

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Schuman.

ROLL CALL

Gretchen Dudney Mike Giller Jim Lamb
Christie Mathews-Leidal Ron Schuman Dan Schroder
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:08pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schuman: Please have the minutes reflect my statement regarding Mr. Mamula coming to the meeting later and hopefully we will hear some guidance on the Development Code. With no other changes, the June 21, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms Puester: I would like to add discussion of the comprehensive Development Code review process at the end of the meeting. With no other changes, the July 5, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

- 1) Looking Glass Residence (CL) PL-2016-0043, 138 Peerless Drive

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

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

- 1) Carter Museum Public Restrooms (MM) PL-2016-0172, 113 North Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented. The project will be using an existing cabin (aka Wentzell Cabin) moved from another site with added improvements to create a public restroom at the northwest portion of Lot 17, Tract B, Abbett Addition to the Town of Breckenridge. This restroom will be adjacent to the Carter Museum and the new Prospector Park.

After acquiring and assuming ownership of the Terrible Lode property, the Town of Breckenridge Open Space program is required by the Forest Service to remove all buildings / structures from the site. The Town is always trying to find creative ways to reuse and repurpose existing buildings. The Wentzell Cabin is an example of such.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): Staff has found that this application passes all absolute policies of the Development Code and has not incurred any positive or negative points under any relative 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. In addition, the Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the Town Council. The Planning Department recommended the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council approve the Point Analysis with a passing point analysis of zero (0) points for the Carter Museum Public Restrooms (PL-2016-0172).

The Planning Department recommended the Planning Commission recommend the Town Council approve the Carter Museum Public Restrooms located at 113 North Ridge Street (PL-2016-0172) with the presented Findings.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Would you clarify is this an historic structure; is it contributing or noncontributing? (Mr.

Mosher: It is primarily historic fabric; this has been disassembled and reassembled from outside Breckenridge, the logs have old character. It may be contributing with qualifications in that it has a fabric, shape, with form that is old, but not a contributing structure to the Town's history.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: This cabin was disassembled, removed and reassembled to where it currently sits from somewhere else. The corner joints are unique in how they are hewn to fit together. It did not come from the town and therefore does not meet the official definition of "contributing".) I think we should qualify exactly what it is, it has good history, but we should be specific. (Mr. Mosher: I think contributing with qualifications may be the best definition we could have. We will look into adding this to the report.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: Because this building isn't in the Town, it is not rated like the other structures on the national register in the Town, so we do not have an operative ordinance to classify it.) I would like to have its status stated more clearly to determine what we do to it. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The exterior is true to its history, it is the interior that has been changed.)

Mr. Lamb: I think it looks cool and will contribute to that area of town.

Mr. Schroder: I think it is an important facility and a good use of the cabin.

Ms. Leidal: Good adaptive use; and restrooms are needed in that area of town.

Mr. Giller: I support the project, but I do think we should clarify what we're doing because it is not so clear that this is a historic structure or historic fabric.

Ms. Dudney: I support the project, I am very proud of it.

Mr. Pringle: Facilities like this are necessary, but I do share Mr. Giller's concern that we are very clear in what it is and how we are going about this.

Mr. Schuman: Maybe a plaque would be good to explain the history of the cabin.

Mr. Schroder: How can we do something like this; what would it look like? (Ms Puester: We can put some clarifying detail in the file so that if anyone pulls the file in the future, no one landmarks it or anything of that nature.)

Mr. Pringle: I don't think we tell the story well enough of what used to be, so we might want to think about looking into ways to make the public aware of the history.

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

Mr. Pringle made a motion to recommend that the Town Council approve the point analysis for the Carter Museum Public Restrooms, PL-2016-0172, 113 North Ridge Street, showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points and to recommend the Town Council approve the Carter Museum Public Restrooms, PL-2016-0172, 113 North Ridge Street, with the presented findings. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

1) Klack Placer Cabin Landmarking (Klack Gulch Placer MS#1224), PL-2016-0273, 200 Block of South Harris Street

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to locally landmark the Klack Placer Cabin per Section 9-11-3, Designation of Landmarks, Landmark Sites, Historic Districts and Cultural Landscape Districts, of the Town Code. The Klack Placer Cabin is owned by the Town of Breckenridge and managed by the Breckenridge Heritage Alliance. In 2009 the Town, in conjunction with the Breckenridge Heritage Alliance, stabilized the cabin by replacing rotten logs along the bottom of the structure and placing gravel below the cabin to improve drainage. In addition to these maintenance efforts the Cabin was rotated 180 degrees to improve privacy to the adjacent residence located at 209 South Harris Street.

In order to be designated as a landmark, the property must be at least 50 years old (the Klack Placer Cabin was constructed in the late 1870s). In addition, the property exemplifies specific elements of architectural style or period (the cabin is architecturally significant for its pioneer log construction); the property

exemplifies cultural, political, economic or social heritage of the community (the cabin is significant for its association with the development of Breckenridge and its mining-related history, dating from the circa late 1870s and it is among the town's last log cabins which survive from the settlement or camp phases which predates the turn of the twentieth century); and, the property is an established and familiar natural setting or visual feature of the community (the cabin is located in the Klack Placer Gulch).

Finally, the property also shows character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the community, region, state or nation and the property retains original design features, materials and/or character (the cabin retains its pioneer log construction).

The Planning Department suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to locally landmark the Klack Placer Cabin located on the 200 Block of South Harris Street, Klack Placer Open Space, PL-2016-0273, based on the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: In column B, I was wondering if the notable persons category wasn't highlighted because James Klack was not actually that notable? (Mr. Kulick: Considering other criteria were met, we did not consider this part because we were not really sure how notable Mr. Klack was.) (Mr. Mosher: The cabin used to be situated on a much larger land area according to historical maps. Its context was very different. Klack owned a lot of land.)

Mr. Pringle: I remember there being a lot of objection to anything being done to the cabin in the past.

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

Mr. Schroder made a motion to recommend the Town Council adopt an ordinance to locally landmark the Klack Placer Cabin located on the 200 Block of South Harris Street, Klack Placer Open Space, PL-2016-0273, based on the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-3 of the Landmarking Ordinance. Ms. Leidal seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2) Class C Subdivisions Approved Q2, 2016 (JP) (Memo Only)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: Regarding staff review of changes to subdivision disturbance envelopes, we reviewed these lots individually previously, and I question staff administrative approval of these. (Mr. Mosher: Staff is just as concerned as the Commission about moving envelopes. To guarantee all of the building, including roof overhangs will be contained in the envelope, we now require specific dimensions on plans where the foundation is close to any envelope.) (Ms. Puester: It is a Class C subdivision which is an administrative review; however, as part of the review process, adjacent property owners do get a public notice per code. This is not a new process. It is rare to modify an envelope but if an envelope is modified, it is reduced elsewhere so that the square footage remains the same as originally platted.) I just don't know why we went through the trouble in reviewing envelopes originally if the envelopes are easily changed. (Ms. Puester: It does not happen often, rare occasions.) (Mr. Kulick: In my experience with the Town I have only been involved in two modifications. The most recent case was the one you are asking about located in Discovery Hill where portion of the building envelope located in a steep, poorly screened, ridgeline area was replaced with a smaller, flatter, more area concealed area. It was also supported by the HOA.) I just want to know if it should be under the Planning Commission's purview when these things come up. (Mr. Mosher: All these proposals are very carefully analyzed and scrutinized by Staff and quite often we do say "no".)

- 3) Class D Majors Approved Q2, 2016 (JP) (Memo Only)
- 4) Comprehensive Code Review Process

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: We are looking to have the first meeting on July 21st. Ms. Dudney and Ms. Leidal will be the Planning Commission representatives and as they're going through the process, they'll come back and share their feedback from the meetings on the process and where it is going. The staff has some idea of what needs to be looked at, but there are many individuals who will want to give input, including architects. The last item on the 19th will be a work session for input on the process as Mr. Truckey begins to work it out. (Ms. Puester: The steering committee will be working on this in a more focused way, but it will all ultimately be coming through the Planning Commission.) (Mr. Truckey: If there are any particular code issues you have, be thinking about bringing those to the meeting on July 19th.)

Ms. Dudney: What will the time frame look like? (Mr. Schuman: Could be 18-24 months for the overall process.) (Ms Puester: The steering committee process will be shorter than that, maybe 4 months, but 18-24 months counting processes for community input, Planning Commission work sessions and staff time. It will in part depend on our workload.)

5) Parking:

Ms. Dudney: Is there anything you can tell us about the transportation process? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The consultant recommendations were by and large favorably received by Town Council. Some things would have to wait for other things to be in place first. Most notable endorsements were walk-ability improvements (heated sidewalks, enhanced lighting, better way-finding), enhanced transit (the purple route will also go in the opposite direction, an orange route improvement, an additional bus on the brown route, an enhanced smart phone app, and technology on the bus shelters to say when the next bus is coming), adding traffic circles on Park Ave. (remove all traffic lights on Park Avenue. This would not necessarily relieve congestion but will become safer and help traffic flow more evenly), pedestrian warning lights and better street lighting at the Village pedestrian crossing to F-Lot. Parking capacity increases in town are still under discussion (including discussion with the Vail Resorts). Managed parking for employees with improved transportation has been handed back to the Parking and Transit committee for further discussion and recommendations. Implementing of managed parking on Main Street is something that Council would like to implement before ski season.) I received a postcard from Vail Resorts today, is F-Lot definitely out now? (Mr. Grosshuesch: No, we are looking at strategies to take about 10% of cars off the streets, but an F-Lot structure would actually increase traffic congestion so we would then have to reduce another 6-8% increase in congestion, but the F-Lot structure is not off the table.)

Mr. Schroder: What is with the potential acquisition of Gold Rush? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It is under discussion.)

Mr. Schuman: What does Vail Resorts say about this? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Their primary concern seems to be related to the parking structure at F-Lot and when it will get built. They are not objecting to some of the other recommendations, they just haven't spent as much time on them in communications.)

Mr. Pringle: Have we ever done a study into the ridership of Summit Stage? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It is mostly an employee commuter line now, though it used to be different.) I wonder why it is the public's responsibility to provide free transportation for workers across the county, when that was not the intent of Summit Stage when it came about; it was meant to have cars parking elsewhere to get cars off the road. (Mr. Kulick: There was a survey relatively recently done on who was riding the Summit Stage bus, and I believe it was that it is mostly workforce members who are using it.) I think there is going to be a huge pushback from workers on having to park farther away. (Mr. Grosshuesch: the parking and transportation committee voted to postpone some of these decisions until after next ski season, but the consultants are saying that pricing parking is the most efficient way to reduce congestion while keeping the

remote lots free. Currently, employees are parking in East Sawmill and Wellington, for example and we enough of them to be parking further away in order to keep some spaces in the close in lots always open, thereby reducing people circling around looking for parking.)

6) Other Matters:

Mr. Schroder: I just wanted to say thank you for clearer maps lately.

Ms. Puester: It is time for updated bios from Mr. Pringle, Mr. Lamb, and Mr. Giller, so if you would like to update them, let me know.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair