PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chair Schroder.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller Christie Leidal Ron Schuman
Jim Lamb Dan Schroder Gretchen Dudney

Steve Gerard

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Leidal: I have some changes to the minutes, specifically comments that were made by others but were attributed to me in the Riverwalk and Denison project items. I called and spoke with Ms. Puester prior to the meeting and Ms. Puester has made the changes for the record.

Ms. Leidal: On page 5: With regard to losing parking spaces, I actually asked if this still retained the 24' drive aisle. (Mr. Schroder stated he actually asked the question regarding the parking spaces.)

Ms. Leidal: On page 8: "Will the storage spaces still be assigned?" I actually asked about the parking in the carport being assigned. Ms. Dudney actually made the comment about the storage maintenance. "Will there be one person in a one bedroom unit?" Ms. Dudney actually made that comment.

Mr. Schuman: On page 5: "It should have read "received" not "gotten".

With no other changes, the February 21, 2017, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 7, 2017, Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1) Shock Hill Overlook Lot 3 Duplex (MM) PL-2017-0010, 72 & 68 West Point Lode

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

WORKSESSIONS:

1) History Colorado: Mark Rodman

Ms. Puester introduced Mr. Mark Rodman, who is the Director of Preservation Programs and Preservation Technical Services Manager for History Colorado. History Colorado oversees the Certified Local Government (CLG) Program, of which we are a member.

Mr. Rodman: You have to be evaluated every four years. I did an evaluation earlier today with Julia and all of your information is very organized and in place. I also come and observe your meeting to see how the meeting is run. A few things about History Colorado: It is a non-profit and state agency. I work with the State Historic Preservation office (government function). I am passing out a booklet on new programs and tax credits.

What it means to be a CLG:

- 1. Have a preservation ordinance, enforce the ordinance
- 2. Have people attend a training
 - a. Any planning training will account for this
 - b. Town of Breckenridge is welcome to bring people in for presentations
 - c. We can go to someone else's preservation meeting
- 3. Have to maintain a publically accessible system of inventory of historic properties and surveys, meeting minutes

- 4. Options for public to participate should include an item on the agenda regularly for general public comment on any historic issues, buildings etc which are not on the agenda, in addition to your public hearing process for development permits.
- 5. Any building that is being proposed for designation by a private individual anywhere in the state: Town of Breckenridge Planning Commission needs to comment on the application.
- 6. National Alliance of Preservation Commissions:
 - a. Code of Ethics (passing this pamphlet around).
 - b. Economic Benefits of Historic Preservation: Expect the booklet to be coming available soon.
 - c. State Historic Tax Credits: Most of the receiving projects have been on the frontrange. We are concerned that they may not get renewed if they are not used elsewhere. Any projects you can get to use the tax credits would help. You can transfer tax credits and are worthwhile to those who do not have State tax liability. Nonprofits can also sell them.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Are there any other Planning Commissions that also function as the Historic Preservation Commissions in the State? (Mr. Rodman: The only other one is Crested Butte.) Do we know how many projects have been done without the state commercial tax credit program assistance? (Ms. Puester: No projects have used the commercial tax credit program.) (Mr. Rodman: You guys do have projects that have taken the federal state credits, but the state current commercial credit program just started in 2015 and it was authorized for 5 years.) (Mr. Truckey: In terms of public involvement, pretty much any project in the historic district will be subject to a Public Hearing at a Planning Commission.) (Mr. Rodman: My concern would be to ensure that a member of the public could come and comment on a non-agenda historic related item.)

Mr. Gerard:

I have seen that before on other Commissions. I think we should add that on our regular agenda. (Mr. Truckey: The Town Council does that also.)

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Truckey presented.

- Water Service for the Berlin Placer (in County by Baldy Road and Sallie Barber). Affordable housing project. Originally came in with 50 to 60 units proposed. Originally 40% deed restricted and 60% free market. We asked to have that reversed and they agreed to that. They are asking for water service. We are going forward with a water service agreement, waiving tap fees for deed restricted units. There were a number of other items involving trailheads, etc., that the applicant has also addressed.
- The Council is also moving forward with the Cross-Tab Agreement. The density is limited per the plat notes. They are asking for an additional 800 sq. ft. to a single family home. The applicants will be purchasing TDRs for the additional density and they have proposed a public benefit, which is a \$5,000 contribution towards trail work on the new trail behind Pinewood I and II and Claimjumper Condos that connects uphill to the Pence Miller trail. It is going to be over a mile of new trail. The Council was pretty comfortable with that moving forward. The actual development proposal will probably be a Class D Major, so the Planning Commission will not see it.
- Riverwalk Pedestrian Improvements: The Council approved the Town Project. The construction was planned for this summer, but they are concerned that construction was planned right in the height of the summer. Council has requested that staff postpone those improvements until the fall.
- Denison Placer Workforce Housing: The Council approved this Town project.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Is Berlin Placer on the uphill side of Sallie Barber Road? (Mr. Truckey: Actually both sides of the road. All those trails will be preserved but the character may change because of the development. We have really been encouraging housing outside of the Town. There is water and transit already for the property and it is a logical location for housing. We supported that. Anytime we can get a private developer coming in with a good proposal; that is a win-win for us.)

Mr. Gerard: What kind of units? (Mr. Truckey: 14 single family, 20 duplex, 1 Habitat for Humanity

home.)

Mr. Schroder: Did they not plan to do the Riverwalk improvements and the 4 O'Clock Roundabout at the

same time? (Mr. Truckey: That was the original plan, but that has changed to reduce impacts

in that area during peak summer activities like 4th of July, NRO, BMF.)

CHILD CARE PROGRAM UPDATE:

Ms. McAtamney presented.

- The child care program has been around since 2006. Started by Council: teacher turnover, losing employees 1:5 for childcare and 1:4 to housing issues. Council has its own advisory committee. I am here to share with you a little about the program and some info on local families. We support our local non-profit childcare centers, work with our 4 non-profit schools to help them deliver high quality programs.
- We built Coyne Valley. Had a waiting list of up to 100 kids. We went ahead and built that center. We paid off debt and Carriage House and Little Red and asked them to fund a reserve fund (for example, to replace a roof). We also asked them to raise their teacher salaries. When you raise salaries typically, tuition goes up. We created a tuition-assistance program. We created a scholarship program that created a lot of confusion. We don't want a family paying more than 13% to 16% for childcare. Here in Summit, we have one of the highest rates of working parents in the country. We are working with the centers to uncover efficiencies. We help them create new financial procedures. We develop training programs for their Boards of Directors. For a lot of parents, this is their first opportunity to serve. We show them what good governance looks like. Many of these parents go on to serve the community in other capacities.
- \$2.5 to \$2.7 million budget among the centers. 250 kids in care. 120 kids receiving assistance. 48% of our families receive some kind of assistance. Average days a week in care: 3.54 days per week. Families have been here for over a decade on average. Program is aimed at the middle class. Great federal and state programs at the lowest level AMI so we do less there. People are eligible up to 150% AMI.
- Program is focused on the Upper Blue. 70% of families. 45% of them live in the Town of Breckenridge. We also want to support our businesses, so we have a local workforce requirement. If I was a business owner, I would use this as a recruitment tool.
- We serve people all over the county.
- 47% using tuition assistance also live in deed-restricted housing.
- 85% of our parents work compared to 64% statewide.
- 40% of families are low income by national HUD standards.
- Average income for families with Tuition Assistance: \$75,734.
- We do income verification. Over reporting occurs 13% on average.
- AMI by Industry: we work with all incomes. We see couples with very similar income.
- We went in and used a sustainability index provided by the state. We felt it was not reflective in Summit County, so we modified it. We used 30% for housing. We found that someone making \$81,500 was in the hole over \$900 at the end of the year. Even couples making \$130,000 (160% of AMI) still don't have any savings left over at the end of the year after child care expenses.
- Local businesses have benefitted from our program as well as independent contractors. We had 11% of our application audited this year, and we are unable to find any anomalies.
- 10 years after founding: 4 non-profit schools, tuition assistance.
- 35 infants and toddlers on our wait list.
- Still work to do regarding retention, etc. but we know that the program is working.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: How long will it take to cycle through that waiting list? (Ms. McAtamney: It is unpredictable.

Teachers do not have healthcare. We created a program this year that would allow any childcare center teacher access to the health care centers for free. Only about 1/3 of the

teachers have care through a spouse.)

Ms. Dudney: What about the option of sharing a nanny or opening up homes for daycare? (Ms.

McAtamney: We don't work with people who are for profit. But the good news is that we can calculate the cost of care for tuition assistance and that assistance goes directly to the center.) Sure, I was just thinking about the overall cost of care and bringing the care down. (Ms. McAtamney: We see our costs are \$74/day for infant care and \$38 for preschoolers.) Is there a regulatory issue that could reduce the cost? (Ms. McAtamney: So much of it is around safety. Maybe you could step back on that but that is not driving the true cost of these centers. The cost structures are all super centers. It is really the people who are driving the cost. We could change ratios but that would not create a good situation.) (Ms. Puester: Although this is not an issue that the Planning Commission deals with directly, we feel that the community looks to the Planning Commission for information and we thought it was important you to know about the new information that we have coming out of this new Childcare position. Ms. McAtamney has been making a lot of headway since she started nearly a year ago.) If there is anything with real estate that could help, you should let us know. (Ms. McAtamney: The nice

thing is that our Planning Code does allow for in-home centers.)

Mr. Schuman: What is the employee program called? (Ms. McAtamney: It is called the Breckenridge Tuition Assistance Program.) Can you email the presentation? (Ms. McAtamney: Yes. It also

looks like we have the opportunity to add dental care to the ECARE program.)

DEVELOPMENT CODE STEERING COMMITTEE UPDATE:

Mr. Truckey presented.

- The Steering Group met almost two weeks ago. We spent most time focused on Policy 22/R Landscaping. I am just going to go over some of the highlights. There is a provision that requires one tree every 15' along the right of way. This is already covered under the subdivision code but with different tree separation requirements. The Group agreed to eliminate the reference to street trees in the landscaping policy.
- The points assignment under Landscaping have some inconsistencies. In one section it talks about "use areas and privacy" and in another it talks about right of ways and adjacent properties, which has been the main focus of what we do. We are trying to make this consistent.
- We have never awarded 6 positive points for landscaping. Do we still want to have this on the table? The recommendation from the Group is to eliminate the positive 6. There is not that much of a gap between positive 2 and positive 4 points, just tree sizes. We looked at what do you need to get positive 6. We have historic properties with too much landscaping. Positive 6 talks about the largest tree sizes possible which could be overpowering like a jungle. We came up with another thought about getting to positive 4. The Group recommends requiring certain water conservation measures, possibly have a list of choices and you have to meet a few of those. Examples: Rain sensors, drip irrigation, a limit on percent of disturbance envelope, not using non-native sod. The idea is to get to positive 4 points, you have to have a water conservation package.
- Our proposal is to remove the requirements for landscaping by zone. The current code requires landscaping in defensible space Zone 1 (within 30' of the house) for positive two (+2) points, planting in Zones 1 and 2 for positive four (+4) points, etc. We will remove this, because the zones are not relevant to where screening is necessarily needed.
- There is a maintenance provision in 22/A regarding replacement of dead or removed trees and we want that to be highlighted a little more and will require that note on site plans, or as a condition of

approval.

- We talked about limiting irrigated turf and assigning negative points for excessive areas of irrigated turf.
- Policy 24A The Social Community: Tables that provide negative points above 9 UPA. Since it is assigning negative points, it belongs in a relative policy so we are moving it out of there.
- Our next meeting with the Steering Group is the 30th of this month.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Has anyone come to us proposing to removing trees that have become overgrown? (Ms.

Puester: Yes, we have had this before and if they are meeting the original intent, depending on the extent of removal, we sometimes will allow or require some replanting of smaller sizes. We would allow them to remove trees with a staff level permit if there is structural

damage or for wildfire mitigation.)

Ms. Leidal: There is a section of Policy 22 that specifically allows for thinning for tree health, so staff has

flexibility to allow this in appropriate situations.

Mr. Schuman: I am not sure about limiting irrigated lawn and encouraging xeriscaping. Might not look right

in certain applications.

Ms. Dudney: Peter says that the sod irrigation is our biggest water usage. In the Highlands, we use native

summit grass and it looks really nice.

Mr. Lamb: The applications in the Highlands are different than the historic district. There should be

exceptions for things like soccer fields and parks too.

Ms. Dudney: I think what I would like to see is the exception being the historic district and sports fields.

My question is why allow any irrigated turf, unless it is in the historic district?

OTHER MATTERS:

1) Saving Places Conference Recap

Ms. Puester: A lot of us went, so I wanted to provide an opportunity to recap the different sessions we went to for the group. One of the sessions I really like was focused on new technology, specifically new apps for historic preservation. Much of this involved how to communicate with the next generation, making this relevant and relatable. Different ways to reach people with new formats. How to involve multiple people at the same time. Linking children, planning, and historic preservation.

Mr. Truckey: There was also an interesting session on video games, etc. and the recognition that the younger generation learns about historic places from some of these games. A teacher from Adams County was discussing how she had her students in the field searching for PokemonGo sites that were all historic buildings.

Ms Puester: I went to one on ADA accessibility that was a little more technical. They had some good examples on handrails, blending in with historic styles with a code compliant height rails which looked different but complimentary, same as the ADA issues.

Commissioner Comments:

Mr. Giller: I went to a law session in CAMP, and they talked about the importance of not using

precedent to base development decisions on, or rather stick to the development code.

Ms. Dudney: I thought the best one was the Yea or Nay session. For a non-design person, that was very

helpful because you looked at different designs, voted on if you thought it was done well or

not and then the professionals discussed it.

Mr. Giller: I thought the focus of the conference sessions has become less tactical/technical, and more

general.

Ms. Leidal: I really liked the ADA Accessibility session. I also liked the one on how Main Street meets

Town of Breckenridge Planning Commission Regular Meeting Date 03/07/2017 Page 6

mid-century modern.

Ms. Dudney: I think the Ski Town Forum was a great interaction with other towns, but the setting was a

challenge and it would be great going forward if we could have the opportunity to display

visuals.

Mr. Gerard: I think you could have a session in a typical class room for Ski Town Forum discussion, and

then go somewhere else and have an opportunity to interact and ask each other about the

projects.

ADJOURNMENT:

	The meeting	was a	adjourned	at	7:55	pm
--	-------------	-------	-----------	----	------	----

Dan Schroder, Chair	