

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller Christie Leidal Ron Schuman
Dan Schroder Gretchen Dudney Jim Lamb
Dave Pringle (arrived at 7:06 pm)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the September 20, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Puester added Other Matters to the end of the agenda. With no other changes, the October 4, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1) Rocky Mountain Underground ADA Ramp (CK) PL-2016-0480, 114 South Main Street

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Would they have had to do this if it was not a change of use? (Mr. Kulick: They would not have had to.)

Mr. Schuman: What was the change of conditions? (Mr. Kulick: We had the expiration date in 2017; it was supposed to be 2018.)

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

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Housing Needs Assessment (LB)

Ms. Best presented. An update to the County-wide Housing Needs Assessment was finalized in August. A copy of the full report and an executive summary were included in your packet. Some of the key findings for the Upper Blue Basin are:

- The 2013 Needs Assessment projected that 175 to 280 additional ownership units and 200 to 370 additional rental units would be needed in the Upper Blue Basin by 2017. The new projection is 230 ownership and 270 rentals (total of 500 units) will be needed through 2020. This projection assumes that the projects currently underway are completed (Denison Placer 1 & 2, Huron Landing, and Lincoln Park).
- The 500 additional units would serve the needs of year round employees (seasonal employees are not included in this assessment) and includes 125 'catch up' units and 375 'keep up' units.
- The 125 catch up units are those units needed immediately to address current deficiencies. For the Upper Blue Basin this includes housing for about 10% of the in-commuters who are currently working in the Upper Blue, but living outside of Summit County. Approximately 10% of the in-commuters have indicated they would prefer to live in the Upper Blue where they are employed if housing were available and affordable. Catch up also includes additional rental units needed to address a very low rental capture rate (8.6%) which signifies an immediate need for additional units to house renters already in the community (either overcrowded or cost burdened).
- The 375 keep up units are the additional units that will be needed between 2016 and 2020 to replace retiring workers and to replace market units that are currently housing employees that will be converted to second home/vacation use, and to provide housing for approximately 80% of the new employees filing new jobs over the next 5 years. New jobs over the next 5 years are projected to increase at a modest rate of 1.7% per year.
- The demand for 500 units is based on the need to provide housing for approximately 900 employees in the Upper Blue. The conversion from employees to units is based on the Upper Blue current

occupancy rate and household size for employee occupied units (average 1.8 employees per employee occupied unit). Diversity in the type, size, and price of workforce housing is needed to reduce cross basin commuting and to provide housing for the different segments of the workforce, but overall the 500 unit projection assumes the 1.8 average occupancy rate will be maintained across the inventory of units. This can be rechecked when the assessment is updated on a 5 year cycle.

- The income/price targets for the 270 rental units are broken down by AMI brackets but most of the need is under 60% AMI and at the 80-100% AMI. The income targets for the 230 ownership units is also broken down by AMI and indicates need across all of the income brackets from under 60% AMI up to 150% AMI.
- The Town anticipates future workforce housing development on the Stan Miller Property (105 units), on Block 11 (250 units), on the McCain property (100 units) and possibly at Berlin Placer (20 units). This could address 475 of the 500 units that are needed by 2020.
- Beyond 2020 the Town should anticipate that additional units will be needed to 'keep up' with the ongoing loss of employee occupied market rate units, retirees in deed restricted units, and job growth. An update to this 2016 assessment will likely be scheduled in 2021 after the next census.

Staff is working with the Workforce Housing sub-committee and Town Council to address the need. It is anticipated that much of the housing that is needed in the Upper Blue could be accommodated on Town-owned sites that are already designated for workforce housing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: What is Berlin Placer? (Ms. Best: It is a private project near Sally Barber, currently going through review with the county. There are some market rate units and some that will be deed restricted. We hope to find more private sector partnerships like this.) (Ms. Puester: 45-55 total units are proposed.) (Ms. Best: We hope to get 20 deed restricted units.) So what is needed in order to make a successful project? (Ms. Best: There are different ways to develop projects, for example, with Pinewood II, we used tax credit financing, but still put in 6 million that we will get back over time. With Valley Brook, we had some higher AMI units for sale that helped cover cost for the lower AMI units.) This still does not address below 60% AMI. If you take a service worker making \$10/hour, they are still only making \$20,000 a year. (Ms. Best: It's difficult to make rental units pencil without subsidy.) So what gives? More density, reducing the quality of the project, or raising wages? They would have to be tripled. (Ms. Best: In Breckenridge, we do have land for almost 500 units, so we can structure projects where proceeds from for sale units could fund some rental.) It's kind of drops in the bucket. (Ms. Best: We are seeing more workforce housing projects throughout the County and hopefully with the ballot in November, we'll have more resources. We'll have to evaluate the most cost effective way to create units; there is no silver bullet, but a variety of options, but we also must be aware of the strings that come with different approaches, for example for rental financing the LIHTC income testing is very challenging because it is difficult to calculate income in resort economy because of the nature of seasonal jobs. It is taking longer to fill units for Pinewood II because of the grant funding we got and the strings attached.)

Mr. Schuman: Have deed restrictions become more standardized or has there been tightening? (Ms. Best: When the town is developer, it is up to the town to determine the level of deed restrictions. When projects are in partnership with private developers, we have to work with them to determine what they need and what they can accept. Every deed restriction is different in that sense, and depends on the project.) What about enforcement, what does the Summit Housing Authority do? (Ms. Best: They perform the monitoring process which includes annual self affirmation affidavits and some inspections, but if a violation is confirmed they referred to the Town to enforce. The Summit Housing Authority has implemented an anonymous tip line and when they get these tips, they investigate and refer to the Town if a violation is confirmed.)

- Mr. Schroder: People are just going to keep coming here because of Breckenridge's reputation, so how is any future worker going to be able to move and live here beyond 2020? (Ms. Best: I think ultimately all workers are going to end up in deed restricted units, and so we just have to continue to try and deed restrict what we can. We can't build enough units so it will be a combination of preserving some of the market rate units and building new units.) So what will be the outlets in the future? Park County, Alma?
- Ms. Dudney: And prices of other commodities will go up: gas, food, etc. (Ms. Best: The best we can do is increase the amount of deed restricted units while we can now.)
- Mr. Pringle: What about the deed restricted units increasing in price to where they cannot be afforded still? (Ms. Best: Many of the restrictions include an appreciation cap and an income cap; for those that do not include an appreciation cap, the market will determine the value of the deed restricted units and hopefully there will always be some discount/gap between market rate units and deed restricted units because of the restrictions on use and occupancy.) What about the ones where there are caps? (Mr. Kulick: Some of the older ones, there are rules like no short-term rentals, even if they do not have caps. But we have not done anything like that recently; it has evolved to where there is some room for appreciation without it getting too high.) (Ms. Best: We commissioned a study on price creep to determine if our deed restricted units are staying affordable to their initial target-there are many other variables that impact affordability that are out of our control-such as interest rates.) One thing that has always bothered me is that if the Town is going to heavily subsidize for sale units, and we want to make sure that they're always affordable; we don't want people to take advantage of the Town subsidizing the unit. (Ms. Best: Well that is our goal, and I think we are still doing well providing some appreciation, but trying to maintain affordability. For example, since AMI has gone down, there is no appreciation in many of our local neighborhoods such as Gibson Heights.)
- Ms. Dudney: Do you see anything dramatic on the horizon like boarding houses or dormitories because this is not an answer long-term? (Ms. Best: I don't see any one answer, which is why we just try to have a wide range of affordable housing types and price points, and Breckenridge is doing well on that.)
- Mr. Pringle: People have talked about tiny homes and things like that. (Ms. Best: These are difficult because you just can't reach the density you need.) I'm not an advocate for them, but I think there could be a very well-maintained mobile home park and outside of resort areas, they are prevalent everywhere.
- Mr. Lamb: The problem is that people do not want mobile homes next to them.
- Mr. Pringle: Well we could hide them; they are prevalent in lots of communities, and maybe we should look into this because it brings the cost down substantially. (Ms. Best: ADUs have worked very well in some communities and maybe we do need to think about having these in second homes, because they can add up.) What we don't want to have happen is getting into issues with parking and such, but if we can accommodate that it could be a very good way to go.
- Mr. Schuman: It is tough after the fact, of course.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Puester presented. There was a call up on the Planning Commission decision on the sprung structures, so that will be at the Town Council meeting next week. There were questions asked at the work sessions regarding timing details. The residential parking ordinance passed at second reading. We also had a resolution in support of question 2A (municipalities being given more authority on their own wireless communication). There was a resolution to support Summit School District issues 3A and 3B, and another for the 5A renewal (housing fees). Budget will come before Council in October. There was a joint meeting with the Breckenridge Heritage Alliance. The Council talked about the town lighting plan, presented by public works, which will be improve lighting in high pedestrian areas also as identified by the Nelson Nygaard study. Three different types of light fixtures, and trying to get a cohesive blend of that as well as what will work best in different

areas. Different types of bulb, LEDs, will be used to get more light in key locations. (Mr. Grosshuesch: They figured out how to make Wellsbach dark sky compliant. They will be starting with Four O'Clock Road, Village Road, Watson Avenue, Park Avenue and they're experimenting on Airport Road. Eventually Main Street will get dark sky compliant lights.) (Mr. Kulick: They are also choosing LEDs that have less of the blue light and this is another reason why they are testing these out right now first before implementing them everywhere.) October 11th at 2 pm is the Town Council visit to Lincoln Park.

OTHER MATTERS:

1) Planning Commission Field Trip, November 3, 2016

Ms. Puester: We will be looking at various code related topics that we discussed last meeting from the Steering Committee updates as well as some recent housing developments and will come out with an agenda fairly soon.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Can we include Maggie Placer? (Ms. Puester: Yes.)

2) State APA Conference (October 24-26, 2016) and Saving Places Conference (February 1-4, 2017)

Ms. Puester: Please sign up if you have not already and let me know if you have any questions. The CLG code also gives us a huge discount on the Saving Places Conference so let me know if you have any issues with using that.

3) Planning Commission Applications

Ms. Puester: Mr. Schroder, Mr. Lamb and Mr. Pringle are all up this year and have all reapplied. There are also five other applicants. Interviews will be at next week's Town Council Work Session and appointments at next week's Town Council Regular Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair