developed some seating areas that you can't really see here. The south side building, there are the storage lockers for these units and the one building has bump out on first floor plan to accommodate this. Other building does not.) (Ms. Dudney: Overflow parking for Rock Pile elevated or on grade? I seem to remember going up a ramp and that it is higher than Airport Road.) (Mr. Schuman: I have walked up there before. It meets grade.) We are meeting grade at the property line.

This is the F1 Building. We increased the overhang, and added some mechanical space. It resulted in this little change here. (Ms. Dudney: I like how that breaks up that elevation.)

F2 Building is similar but different. Has storage for all of the F Buildings in phase 2. (Mr. Schuman: What corner is Mr. Pringle most concerned about?) It does step back. (Mr. Schroder: I was thinking about solar access, so it doesn't look like it would be in the shade all the time.) (Ms. Puester: There is 6 feet of difference.) (Mr. Pringle: I have to say that the porches add so much more interest. I generally like these buildings but I don't know if I like the back 3 story element portion that is just flat. I don't know if there was anything more that can be done. If there was an objection, it would be on that side.) (Ms. Dudney: I think it looks pretty good.) (Ms. Leidal: What is the garage door material on the community building?) Not sure yet. We have some views of our overall site model. We put this image in the slideshow to show the variation. At any point in the project, you would be hard pressed to find the same building type. (Pete Weber, Coburn presented a 3D slideshow.)

(Mr. Giller: It would have been nice to see the community room open to the Oxbow park.) Where we landed was that we would rather have people living next to the park. (Ms. Best: We wanted to have a formal entry way and the community center helps set that.) (Mr. Giller: I think the Oxbow Park could be a key element to the design. The addition of the small tot lot park next to the community room helps though.)

Ms. Puester: Have to ask this question, any code issues here that you think warrants negative points?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: I am impressed. This is well thought out. I would love to see some additional design detail. It is a matter of finances. Bringing gables down, columns to the ground could be good, but it

- looks better than ok to me especially for what it is.
- Mr. Pringle: I think the massing looks good. When we start looking at the sizes of the porches and the eaves, any way we can put depth into those planes, bringing down corner columns on porches. It looks like you are going to have a lot of water shedding onto the backsides. That might be a problem over the long term. I think where you have introduced the decks, it really does emphasize my point by adding more relief. I think the community building is the most interesting. I like that architecture. When we talk Breck vernacular, it is hard to imagine. I think some look barn-like and I wonder if that is what we want to see. I think the project is on its way, and I would like to see it come back.
- Mr. Schroder: I don't have much more to say other than it meets those two code items regarding height and architecture.
- Ms. Leidal: I like the variety of the buildings. I would like to see 4 sided architecture. Building B2, those entries face the street. Maybe those entries could be defined better, especially since it is facing Flora Dora Drive.
- Mr. Giller: The 7 different buildings work well. Diagonal orientation works well as a site layout. I think some of what Mr. Pringle and Ms. Leidal mentioned is that these are tall buildings, but these buildings could use more anchor or base to solidify them. I think that the community center next to Oxbow Park could have been a better option, but all in all I think this is well on its way to being a good project.
- Mr. Pringle: I know we have budget constraints. Put in top notch windows in bedrooms. Beds underneath windows can be cold. Would like to see you add some of what we discussed and see it again.
- Mr. Schuman: I worry about ice and water at front entries with short gables. I don't know if you are going to have solar panels. Oxbow Park parking; it seems like only 5 spots and should be more but know it's a different project just may impact this one. (Mr. Truckey: We are scheduled for a final hearing next month, due to LITC deadline, we won't be taking this to another preliminary. You have seen this at 2 work sessions and 1 preliminary now.) (Ms. Best: CHFA needs to look at financing in early May. We wouldn't go vertical until spring in 2017. I value all your comments and think we have ample time to vet these questions and address design issues. I appreciate design comments. We would like to make sure you are happy with this before it gets built.)

Mr. Lee Edwards, Architect: This is not the approach and what we want to see coming into the valley, we being me. (Mr. Schuman: Mr. Edwards, we have finished our comments at this work session and please send us a letter before the next meeting and we can go over it.)

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Cucumber Creek Estates Master Plan Modification (CK) PL-2016-0017, Grandview Drive
Mr. Kulick presented an application to create a master plan for a 9.24 acre property to provide for the development of 6, approximately ½ acre, single-family lots, 5 clustered single-family lots and 12 duplex residences. Application is unique, a combination of reviewing a development agreement, purchase contract for adjacent open space, as well as town code. Mr. Kulick reviewed the history of the application and the vested property rights. Currently the site has 22 SFEs; the master plan proposes to utilize all 22 of those SFEs and potentially one additional SFE to be transferred to the site.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: What are the lots to the top of the plan? (Mr. Kulick: Those are in Shock Hill.) (An owner of one of the properties made his presence known.)
- Ms. Dudney: So the Nordic lodge doesn't show on this? (Mr. Kulick: No but it is here.)
- Mr. Schroder: Where do the current trails lie? (Mr. Kulick: There are a variety of trails on site, but none of them are platted. There are easements that ring the property. 15' on either side of the property line between the concerned property and Penn Lode. There are a lot of loops. Has been leased

for a dollar a year as long as it is not developed. Those are not platted. Drainage and retention facilities are platted in the Gulch when the 23 acres was purchased by the Town.

Not subject to the Cucumber Gulch Overlay. One of the things that was negotiated under the development permit with Town Council years ago. Specific language for design building envelopes for large lot single family lots. I'll go more into setbacks and such. Most of large lots are on NW edge of parcel. Most of duplexes on southeastern side of lot with a couple cluster single families mixed in. Description of trail easement.

Proposed density is 23 SFEs, 1 SFE over what is currently allowed. Transfer of density would bring in 4.5%; only subject to negative points by the code if exceeded 5% over density. Square footage limitation proposed is all voluntary imposed by the applicant. Current proposal is 8,000 square feet less than current vested plan. One more unit of density proposed, but a cut of 8 or 9% in terms of area.

Staff understands there are many unique provisions associated with this application due to past Development Agreements and vesting but believes the proposed voluntary reductions in buildable square footage, increased external site buffers, reduction in building envelope square footage and change in unit types is an improvement over the currently vested subdivision. Staff would like to hear feedback from the Commission in preparation for a Final Hearing and has the following questions for the Commission:

1. Should the applicant propose 23 SFEs at the final hearing, a transfer of density would be required. Is the Commission comfortable that an additional 1 SFE of density fits on the site?
2. Was the Commission comfortable with the general elements of the site plan?
3. Was the Commission comfortable with proposed change in unit types?
4. Did the Commission have any additional comments about the proposed application?

Staff recommended that the application return for a final hearing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Did you look at cul de sac dimensions?

Ms. Christie: Do they meet the absolute the side setback between the single families?

Mr. Tim Casey, Applicant: We have owned this property for 30 years. When we did the open space dedication and sale, that was sort of the impetus for the open space tax. We effectively sold the property, significantly reduced the market value and established vesting. Can we improve on what we have remaining for the next 5 years? Single family lots consume nearly the entire property vested. Our partnership gave the Town of Breckenridge the piece, which was not a requirement of agreement. That is what created the Nordic Center. This is the reason it is there, because of our partnership. We think it is a better plan, a better land use, and more consistent with what the market is looking for. Indicative of Shock Hill. Reduced size of single family units. What we have vested now is very large. We tried to come up with a better plan after 30 years of ownership. There are trails that meander all over. We lease for a dollar a year to town open space, and they have lease agreement. Interstate trail remains. Trail easement parallel to Penn Lode remains. The trails all remain through Shock Hill, owned by the Town of Breckenridge. The Daytons have long term lease that allows them to operate facility. We need to work on road crossing detail. We are going to have to find a solution, perhaps artificial material. We are going to ask the TC for an additional 10 years of vesting. (Mr. Schroder: Why now?) My partner and I are not getting any younger.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Webster, 145 Windwood Circle: (Handout given to Commissioners) Overall plan development. Where are trails moving now? My concerns are in that area- are we considering the loss of this specific area. I would ask if the Commission can take a look specifically at the vision for community character, sustainability,

resources, recreation resources, or are we locked in? Review against existing plans to see what is possible. Trails through the middle of the property where entry level training is done will be lost and there is no other area for this. One path by Penn Lode, but road crossing to move back and forth not ideal. We asked that that be looked into either from homeowner, guest, or resident perspective to be sustainable. Have all the members of the Nordic Center been notified of this proposal? If we look at the plan, there is no easement that goes down the back side to the Nordic Center. More feasible for access in both directions. At the southern end, the trees form a barrier to the neighborhood and road. Northwest side shows no trees on the plan. I would like to see more. (Last comment has been resolved.)

Mr. Paul Weller, 111 Windwood Circle, President of the Christie Heights Homeowners Association: My problem is 3 fold. The Nordic Center is a world class attraction. Drive for people to come to town. I am concerned about that facility being lost. We need a way from being to get from Nordic Center without having to loop around to west and down again. 2. This area is used a lot as an open space. Very popular area and that will be lost, though I understand the developer has the right. 3. Environmental impact: if you are worried about the gondola hours extended, you should be worried about this. Penn Lode might not be able to see this, but I am more concerned about the environmental impact on the Gulch and if this is consistent.

Mr. Peter Kalan, 118 Windwood Circle: To see it developed will take away from the natural open space but I understand the vested property rights. More density, different sense of feel than the homes backing up to Shock Hill. Other concern: proximity of Windwood Circle and traffic. Windwood Circle has a very steep slope and it gets very icy. We have to make sure we are having safe traffic management between the two developments.

Mr. Mike McDivitt, 138 Windwood Circle: Agree with Mr. Kalan.

There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: It has been well considered by Staff. This is an overall improvement in overall site plan that is vested. Would like to see cul de sac articulated or softened maybe with internal landscaping. I am comfortable with the density.

Ms. Christie: We got used to having this is our backyard. Agreements in place that we are bound by. 1. yes, 2. yes. No more comments, meets density.

Mr. Schroder: Thank you for recognizing property rights. It is hard to see change. We have become too comfortable with the area as it is. Feel for loss of beginner trail area. The owner did the Town a great service minimizing the developable area to 9 acres and letting us use the property for this long. 1. yes, 2: yes, 3: yes, 4: none.

Ms Dudney: Our only mandate is to compare the current plan that the previously vested plan. 1: yes, 2: yes. Also, I would be ok with Council deciding to vest this.

Mr. Pringle: Not a surprise, it is just a change in a town that has seen a lot of change. Remember all this going on in planning. Anyone could have seen that this would be developed eventually, plans are on file. 1: yes, 2: yes, 3: yes. Would agree with additional vesting, and mitigate cul de sac more. 4: none.

Mr. Schuman: 1: yes, 2: yes, 3: yes, 4: Nordic center may find ways to work around this. It has provided a wonderful amenity over the years.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

Mr. Schuman precluded with a call for a vote as to whether he should recuse himself for this matter as he is the HOA president but had not seen the plan before this nor does he have any financial interests here. Mr. Pringle made a motion to allow Mr. Schuman to participate and that his involvement with the Wellington is not a conflict of interest. The motion passed unanimously (6-0) with consensus from the Commission. It was

also noted for the record that Mr. Schroder is a resident of Wellington Neighborhood.

1) Lincoln Park Filing No. 2 Subdivision (MM) PL-2016-0032, Bridge Street / Stables Road
Mr. Mosher presented an application to subdivide a portion of Lots 1 and 2, Block 6, Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood into 21 lots with 24 units. Units are comprised of 18 single-family and 3 duplex homes. The Vern Johnson Memorial Park (separate Development Permit) is to be constructed as part of this phase of the Lincoln Park Master Plan.

The initial subdivision for the Wellington Neighborhood (PC#1999149) encompassed the entire 84.6-acre property (Phase 1, Phase II and Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood). All of Phase 1 and only a portion of Phase II have been developed. The Planning Commission approved the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan (PC#2014038) on April 28, 2015, and the Subdivision of the First Phase of Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood (PC#2014039) on July 28, 2015. The layout of this block is similar to the illustrative plan of the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan (7th Master Plan Amendment of Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan). Vern Jonson Memorial Park is being designed right now, as part of the Master Plan development.

The proposed lot layout, green design and landscaping follows the patterns of the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan. Staff welcomed any comments from the Commission regarding the information presented in this report. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Filing 2 Subdivision, PL-2016-0032, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Why the phasing? What is the difference between the subdivision and the phasing? (Mr. Mosher: In this case the planned phasing described with the Lincoln Park Master Plan matches the planned Filings for each subdivision.) Is this going faster than we had expected? (Mr. Mosher: Not really but, things are moving quickly, which is a good thing.)

Mr. Pringle: You have an application in your office for the Vern Johnson Memorial Park. What leverage do we have that it will ever get be built? (Mr. Mosher: It is tied to this phase of the Master Plan and they seem eager to get started. I don't think he is going to walk away with all the interest from the Wellington Neighborhood owners.)

Ms. Leidal: Will they satisfy the landscaping requirements? Section 9-2-4-2-d-3 of the subdivision standards says one tree for every 10-feet of roadway in non-wooded environments. (Mr. Mosher: No. They prefer to have less. They plan on getting negative points under Policy 22/R Landscaping with a Master Plan modification that suggests one tree for every 15-feet of roadway.) (Ms. Puester read the subdivision code section regarding one tree every 10-feet of platted right of way and said we might put a condition on it being met or continue. We are looking at subdivision standards, not development code.) (Mr. Mosher: Yes, but it is the absolute policy in the Development Code and is associated with the Master Plan. The overall landscaping plan was an exhibit with the Master Plan application. We seem to have a conflict between the Development Code landscaping policy and the Subdivision Standards. These numbers and the Relative policy are in conflict.) Why can't they meet the policy? (Mr. Mosher: They did not want to have that many trees planted along the right of way so as to maintain the character of the existing neighborhood.)

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Andy Podhorecki, 581 High Point Drive: Incredible amount of noise. Every morning it sounds like the 5th armored division, plus rock crushing and back-up beeping noises. Get the hours of construction changed from the 7-7 Monday through Saturday. They should start later and end sooner. Mr. O'Neil didn't have to pay

for density, got them all for free. I have been listening to this racket since 1999. I am a licensed landscape architect. Can any of this layout change (referring to Master Plan layout)? On the original plan, they have this turnaround. I propose a different plan for a portion of Phase 4. (Mr. Schuman: You can reach out to David O'Neil, because we haven't even had the last phase subdivision discussion yet.) I want to make sure that this area (referring to Xcel easement and Town Open Space) will remain undisturbed and not developed. (Mr. Schuman: Please share your comments on Phase 4, because we are reviewing a separate portion of the development.)

There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I think this is a continuance to a future meeting to figure out the landscaping technicality.

Ms. Leidal made a motion to continue Lincoln Park Filing No. 2 Subdivision, PL-2016-0032, Bridge Street / Stables Road to a future meeting. Mr. Pringle seconded and the motion carried unanimously (6-0).

TOWN PROJECT HEARING:

1) Kingdom Park Playground (CL) PL-2016-0040, 880 Airport Road

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to construct a new public playground at 880 Airport Road on the south side of the existing pavilion across from the tennis courts, north of the Skateboard Park. The design for the new playground features approximately 1,000 sq. ft. of poured rubber play surface and 3,000 sq. ft. of wood fiber play surface, climbing rocks, play and climbing structures, slides, swings, benches, accessible play elements, picnic tables, walkways and landscaping.

This is a Town Project pursuant to the ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013). In accordance with the Town Project ordinance, staff has reviewed this project to identify any code issues. The Planning Commission is requested to make a recommendation on the project to the Town Council.

Staff suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council approve the Kingdom Park Playground, PL-2016-0050, located at 880 Airport Road, showing a passing point analysis of positive three (+3) points, with the presented Findings.

Mr. Mark Johnston, Town of Breckenridge Streets Department Manager: We gave people three options to vote on. This was the choice. Ages 8 and up is the larger features and smaller features are for tot lots. (Mr. Schuman: Should benches be away from the skate park? Will they use them as skate features?) (Mr. Schroder: Can it be a taller structure?) It's all about the budget. (Ms. Dudney: What is the timing for construction?) (Mr. Pringle: Agree with staff recommendation.)

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

Mr. Schroder made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Kingdom Park Playground, PL-2016-0040, 880 Airport Road, showing a passing score of positive three (+3) points, with the presented Findings. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

OTHER ISSUES:

Ms. Puester reminded the Commissioners to review the Worker's Compensation Policy documentation provided by Ms. Joanie Brewster, Administrative Services Coordinator for the Town of Breckenridge. Please remove the Acknowledgment Form, sign and return to me.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair