

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm by Vice Chair Leidal.

ROLL CALL

Christie Leidal	Jim Lamb	Ron Schuman
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard	
Dan Schroder- Absent	Gretchen Dudney	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Giller - Page 2, second quote “looks like the windows”, make reference to code equivalency.

With those changes, the July 5, 2017, Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the July 18, 2017, Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Comments

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1) Highlands at Breckenridge Parcel A Open Space Wildfire Mitigation (CL), PL-2017-0299, 200 Highlands Drive.

With no call ups, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch presented:

- No planning commission decisions called up.
- Legislative review - town will hire out parking enforcement. A report shows that paid parking has worked and is freeing up parking space.
- Reviewing new cardio equipment at the recreation center.
- Housing – Looking at standardized covenant including price acceleration for resell and realtor fees that are built back into the selling price. There were no final decisions, just discussion.
- Gondola study review. Reviewed the recommendation for alignment of the surface gondola and cost. The gondola would align from the Block 11 parcel through the elementary school then behind the recreation center. There will be stop at the recreation center, the elementary school, City Market and the Gondola lot. It could continue south to Blue River Plaza and F lot then up to the ice arena. The alignment from the Gondola to the satellite parking is public ownership and relatively unobstructed. Gondola to F lot is also relatively free of obstruction. F lot south to the ice arena is tricky. There are private properties and one building that make the alignment difficult. The consultant did not support that portion of the alignment. Also, it ends at a wetlands and away from the ice rink parking lot. The discussion will continue at the next council meeting. Estimated cost for the project ranges from 31 to 52 million. The standard for gondola clearance is about 25 ft above ground. A gondola can only be turned 3 degrees without a turn station and the cost of each turn station is about \$2 million.
- Mr. Truckey – The 100% Renewable Energy Task Force has proposed that the Town Council adopt a goal to attain 100% renewable energy sources for town facilities by 2025 and 100% for the entire

town by 2035. We will be working with Xcel energy to provide more renewable options in order to reach the town goal by 2035 rather than relying on the individual residents.

- An RFP is out for developers for the next housing project. RFP is on hold until we get the master plan for the property to Town Council. The McCain master plan will be coming to the planning commission as well. In question is where the parking is located. There are flood plain issues and soil issue that we are still working on. Should be resolved by mid-August.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

No Comments.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Gold Pan Saloon Landmarking (CL), PL-2017-0229, 103 N. Main Street. Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to designate the Gold Pan Bar and Restaurant building as a Landmark, per Town Code section 9-11-3, Designation of Landmarks, Landmark Sites, Historic Districts and Cultural Landscape Districts. Staff had a question for the Planning Commission:

1. *The existing covered walkway structure was added to the historic façade of the building in the late 1960's, and currently encroaches into the Town Right-of-Way by approximately 7 ½ ft. If the Commission agrees that the building meets the Designation Criteria of Town Code section 9-11-4, does the Commission find that the building is eligible for designation as a Landmark with the existing covered walkway addition remaining intact?*

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Does the applicant want the walkway? (Mr. LaChance: Yes.)

Mr. Schuman: What is the precedence? (Mr. LaChance: I will have to refer that question to my colleagues who have been here longer than and could more experience with related precedence.) (Ms. Puester: The crepe cart would have been a development permit rather than a landmarking.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The crepe cart was not permitted, they just built it there.)

Ms. Dudney: Is the covered walkway structure historical? (Mr. Grosshuesch: No, it was not constructed during the "Period of Significance.") What is the reason for the landmarking? Is it to gain density? (Mr. LaChance: It would allow for free basement density.) (Ms. Sutterley: It does meet nation register requirements.) (Ms. Puester: It has not been sent for national referral.)

Mr. Giller: If it needs to be replaced are they grandfathered in to build a new one? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It would come down to a point analysis. If it is reversible, we are ok with it and it looks like this is reversible.)

Janet Sutterley, Architect presented: Ms. Sutterley presented a picture showing that the walkway may have been there in 1965. They did just rebuild the walkway 6 – 7 years ago so the structural reinforcement was just done. They do have a tenant that would like to use the entire basement. They would need to dig a basement without moving anything and there is a partial basement there now. (Ms. Dudney: Do you know if they will try to get a National Register designation?) I don't think they will but a lot of that has to do with who the current owner is.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: No issues. It would be terrible if the walkway was lost. I support the project.

Ms. Dudney: I support

Mr. Giller: I support. The walkway is non-contributing and should be well documented as such.

Mr. Gerard: I support. The walkway is culturally and socially related to Breckenridge and should not be lost.

Ms. Leidal: I agree that the walkway discussion should be well documented. It does look reversible. I support the project.

Mr. Schuman: I support.

OTHER MATTERS:

1) Class C Subdivisions Approved Q2, 2017 (JP)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

No questions.

2) Class D Majors Approved Q2, 2017 (JP)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

No questions.

3) Review of Period of Significance: Town Buildings Constructed 1942 to 1967

Mr. Kulick: This was one of the first projects I worked on when I came to the Town. We looked at buildings constructed from 1942-1967 about ten years ago and will revisit those again. The Peak 7 and 8 buildings were not included because of the already approved changes to the area. Mr. Kulick showed pictures and presented a brief history of each building. Buildings 50 years or older could be included in the Town's period of historic significance.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Shuman: I see no reason to change anything.

Mr. Giller: Thank you for the review. I don't see anything significant.

Mr. Gerard: The presentation was interesting. I don't think it dictates any changes.

Mr. Lamb: We are in a good place now. No changes are needed.

Ms. Dudney: No change.

Ms. Leidal: No change. I support the land marking designation. I would prefer to see the walkway removed.

Mr. Grosshuesch: Regarding incentives to preserve, we could adapt landmarking as there are no regulatory aspects but it does allow for more density. We could extend design standards to these properties that could be either voluntary or mandatory. I think mandatory standards would be very controversial. You would need written guidelines of what you want to see.

Mr. Kulick: I believe most people that live in the Weisshorn neighborhood appreciate the diversity of its architecture. It is really the only area in Town that does not have rigid HOA design regulations. The differences in architecture give the neighborhood its charm.

Ms. Leidal: There are a handful of interesting buildings in the historic district. Would they have to follow our historic guidelines to be landmarked? (Mr. Grosshuesch: No because it is not a development application, just the landmarking criteria would be considered.)

Mr. Giller: Do you have an infill design manual? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Our Handbook of Design Standards for the Conservation District addresses this.) Other towns and city have more architectural focused guidelines. (Mr. Grosshuesch: There are hardly any vacant lots in the historic district so we are primarily talking about buildings constructed after 1942 being scraped.) (Mr. Kulick: The Handbook of Design does have very detailed guidelines for new construction in addition to restoration for each Character Area. It is very detailed, all the way down to materials, window shapes and ornamentation.)

No Public Comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:38pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Vice Chair