

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Ron Schuman Dan Schroder Gretchen Dudney
Christie Mathews-Leidal Jim Lamb Dave Pringle
Mike Giller was absent.

There was no Town Council Liaison present due to today's election.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schuman: On page 4 of the packet, under the approval of minutes (for March 1), please change "Manager / Owner" to just "Manager". With no other changes, the March 15, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no other changes, the April 5, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

- 1) Wilmot-Adler Remodel/Addition (MM) PL-2016-0064, 104 North Gold Flake Terrace
- 2) Shock Hill Overlock Duplex Lot 6A & 6B (MM) PL-2016-0069, 44 & 40 West Point Lode

Mr. Mosher: There is a correction on staff report for Wilmot-Adler Remodel/Addition under the summary for the total density, there was numerical a typo. I have passed out a document to each of you this evening that shows the correct amount. It is already changed in the final document itself and it did not affect the report.

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

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Denison Placer Housing Phase 1 (JP) PL-2016-0011, 107 Denison Placer Road / TBD Flora Dora Drive
Mr. Mosher presented on behalf of Mr. Grosshuesch, who was to present on behalf of Ms. Puester. The proposal is to construct 66 workforce rental Townhome and apartment units (43 single family equivalents) in fifteen buildings, a neighborhood community center including manager's lease office and associated parking on 4.4 acres of the northernmost section of the Block 11 parcel with access from Denison Placer Road and Floradora Drive. In addition, Floradora Drive is proposed to be extended through the development from Airport Road.

As a reminder, the Commission has had three previous hearings and a site visit on this project.

Architectural compatibility will be presented by the agent who is here this evening. Under Placement of Structures, the two required are not being met; therefore, for each non-compliant, negative three (-3) points are assessed, so the total for this is negative six (-6) points. Positive three (+3) points were assessed on the pathway after your concern that positive six (+6) points were too much. Parking: there are two spaces per unit. There is adequate open space.

Interior storage of 5% is encouraged which equates to 3,211 square feet for this phase. The total floor area of separate storage units is 1,188 square feet. Further, the interior storage areas of the Townhomes and apartment buildings equate to 3,825 square feet (6%). Landscaping: they have met requirements for right of way plantings and exceeded the number of trees for the overall site. Under Policy 24/R, The Social Community; Positive ten (+10) points are suggested for providing 100% workforce housing. Positive six (+6) points for goals and objectives of Town Council for providing the employee housing. The drainage issue off site is being addressed on site; therefore, positive three (+3) points for drainage. Snow stacking: mechanical removal

(beside a simple plow) is anticipated with the maintenance crew looking after it (similar to Wellington Neighborhood). The transit points will be assigned under the Denison Placer parking lot application being presented later this evening. For refuse, there are multiple dumpster enclosures planned that have been carefully located for functionality.

The project has a passing score positive sixteen (+16) points.

The Planning Department was supportive of the changes made by the applicant based on Planning Commission comments. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve Denison Placer Housing Phase 1, PL-2016-0011, located at 107 Denison Placer Road, Lot A-1, and Tract E, Runway Subdivision, with a passing point analysis of positive sixteen (+16) points with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Ms. Laurie Best, Planner III: Since architecture was big concern for the Commission at the last meeting, Mr. Jarrett Buxkemper from BHH Partners is going to go through some of your concerns with a PowerPoint presentation.

Jarrett Buxkemper, BHH Partners: We made the following changes for the final hearing you are seeing tonight (showed graphics on the overhead screen so Commission and Audience could view as well):

Community Building: We removed skylights; added cupola & clearstory windows; removed covered porch patio area; removed covered walkway around backside of building; added windows in garage. (Mr. Pringle: Why did you take the covered walkway off?) Budgetary concerns. (Mr. Schuman: Was clearstory result of removing skylights?) (Ms. Best: We added the clearstory to break up the roof and articulate the building. Mr. Giller had asked the question previously about the skylights, and we realized the skylights did little to improve either the aesthetics or functionality of the building so those were removed)

Building A: We made some roof modifications; changed gables to shed if order to shed snow clear of entryways; added gables onto entry doors; on the left elevation, we changed shed roof to gable roof; added some lower shed roof forms to break up size of wall; added some columns where we previously had braces on little awning roofs; on the back elevation, we have broken up that elevation there with shed roofs instead of gables; added columns on low awning roofs to break up façade better.

Building B1: Likewise, we added columns onto lower roofs there to break up facades; extended overhangs a little bit more. (Mr. Pringle: Soffits on ends of eaves?) Correct. We added another window on back elevation; added columns. (Ms. Dudney: Change to window design?) Yes; these two (noted on plan) are now ganged up. (Mr. Schroder: They were too similar? That was the reason you changed?) Exactly right.

Building B2: We added some wainscoting; changed colors a little bit; on the front elevation we changed the entry roofs to gables and added columns to those and a little more banding. (Ms. Dudney: More windows?) Correct. Low awning roof over meters; on the right elevation, we ganged windows up; added columns; low shed roof over center portion; windows; on the back elevation, we have broken down the large gable there to have nested gable to right side; added columns to entry rooms; banding and wainscoting; added some windows; changed coloring around.

Building C: On the front elevation, we added wainscoting and banding; changed shed roofs to gable; ganged up windows; added banding; we added some roof vents in gable ends; on the right elevation, we added wainscoting and banding; changed windows; added columns to front elevation. Actually on the back elevation we added gable roofs over entry doors; broke up colors of siding; did a wainscoting siding change; on the left elevation, we changed windows; did banding and wainscoting; added a low shed roof over center; ganged windows up.

Building D: We flipped the gable element to a smaller gable element; added some columns to low shed roofs; ganged widows; on the back elevation, we added banding and wainscoting breaking up those elevations; on the left side we added wainscoting and banding; did gable roof over meters; added columns over entry; on the left elevation, we ganged up windows on the side; on the front elevation we added a gable roof to the middle entry door; two height double level pop outs; changed up window patterns as well as siding. (Mr. Pringle: Is it fair to conclude that the right elevation on Building D faces Floradora drive; is that why the elevations are distinctly different as they front different streets?) (Ms. Best: Yes; that happens twice when the D building is on a corner.)

Building E: We are removing the second level awning roof there and also you asked us to straighten up deck columns, so we straightened up all of those on all of the elevations.

Ms. Best: We are going to show you a couple of perspectives (shown to Commission and audience on overhead monitor). This is entry off Airport Road and Floradora looking south from Denison at intersection of Floradora. Please note that the building elevation has not been changes yet to show the new columns and architectural changes, but gives a good idea of the mass and the street perspective.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: It is appreciated that you gave us the side by side comparisons of the elevations. The visual help was really great thank you.

Ms. Dudney: How do you feel about the suggested changes? (Mr. Buxkemper: I think they were very good for breaking up masses.) Do you think you can afford it? (Ms. Best: Well, we think we can. We are hoping we will get the LIHTC funding.)

Mr. Pringle: The drainage problem identified in the report and the associated positive points being sought originates off this property; it is a Town created problem across the street. I applaud the Town for doing it. Can we set bad precedent that if neighbor across the street is taking care of it and we don't need the positive three (+3) points we can remove those? (Ms. Best: The 48" pipe is a very expensive piece of this project and is solving a pre-existing off site issue.) (Mr. Mosher: The difference that might matter for precedent is that Barton Creek predates this subdivision and Win Lockwood's PUD improvements and the development. This was not development creating this issue; the issue is the creek historically running through this valley. As far as precedent goes, I believe we would be hard pressed to find one.) It seems to me to be a Town problem; this developer is fixing but the developer is the Town who is fixing it. Kind of like we are applauding ourselves for fixing a Town problem. Maybe the funding needs to come from Public Works, not the project.

Mr. Lamb: I am glad to see you solving the Barton Creek issue. I used to work down there and Denison Placer floods pretty often.

Ms. Leidal: It is mentioned in staff report for this application or the next one that three apartments do not have storage. (Ms. Best: The plans in your packet have not been updated yet, but there will be three additional storage units added to the north building so all 16 apartments will have a storage unit) Within the unit? (Ms. Best: The ground floor units all have their storage on their patios; the upper level units all have storage in the southern building)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I don't know how anyone else feels, but positive three (+3) points for the drainage problem in the Town which the Town should have solved; is the Town awarding itself?

Ms. Dudney: This is not a Town project in the sense of us making recommendation to Town Council, so the Town is being treated as private developer here. I understand what you are saying but this

- application is different from Town project.
- Ms. Leidal: You bring up a good point. Offsite does not serve this project. (Ms. Best: This is an on-site improvement to fix an off-site regional problem. If we were holding ourselves to same standard that we would apply to a private developer, we would be very hard pressed to get a private developer to put in a 48" pipe to fix an offsite problem, and not receive any points.)
- Mr. Pringle: It's an incestuous deal. I just don't know if we want to award positive points for something the Town should be dealing with offsite.
- Mr. Schuman: I am opposed to this.
- Mr. Lamb: The offsite issue is affecting on site where problem happens. I am fine with awarding positive three (+3) points.
- Ms. Dudney: I tip toward leaving the points on. In my mind, thinking of the Town as the developer, and in my mind I agree with Ms. Best; to award them points for the fix is something we would want to incentivize.
- Mr. Pringle: I don't think they would have other developer fix problem from offsite.
- Ms. Dudney: I do.
- Mr. Schroder: The precedent is good; offsite problem hope opportunity would be for a developer to fix. Incentivize them to fix with points.
- Mr. Pringle: The next off site problem might not be drainage.
- Mr. Schroder: Good point.
- Ms. Dudney: It's an onsite improvement.
- Mr. Schroder: It's a gray area. What if you have someone plant trees in another location? Do they get points?
- Ms. Dudney: Not off site. Your tree example: trees would have to be on site. I agree; don't award points for doing something off site. This pipe is on site.
- Mr. Schroder: I support the points as they are.
- Ms. Leidal: Good arguments on both sides, but I agree it's a gray area. I support removing those points and not creating precedent.
- Mr. Schuman: It is an offsite problem they are fixing on site, but setting precedent for further issues.
- Mr. Pringle: We need to talk this out. I don't think we award positive points when it is gray area because we try to tighten up the point analyses on projects.
- Ms. Dudney: Give an example. It has to be improvement on site; not plant trees off site.
- Mr. Pringle: The problem is off site.
- Mr. Lamb: But it affects the site. I agree it starts off site but it creates the effects on site.
- Mr. Pringle: The Town should take care of this problem independent of this application. The Town is taking care of this problem through this development AND it is awarding itself positive three (+3) points.
- Ms. Dudney: I think you won.
- Mr. Pringle: I did? So I should stop digging now?
- Ms. Dudney: Yes.

Commissioner Final Comments:

- Ms. Leidal: Thank you for listening to our concerns about the architecture. We appreciate the side by side view; more changes visually than just reading it in the report. Thank you for finding the three storage units. This is a much better project especially as the entry to Town.
- Mr. Schroder: I support project as presented.
- Mr. Lamb: Support the point analysis. I was ok with the architecture before, but the changes look good. Good looking project; one of first things you see as you enter Town. When will you break ground? (Ms. Best: On the LIHTC site, excavation work will start this summer and then go vertical in 2017. On the Phase 2 apartment buildings and the roads, infrastructure, utilities, and grading we plan to break ground early summer with site work and go vertical late summer.)

Mr. Pringle: I tip my hat to you for listening to the Commission. The first time I saw this, it was bleak and austere and I was really alarmed. I appreciate it so much that you have listened to the comments of the Commission. And buildings are a lot more interesting and it's a better project. I appreciate comments from the Commissioners that helped push this forward. I hope when we get to value engineering so much does not come out. I applaud you. I would like to see the three points come out of the point analysis, but won't lose sleep if not.

Ms. Dudney: I agree with everything Mr. Pringle said. Design by committee usually doesn't work, but in this case you made it a better looking project. I hope the value engineering does not take it out.

Mr. Schuman: Thank you and thank you to Staff as well for putting the additional worksession in to allow the input on architecture; it truly put us on right path.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to change the point analysis for the Denison Placer Housing Phase 1, PL-2016-0011, 107 Denison Placer Road, Lot A-1 and Tract E, Runway Subdivision, on policy 27R drainage from positive three (+3) to zero (0) points. Ms. Leidal seconded and the motion was carried (5-1).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the modified point analysis for the Denison Placer Housing Phase 1, PL-2016-0011, 107 Denison Placer Road, Lot A-1 and Tract E, Runway Subdivision, showing a passing score of positive thirteen (+13) points. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Denison Placer Housing Phase 1, PL-2016-0011, 107 Denison Placer Road, Lot A-1 and Tract E, Runway Subdivision, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

2) Denison Placer Housing Phase 2 (JP) PL-2016-0012, 107 Denison Placer Road

Mr. Mosher presented on behalf of Mr. Grosshuesch who was to present on behalf of Ms. Puester. The proposal is to construct 30 workforce rental apartment units (101-BR and 20 studio) (13 single family equivalents) in three buildings on approximately 1.05 acres on the southern section of Tract D with access from Denison Placer Road. A material and color sample board was also presented.

This project is under density and mass. Parking, no concerns. Setbacks not being met in the front garner negative three (-3) points. Per the Land Use Guidelines, 13 SFEs are proposed for this property for employee housing and 3.25 SFEs must be transferred to the site. Building height: The negative points for a long unbroken ridgeline are incurred with this report; but, plans are to change the long ridgeline out of building. Storage: 929 square feet required storage units. Access circulation. Landscaping: no concerns. Positive ten (+10) points for affordable housing project. Town Council goals, Policy 24/R, positive six (+6) points. Drainage utility and snow storage: no concerns. Transit not included on this property. The Point Analysis shows positive twelve (+12) points: negative three (-3) placement of structures for not meeting 15' front setback; negative one (-1) ridgeline for building types exceeding 50' ridge lengths, Policy 24 positive ten (+10) for employee housing and positive six (+6) for Town Council goals.

The Planning Department recommended the Planning Commission approve the point analysis for the Denison Placer Phase 2, PL-2016-0012, located at 107 Denison Placer Road, Tract D, Runway Subdivision, showing a passing point analysis of positive twelve (+12) points. The Planning Department also recommended the Planning Commission approve Denison Placer Phase 2, PL-2016-0012, located at 107 Denison Placer Road, Tract D, Runway Subdivision, with the presented findings and conditions.

Mr. Jarrett Buxkemper, BHH Partners:

Building F1: On the front elevation, we added gable element to left side; decreased shed roof to right side of entry; added banding; changed color of wainscoting; added some windows on the gable elements and above

connector element; changed colors; on the left elevation, we changed direction of shed roof and made it into gable roof; added shed roof to side; reconfigured window patterns; banding; on the right elevation, we have broken the vertical gable element up with banding; added shed roof to right of gable element; on the back elevation, we reworked the entire center portion gable on sides, the shed element in middle, the shed dormer elements to break up elevation; added banding as well.

Building F2: We changed colors; added some banding; added shed roof over to side of gable elevation; on the back elevation, we reworked elevation; added banding; on the front elevation, we changed to a single center gable element as opposed to two on sides; windows reworked; on the right elevation, we added banding; reworked the window patterns there.

The dumpster enclosure did not change.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: This is a great improvement appreciate the changes.
Mr. Pringle: Same comments as last time; thank you. I agree with point analysis.
Mr. Lamb: I agree with those two; pretty straightforward. I support the point analysis.
Mr. Schroder: I agree with Mr. Lamb & the rest of the Commission.
Ms. Leidal: I agree; I support.
Mr. Schuman: Thank you staff for extra worksession.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Denison Placer Housing Phase 2, PL-2016-0012, 107 Denison Placer Road, Tract D Runway Subdivision, showing a passing point analysis of positive twelve (+12) points. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Denison Placer Housing Phase 2, PL-2016-0012, 107 Denison Placer Road, Tract D Runway Subdivision, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Resubdivision of Lot A-1, Tract D, and Tract E, Runway Subdivision and Lot 2C, A Resubdivision of the Common Area of Rock Pile Ranch Condominium (JP) PL-2016-0067, 107 Denison Placer Road and 1900 Airport Road

Mr. Mosher presented on behalf of Mr. Grosshuesch who was to present on behalf of Ms. Puester. The proposal is to resubdivide Lot A-1, Tract D and Tract E, Runway Subdivision and Lot 2C, Block 10, a resubdivision of the common area of Rock Pile Ranch, to create a total of eight lots/tracts, easements and rights of ways.

Applicants are Colorado Mountain College and the Town of Breckenridge. 107 Denison Placer Road and 1900 Airport Road in Land Use District 31.

The right of way is 859 feet long. The subdivision measures the right of way to get the number of trees every ten feet and place them in the subdivision. Floradora gets you 759 feet; therefore, 413 trees, so staff had no concerns. There is no point analysis for subdivision.

This subdivision proposal is in compliance with the Subdivision Standards. Staff recommended approval of the Resubdivision of Tract D, Tract E and Lot A-1 of Runway Subdivision and Lot 2C, Block 10, A Resubdivision of Common Area of Rock Pile Ranch, PL-2016-0068, located at 107 Denison Placer Road and 1900 Airport Road

with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Ms Best: (Helping locate the property on a map) I am going to zoom in on the plan to show it on the overhead camera. Basically (indicating on plan) this is all of Block 11 and this is the Rock Pile Ranch Lot 2C. We are taking that the Rock Pile Ranch lot and Block 11 lot, and reconfiguring them to create the LHTC parcel, the Phase 2 parcel, the Oxbow Park lot, and to establish the right of way and utility locations. (Showed LHTC parcel and Oxbow Park.)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Leidal: This is a housekeeping matter to accommodate the land swap easements and clean up other ones. I agree with staff report.

Mr. Schroder: I agree with staff report.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with staff; no concerns.

Mr. Pringle: I concur.

Ms. Dudney: No comment.

Mr. Schuman: I agree.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve the Resubdivision of Lot A-1, Tract D, and Tract E, Runway Subdivision and Lot 2C, A Resubdivision of the Common Area of Rock Pile Ranch Condominium, PL-2016-0067, 107 Denison Placer Road and 1900 Airport Road, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

(The Commission took a five minute recess.)

2. Lincoln Park Filing No. 2 Subdivision (MM) PL-2016-0032, Bridge Street / Stables Road

Mr. Mosher presented. This is a continuance from the March 15th Planning Commission Meeting. Per the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan, the applicant proposes 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 composed of 18 single-family and 3 duplex homes. The Vern Johnson Memorial Park (separate Class D Development Permit) is to be constructed as part of this phase of the Lincoln Park Master Plan.

At the previous meeting, the Commission expressed concerns regarding the number of trees that are to be planted along the Bridge Street right of way (ROW) as far as where they belong during the subdivision and where they belong during the overall development. For the subdivision code policy, the required trees are to be planted throughout entire development while the Development Code policy the tree counts are only along the ROW. This application: The number of trees along the ROW is one tree every fifteen feet of ROW. The number of trees overall is one tree every ten feet of ROW. However, under Policy 22/R, the trees are suggested to have a minimum diameter of 3" caliper whereas the minimum requirement for a subdivision is 2" caliper.

Negative points may be assigned to the master plan, not a subdivision. Staff has already approved a Class D modification to the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood Master Plan subtracting negative point for the under sized tree (from positive thirteen (+13) to positive eleven (+11) points). (Ms. Dudney: Is this because they didn't meet caliper?) Right. Ultimately, this subdivision is still standing with the added condition regarding the tree counts associated with the Master Plan.

We have identified this condition for past and future Lincoln Park subdivisions. I may repeat the condition in Phases 3 and 4 as a precaution. (Ms. Leidal: This new condition was not clear to me until I discussed with Mr. Mosher. Bridge Street runs through entire subdivision, so the condition takes into account that at the end of

day, you need to install 214 trees of minimum 2" caliper.) There may be garage added to one unit, and then a tree from Phase 1 moves to Phase 2. (Ms. Dudney: So this is now already dealt with in the Master Plan.) Again, I passed out a new set of Findings and Conditions for you this evening. "Bridge Street extends through the entire length of Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood, and will be platted via subdivision applications. The total length of Bridge Street is approximately 2,139 feet which equates to 214 trees for all of Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood filings. Applicant shall install a total of 214 trees, a minimum of 2-inch in caliper, per 9-2-4-2-D-3 for all of the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood subdivision filings."

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.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment.

Andrew Podhorecki, 581 High Point Drive: I live to the south of the development. My main concern was I think it is too late to do anything, but I built my house in 1993 and I believe the Wellington site was zoned as agricultural with almost no density. Our concerns were construction noise, dust, traffic, fumes, and the free handout of their density. Additional phases were approved with almost unchecked density.

There has been heavy construction here since 1999 and now it is going another six years; almost a quarter of a century of rock crushing, quarry noises and dust, roar of multiple diesel engines, diesel fumes, the piercing shrill of numerous back up beepers, steel buckets grinding against river rock, rock dredge banged against large three cubic yard steel buckets, the sound of metal crawler tracks against dredge rock, dredge rock being classified through mechanical grizzlies, dozers pushing dredge rock, concrete trucks, dump trucks having dredge rock dumped into their beds, compactors, diesel powered high lifts, power saws, pneumatic nailers, gunpowder driven concrete nailers, constant delivery trucks, hammering, etc. The topo to the South is a natural amphitheater that allows all the noise to go directly to our homes.

Last Sunday I heard construction noise and called Breck PD. I had called numerous times before kept working past before and after hours now documented with Police Report 16-4367. There was a crew working with a diesel powered high lift on the exterior of the Townhome. I took a picture. When I told them it is unlawful to work on Sundays, he told me that I was wrong and that he has been working on Sundays here for the last two years. He told me to call his boss McCreary.

There are always excuses why the rules are violated. It seems like this project's M.O. is just do it, don't get caught, and if caught just ask for forgiveness. Possible violations that I have noticed; work outside of designated hours, exceed state noise ordinances, no BMP-lack of erosion control for run-off and ensuing stream degradation, dredge rock and crushed rock trucked off site, exceeded diesel smoke pollution standards, lack of dust control, worker safety, is there checking of undocumented labor? It is time for consequences for any disregard of the rules.

In summary, we are asking that since this was a special approved zoning variance project that extremely changed the neighbors' quality of life, that the construction impact be mitigated. With this application, please decrease the hours of operation to 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday. We have to be subjected to this construction from the time we awake until well after dinner six for days a week. There are people who work late and sleep in, work from home, have kids, are retired or semi-retired and need relief. Please do not approve this proposal unless the construction impact is mitigated.

Site specific concerns:

A limit of disturbance plan should be submitted and adhered to, to prevent more site disruption. Be sure that the dredge pile to the South remains in place as a buffer and that it is not to be disturbed for any reason,

including ball fields, a dog park, or other reason that would create more construction. How can this area to the South be guaranteed open space in perpetuity? Why is there a loop road to the South, can't there just be dead end alleys like in the other phases? Eliminating this road will decrease the amount of impermeable surface, plowing costs, and maintenance costs. It will also give the homes more privacy by not having asphalt on two sides. The homes can be oriented toward the alley with minimal redesign.

At the last meeting, the issue of not enough trees to meet code came up. Do not let the LLC get away without either planting the trees or in lieu of the trees, contribute money to the open space fund. Maybe even make the LLC pay for the free market density. Each tree is worth a minimum of \$250 each, plus irrigation cost.

The Stables Road should not be used as a part of this development. It is a gravel road and additional traffic will create dust and ruin the tranquil setting of the horse stables. There should be a berm with trees between the development and the horse stables. Again the alleys should dead end here.

That's pretty much it. I don't know if there is any power you have to mitigate noise. (Mr. Schuman: If staff is interested in mitigating or eliminating issues, they have to be Code based issues. I have a question for you; Are you are representing you, yourself, or neighbors? Is there an HOA? I wanted to clarify whether you are representing an HOA or just yourself and your neighbors?) I don't think there is an HOA, no, just myself and the neighbors. (Mr. Schuman: If it's not in the Code, there is nothing we can do as Planning Commissioners. I don't know if you have approached the Town Council; that is where you need to let the rubber hit the road. We don't finally approve projects; we recommend the Town Council approve projects. I recommend you approach the Town Council; that is really who you need to speak to. We look at the Code; what is allowed by the code. A lot of the concerns you have are large big project issues that the Town Council could certainly flex some of their muscle.) (Mr. Mosher: As a reminder, public comment at the beginning of the Town Council meeting is for any item NOT on that meeting's agenda.) (Mr. Schuman: Coffee Talk with the Mayor is a great venue too. You could go there, have a coffee, and clearly state your concerns with the project.) (Ms. Dudney: Construction protocol; we never get into that. If they are violating that, you have a complete right to talk to the police and the Town Manager. Keep filing Police reports. I am sorry that is your experience.) (Mr. Schuman: Thank you for your comments and your time.)

There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed. (Mr. Pringle: It's difficult living in a transitional area.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Dudney: No comment.

Mr. Pringle: No comment.

Mr. Lamb: No comment. Working after 7 and on Sundays; that is an enforcement issue, a police issue.

Mr. Pringle: I would like to thank Ms. Leidal and Mr. Mosher for working out that technical issue. Thank you for figuring out the math on that.

Mr. Schroder: Enforcement is important. (Mr. Mosher: We have followed up and there is the police report. Also, I have indicated to Mr. Podhorecki to please get his comments in prior to the packet deadline so they can be included in your packet you see instead of 35 minutes before the meeting.)

Mr. Leidal: Thank you, Mr. Podhorecki, for bringing this to our attention and sounds like staff is working on it. Thank you, Mr. Mosher for helping me understand the calculations on the landscaping.

Mr. Schuman: I concur.

Ms. Leidal made a motion to approve the Lincoln Park Filing No. 2 Subdivision, PL-2016-0032, Bridge Street / Stables Road, with the modified findings and conditions, including the addition of Condition Number 9 ("The application for this phase of the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood subdivision and all previous and subsequent subdivisions of Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood shall abide with *Development Code, 9-1-19-35A: Policy 35 (Absolute) Subdivision and Subdivision Standards, 9-2-4-2: Design Compatible With Natural Features* that requires all subdivisions to provide one tree having a minimum trunk

diameter (measured 12 inches above ground level) of not less than two inches (2") suitable for the Breckenridge climate for every ten (10) linear feet of roadway platted. Bridge Street extends through the entire length of Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood, and will be platted via subdivision applications. The total length of Bridge Street is approximately 2,139 feet which equates to 214 trees for all of Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood filings. Applicant shall install a total of 214 trees, a minimum of 2-inch in caliper, per 9-2-4-2-D-3 for all of the Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood subdivision filings.”) Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1) Denison Placer Parking Lot (JP) PL-2016-0013, 1900 Airport Road

Mr. Mosher presented on behalf of Mr. Grosshuesch who was to present on behalf of Ms. Puester. This application is a proposal to construct a 30 space paved parking lot and install landscaping and downcast lighting. This parking lot is intended as overflow parking for the adjacent Denison Placer workforce housing rental units on Block 11.

No density or mass are required for parking and staff had no concerns from site design, environmental impact or drainage. None of this parking is required. Again, healthy landscaping is being placed. This is for the benefit of Denison Placer residents.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): Staff has provided a final point analysis and find this application warrants negative two (-2) points under Policy 22R Landscaping for providing less than 10 feet of landscape area width along one edge of the parking lot and therefore warrants positive four (+4) points under Policy 25R Transit for providing bus pull outs in both travel directions. The application was found to meet all Absolute policies.

This is a Town Project pursuant to the ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013). As a result, the Planning Commission is asked to identify any concerns with this project, and any code issues and make a recommendation to the Town Council. Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council approve the Denison Placer Parking Lot, PL-2016-0013 located at 1900 Airport Road with a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Why is this presented a Town Project? (Ms. Best: We know the Town will control this property. It can only be Town Project if owned by the Town. The Housing projects may be owned by different partnership entities so those were not processed as a Town Project, but they were processed as Class A development permits)

Mr. Pringle: For Denison? (Ms. Best: It will be overflow, maybe for all of Block 11 housing. We don't know yet.) The cagey skier might use the lot; is there any control? (Ms. Best: The designated day skier parking will be in another location. This lot will support the residential units and we'll evaluate best way to manage that as part of managing the residential uses-perhaps permit parking.) If a day skier wants to park on Main Street they can. (Ms. Best: This lot is intended for parking for the residential use.)

Ms. Leidal: Just positive two (+2) for two pullouts and no shelter? (Ms. Best: No shelters included) (Mr. Mosher: From Public Works - Shelters often need maintenance and a lot of extra work from Public Works; we like to have HOA be responsible for the shelters if possible.)

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

Mr. Lamb made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Denison Placer Parking Lot, PL-

2016-0013, 1900 Airport Road, showing a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair