

**Town of Breckenridge**  
**Planning Commission Agenda**  
Tuesday, February 3, 2009  
Breckenridge Council Chambers  
150 Ski Hill Road

|              |  |           |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| <b>7:00</b>  | <b><i>Call to Order of the February 3, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting; 7:00 p.m. Roll Call<br/>Approval of Minutes January 20, 2009 Regular Meeting<br/>Approval of Agenda</i></b> | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>7:05</b>  | <b><i>Worksessions</i></b>   |           |
|              | 1. 2030 Plan (MT)  | <b>5</b>  |
|              | 2. Historic Structure Setbacks (MGT)   | <b>18</b> |
|              | 3. Sunsetting Density Policy (MM)  | <b>21</b> |
|              | 4. Footprint Lots (CN/PG)  | <b>24</b> |
|              | 5. Free Basement Density (CN/MM)   | <b>27</b> |
| <b>9:45</b>  | <b><i>Town Council Report</i></b>  |           |
| <b>9:55</b>  | <b><i>Other Matters</i></b>  |           |
| <b>10:00</b> | <b><i>Adjournment</i></b>  |           |

For further information, please contact the Planning Department at 970/453-3160.

*\*The indicated times are intended only to be used as guides. The order of projects, as well as the length of the discussion for each project, is at the discretion of the Commission. We advise you to be present at the beginning of the meeting regardless of the estimated times.*

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:03 P.M.**

**ROLL CALL**

Dan Schroder  
Jim Lamb

Rodney Allen  
JB Katz

Michael Bertaux  
Dave Pringle

Leigh Girvin was absent

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

With no changes, the minutes of the January 6, 2009 Planning Commission minutes were approved unanimously (5-0). Mr. Allen abstained since he was not present at the meeting of January 6.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

With no changes, the Agenda for the January 20, 2009 Planning Commission agenda was approved unanimously (6-0).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Big Bend Residence (MGT) PC#2008126; 1144 Discovery Hill Drive

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

**WORKSESSION:**

1. Solar Panel Policy Modification

Ms. Puester presented a memo outlining potential changes to the Solar Panel Policy. The existing ordinance to allow and regulate solar panels inside and outside of the Conservation District was passed June 10, 2008 as an amendment to Policy 5 (*Absolute Architectural Compatibility*).

The Town received a request from a property owner and management company outside of the Conservation District to modify the solar ordinance language to allow for tilted and angled solar panels. The Town Council directed Staff to rewrite the ordinance to allow for the modification outside of the Conservation District as well as any other modifications necessary. More recently, the Town received a grant from the Colorado Governor's Energy Office for a reimbursement program for solar hot water systems which require a panel tilt of 40 degrees in order to achieve 80% efficiency.

Staff has made changes to the ordinance in strike and bold to include changes to allow for more flexibility for tilted and angled panels outside of the Conservation District. Staff has also proposed some potential changes within the Conservation District to allow the opportunity for solar access to all property owners. Staff had meetings with various solar energy and solar thermal contractors and suppliers to gain their input on the proposal.

Staff requested the Planning Commission's opinion on the changes proposed to the ordinance and asked for the Commissioners opinions on the following policy direction:

1. Should solar panels within the Conservation District be allowed to be visible from public rights of way (such as on a corner lot) to allow for a greater number of property owners to have solar access?
2. Should solar panels be permitted to be visible from major rights of way within the Conservation District if mounted on noncontributing structures?
3. Should solar panels outside of the Conservation District be allowed to be angled and tilted a different orientation from the roofline (for east and west facing roofs)?

**Commissioner Questions/Comments:**

Mr. Pringle: Concerned with the Historic District. Can the energy conservationists use another type of energy saving techniques to accommodate historic structures? The historic character is of utmost importance. Didn't want to see panels on historic structure if there were other options that would be less intrusive. Our Design Guidelines require owners of historic structures to repair historic windows, siding and so on; then why would we harm that effort with just throwing up solar panels

that are visible? The Historic District is what sets our community apart from other resorts and should be protected; it preserves tourism and the economy for us here. To be forward thinking is to require 7,000+ square foot homes to include alternative energy or be smaller. Could see less stringent regulations on non-contributing verses contributing structures but should still take a close look at everything in the District. The Town has always worked hard to preserve the structures. Maybe not every site is appropriate for solar panels. Technology may keep changing so that it could work so why give in and throw up a bunch of panels now? Not in favor of a prohibition of panels in the Historic District but the town needs to take a very careful look at what you can easily see on historic structures. With regard to outside of the district, would like to see designers integrating panels on new buildings.

Mr. Schroder: Would like a definition of “highly visible” included. Was very much in favor of alternative energy and everyone should have an option to seek alternative energy, even in the Historic District. Thought that it would make town look progressive. Panels should run with the roof line but allow for maximum gain which may require panels to not align with the roof. Agreed with Staff that this is a conflict of two policies: energy and preservation. The off-angle was not appealing but supposed that beauty would be in the eyes of the beholder.

Ms. Katz: Supported panels in the historic district and asked about other historic districts. (Staff explained a lot of these policies are un-chartered.) Was in favor of solar panels on historic structures. Felt it was time for Breckenridge to be a leader in green initiatives. Thought it was wrong that historic structures are prohibited from becoming greener. For example, historic structures should be allowed to install more energy efficient windows. The needs to protect and needs for the future should be balanced for the best of a forward thinking community. There absolutely needs to be an escape clause built in that would allow for denial if something doesn’t look right in an application or if it might diminish the historic rating. As long as the state historic society allows for an historic status, she was all for solar panels on a historic structure. Fate shouldn’t be decided on whether one owns a corner lot or not. If the technology changes, human nature should lead us to less intrusive applications.

Mr. Bertaux: Cautious with panels on east/west facing roofs. Would like that to be the last option, even look at awnings as an option before east/west roof placement. Sought clarification regarding an application on a secondary building. (Staff referred to the some properties in town with rear sheds as well a photo in the packet.) Thought the town needed to be careful with contributing structures. If the panels go on a noncontributing garage than fine. Something will always be visible from somewhere. Had a problem with east/west orientation and therefore suggested beefing up the language to make sure that this could not happen on the historic buildings.

Mr. Lamb: Disclosed that he would soon be submitting an application for solar panels in the Conservation District. (Commissioners saw no problem with him participating in this discussion. Staff noted that this discussion is a legislative issue, not quasi-judicial.) Tearing down a historic structure is different than putting panels on a structure since the panels can be removed if a better technology comes along. (Mr. Pringle responded that you cannot force owners to replace panels, even if new technology is available.) Outside the conservation district, houses that may not be designed with solar should be able to take advantage of it. Concerned with the appearance of the east/west roofs with angled and tilted panels but if someone wanted to do that to their house than they should be able to. Bolting a solar cell on a roof isn’t a permanent fixture and therefore he didn’t see a huge problem. Has a satellite dish on his historic house and that doesn’t look good. Flush mounted in the historic district would be fine unless you need to angle it and you can’t see it. If the federal and state regulations are ok with it, then also feels ok.

Mr. Allen: Well written and supportive of changes. East/west alignment should be of last resort. He would like to see the code require non-functioning panels to be removed. Not concerned with nonconforming structures in the Historic District. Concurred with Mr. Lamb and Mr. Schroder. Answered yes to all three questions asked by staff.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to Public Comment:

Pat Kingston, Realign Technology: Angled panels would not be pretty on east or west facing roofs but should be allowed. Spoke about options on Main Street corner buildings. With propane costs increasing, solar is a more viable option.

Eric Westerhoff, Innovative Energy: Some places have had problems with property owners who want to take advantage of rebates and are limited by the town or HOA.

Marc Hogan, BHH Partners: Need to get the designers and architects to think about solar option at the beginning of their process. Everyone needs to think about this ahead of time for new projects.

There was no further comment and the hearing was closed.

***TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:***

None.

***OTHER MATTERS:***

None

***ADJOURNMENT:***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

---

Rodney Allen, Chair

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Town Council

**FROM:** Mark Truckey, Assistant Director of Community Development

**DATE:** January 30, 2008

**SUBJECT:** 2030 Report and Sustainability Action Plan

---

### **2030 Report**

In early 2008, the Summit Leadership Forum directed county and town planners to initiate a project that would provide a snapshot of what Summit County would look like in the year 2030. Planners from Breckenridge, Frisco, Silverthorne, Dillon, Summit County, along with Blue River's mayor participated in a brainstorming session where scenarios were postulated for a variety of subjects. These subjects ranged from population to second homes to the economy. The results of the session were compiled by County staff and a document was then generated to provide the Leadership Forum the snapshot of 2030. The resulting summary document, along with a table that highlights key findings, are attached for the Planning Commission's review.

The premise behind the 2030 document is that by looking forward, we can look back to the present and determine if we are on the correct path. If we do not like some of the things we see in 2030, then perhaps there are efforts we can undertake today to avoid the likely 2030 scenario. This retrospective analysis is similar to the process we have gone through with the recently-conducted Capacity Analysis. By looking at conditions in the Town at buildout in the Capacity Analysis, we are able to identify actions we can take now or in the future to avoid potential problems.

Staff provided an overview of the Town's Capacity Analysis to the Planning Commission several months ago. We now would like to provide a similar overview of the 2030 project. In the attached 2030 table, the right-hand column contains the likely 2030 scenario. Breckenridge Town staff has added our own comments in italics in numerous places in this column. Town comments indicate either areas of disagreement with the findings or where more Breckenridge-specific discussions are needed.

### **Next Steps—Sustainability Action Plan**

The Town Council has already reviewed the information in the 2030 report and has received numerous reports on the Capacity Analysis. Our next steps will be to embark on a public process that will lead to a Sustainability Action Plan for the Town. A committee of the Town Council will be reviewing some of the key findings in 2030 and the Capacity Analysis and identifying potential action steps to address issues of concern. For example, the transportation assessment prepared by FHU consultants (as part of the Capacity Analysis) indicated that further traffic congestion impacts could be mitigated by road widening/improvements or increases in transit service. The Council committee may identify a list of approaches that would address the congestion issue, and those issues would then be taken to a series of public forums for further discussion and public input as to the most appropriate approach.

The Sustainability Action Plan will be initiated shortly and staff wanted to make the Planning Commission aware of this project, which is expected to be one of the Town's largest efforts in the coming year. We

would also like to hear any comments the Planning Commission has regarding the conclusions in the 2030 report.

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue                             | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions   | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Category: Build-out</b>                     |  |   |
| Countywide Build-out                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 27,654 units built countywide as of 2007 (this represents a 74% realistic countywide build-out). Approximate build-out by basin (inclusive of incorporated and unincorporated areas): Upper Blue 10,446 units, Snake River 7,251 units, Lower Blue Basin 5,125 units, and Ten Mile 4,832 units</li> <li>Towns currently more built-out than unincorporated portions of County. Approximate build-out of respective towns: Town of Blue River 79%, Town of Breckenridge 76%, Town of Dillon 80 - 85%, Town of Frisco 90%, Town of Montezuma 53%, Town of Silverthorne 62%</li> <li>Upper Blue Basin, per realistic build-out, has the most development potential left of the four planning basins (approximately 3,500 units, of which 1,400 are in Town of Breckenridge; Town of Blue River has 40 lots left)</li> <li>Nearly 45% of build-out left on unincorporated lands zoned for multifamily units</li> <li>Between 2002 – 2007, on average the number of residential housing units built increased approximately 1.4% per year</li> <li>Currently there is a dearth of available and vacant developable properties; especially vacant lots lacking site constraints</li> <li>Median size of dwelling units built in unincorporated portions of county noticeably increased between 2000 and 2007</li> </ul> | <p><i>Note: Town of Breckenridge staff comments are provided in italics below:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By 2030 nearing realistic build-out in the County; experience build-out of remaining vacant properties, especially in incorporated portions of County <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Much of the County will probably build out before this time. Based on our projections, buildout will occur in Breckenridge sometime between 2013 and 2020. Buildout may be reached even earlier in Frisco.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>As a byproduct of build-out, increased building on vacant parcels in the backcountry areas of the Snake River, Ten Mile and Upper Blue basins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>This may be mitigated by the public acquisition of backcountry in these basins, particularly in the Upper Blue Basin where already some 70 percent of private backcountry parcels have been protected.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Development that takes place is an even mixture of multifamily and single-family residential</li> <li>As a result of a lack of available and vacant properties, there is a focus on and predominance of: “redevelopment”, “tear-downs”, “scrape-and-build” or “infill” developments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Redevelopment is expected to occur in Breckenridge, except within the Historic District, which occupies a significant portion of the downtown area. In the Historic District, we anticipate seeing more historic building restorations, small-scale additions (where density is available), and infill development.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Size of homes built as a result of redevelopments, tear-downs, scrape-and-builds or infill are larger or higher than previous existing dwelling units (to maximize residual density or available square footage per underlying zoning) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Could be tempered somewhat if maximum home size restrictions are developed by different Summit County jurisdictions.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>Category: Population and Demographics</b>   |  |   |
| Permanent Resident Population and Demographics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2010 U.S. population = 300 million</li> <li>2007 County permanent resident population approximately 28,296</li> <li>State Demographer projects approximately 2.9% growth rate per year in permanent residents</li> <li>State Demographer projects that the County’s median age will increase to 37.5 in 2010 (2000 Census was at 30.8) and 42.9 in 2020</li> <li>Baby Boomers now are approximately 45-63 years of age (first wave of Baby-Boomers just retiring)</li> <li>Difficult to determine when second homeowners become full-time permanent residents</li> <li>Lower income seasonal / service sector workers and young professional are affected by the steadily increasing cost of living (fewer younger people living here permanently)</li> <li>Experiencing significant increase in ethnic diversification (Hispanic / Latino, Eastern</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2030 U.S. population = approximately 400 million</li> <li>Permanent resident population of approximately 49,866 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These estimates are provided by the State Demographer and do not account for density caps and buildout scenarios that most of the jurisdictions in Summit County have implemented. With an estimated current buildout percent of 74 % countywide and a population of 28,296 in 2007, the population may be more in the 38,000 to 40,000 range by 2030. However, other dynamics (e.g., large numbers of second homes becoming permanently occupied) could change existing trends and result in higher or lower permanent population figures.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Permanent resident population that is significantly older (median age in the mid 40s) and more ethnically diverse</li> <li>Permanent resident population in which much of the “middle class” / young</li> </ul>   |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue                          | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”   |
|---|---|--|
|   | European)   | <p>professionals, and those that have seasonal or service sector jobs are not represented and cannot afford to live locally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although this may be the case in the County as a whole (depending on the success of other towns in implementing affordable housing), we anticipate that Breckenridge will have continued to make great strides in providing deed-restricted affordable housing. As a result young professionals, seasonal, and service sector workers will continue to be represented and live locally. Virtually all of this local living will be in deed-restricted housing, as even today free-market units are generally out of reach of these groups.</li> <li>• Demographically the community will continue to be better educated than the nation as a whole.</li> <li>• The next 22-years will be significantly influenced by the needs, desires, spending habits or trends of the Baby Boomers</li> <li>• 2030 will mark the tail end of the Baby-Boom era</li> <li>• County serves as more of a bedroom community to Front Range / Denver <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unless a light rail/monorail system is established from Denver to Summit County, we do not believe this will happen. Gas prices, etc., will encourage people to reduce their commuting distances.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Scoop Daniel returns from South America hiatus.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Category: Skier Visits and Ski Areas</b> |   |  |
| Skier Visits                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current “development” movement tailored to bring in the “destination” skier, rather than depend on the day skier or “brown-bagger”</li> <li>• Skier visits in the County have been steadily increasing over the last decade (new record set by Breckenridge for 2006/2007 ski season)</li> <li>• Experience approximately 125,000 visitors on a Peak Day in March (“Peak Population”)</li> <li>• Difficulty for Front Range skiers (“Day-Trippers”) to get here on weekends (i.e. I-70 congestion and gridlock); nevertheless steady increase in Front Range skiers</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience more destination skiers; more of a year-round destination resort community</li> <li>• Aggressive marketing campaigns to attract destination skiers</li> <li>• Experience increased visitation on Peak Days, perhaps 150,000 – 170,000 visitors or Peak Population</li> <li>• Front Range visitors/skiers have bolstered and increased skier days/visits, and tolerate congested I-70 conditions</li> </ul>   |
| Ski Resort Expansion and Employment         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansions at all four ski resorts in the County were granted and approved in the 2000s</li> <li>• International workforce now fills positions that used to go to traditional American ski bums</li> <li>• Colorado ranked second in 2004 in the U.S. in the number of temporary work visas, many of them for work in the ski resorts</li> <li>• Increased automation of basic jobs</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional ski area expansions at all ski resorts (expansions partly warranted and granted due to continued growth in Front Range skiers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The White River National Forest Plan will have been amended again and Breckenridge’s ski area permit boundaries will extend north to Peak 4 and south to summit of Peak 10. Lifts will climb the cirque between Peaks 8 and 9, into Carter Bowl on Peak 10, and 4<sup>th</sup> of July Bowl may be lift served.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Global workforce and gentrification at all ski resorts</li> <li>• Automated technologies continue to replace more menial jobs</li> </ul>  |



**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue  | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions   | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”   |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Category: Summer Visitors</b>  |  |  |
| Summer Visitor Population Projections                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skiing has become more marginalized by other activities; as these additional activities happen skiing will continue to be more marginalized</li> <li>• Summer visitations have increased, and shoulder / mud seasons are less pronounced</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summer visitation and Peak Population in the Summer will surpass winter               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Although we expect summer visitation to increase in Breckenridge, overall winter visitation is expected to exceed summer visits because of the longer season and because winter visits are focused on a few Colorado ski towns, as opposed to more dispersed summer visitation patterns in the mountains (e.g., camping, tourism in towns without ski resorts).</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>Category: Land Use, Open Space and National Forest Service lands</b> |  |  |
| Land Use and the Built Environment                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second homes or “trophy homes” a lions share of the residential development (a larger focus than commercial, service-commercial or industrial)</li> <li>• Baby Boomers creating demand for second homes within 150 miles of major metropolitan areas</li> <li>• Limited opportunities to locate service-commercial or industrial businesses</li> <li>• Influx of chain stores catering to suburban type culture or needs</li> <li>• People buying land on Main Streets for residential use</li> <li>• Working toward appropriate balance of residential and commercial</li> <li>• Redevelopments in commercial areas or commercial cores</li> <li>• Respective jurisdictions land use analysis have not necessarily accounted for “redevelopment”, tear-downs or infill</li> <li>• County pursuing land use and TDR Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) with Frisco and Silverthorne</li> <li>• Properties purchased for corporate retreats</li> <li>• Development Rights (TDRs) / density purchased and sold as a commodity</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have facilities, services and amenities similar to those that service a typical suburban community of approximately 150,000 residents</li> <li>• Residential development remains the focus and trophy homes become even more transparent</li> <li>• Baby Boomer effect or demand for second homes has passed (off-set by proximity to Denver)</li> <li>• Main Streets experience more demand to convert commercial to residential uses; more residential housing proposed on commercial land               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Breckenridge’s Downtown Overlay District prevents conversion of ground floor commercial to residential. Office space may continue to outbid retailers and hves an increased presence on Main Street (unless new regulations are enacted).</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Land use needs heightened for service-commercial or industrial (i.e. land use sustainability issues)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>New residential uses and college on Block 11 will drive demand for retail space on Airport Road, replacing many of the existing service commercial uses. Redevelopment of French Creek industrial area will eliminate service commercial uses there. Service commercial uses such as landscape nurseries, auto body and repair, car wash, are no longer present and residents must travel to Silverthorne or further for these services.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Low rent users squeezed out to outlier communities; service-commercial businesses and industries to be located further away from residential cores / towns (e.g., a trash business to service Summit Cove located in Kremmling)</li> <li>• Continued redevelopment in commercial cores and continued growth in chain stores; chain stores reinvent themselves (integrate more mixed use)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Breckenridge’s design standards minimize chain store growth.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Residential subdivision and feathered development around Corinthian Hills (Highway 6)</li> <li>• See commercial services located in Town of Blue River on Highway 9</li> <li>• IGAs developed to control land use around respective towns</li> <li>• Continued purchase of properties for corporate retreats or tax write-offs</li> <li>• TDRs / density become more valuable commodity               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This only happens if new markets for TDRs are created (e.g., TDRs required for</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue              | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”  |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
|                                 |   | <p><i>homes to exceed certain size). Otherwise buildout will cap demand, as new density will not be allowed (assuming Joint Upper Blue Master Plan policies are upheld). TDR Sending Area sites in the backcountry will be either developed or protected as open space.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land devoted to agriculture or range will decrease (i.e. Lower Blue Basin)</li> </ul>  |
| Open Space                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space referendums receive high approval ratings</li> <li>• Current open space funds used to leverage protection or acquisition of over 13,000 acres in the County</li> <li>• Select property owners elect to use conservation easement programs</li> <li>• Open space properties used to seed respective TDR Banks</li> </ul>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mill levies or referendums reauthorized / pass to continue to purchase or acquire open space; more properties purchased for open space</li> <li>• Dearth of properties to acquire with voter approved open space funds</li> <li>• Increase in the number of pocket parks</li> <li>• Intensified management of existing inventory of open space properties</li> <li>• Select property owners continue to use conservation easement programs</li> <li>• Open space properties continue to seed TDR Banks or transfers</li> </ul>   |
| National Forest System lands    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conveyance of National Forest System lands and land trades are frequently entertained and consummated; usually involve U.S. Forest Service inholdings / parcels</li> <li>• USFS budget shortfalls make for difficult and judicious decisions in personnel management, use of available resources and project priorities</li> </ul>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conveyance or land trades with National Forest System lands continue; especially for workforce housing such as Claim Jumper parcel in Upper Blue Basin and Keystone Gulch parcel in Snake River Basin</li> <li>• The U.S. Forest Service does not dispose of large chunks of property, but primarily continues to focus on disposing of smaller inholdings</li> <li>• Property along the Dillon Dam Road is traded for affordable housing; as a result there is less community separation between Frisco and Dillon</li> <li>• Possible addition of “Wilderness Areas” designated in the Tenmile Range</li> <li>• No significant increase in USFS agency budgeting for personnel or needed resources</li> <li>• Increased reliance on non-profit or volunteer organization to help manage forest or provide needed maintenance/improvements (e.g., Friends of Dillon Ranger District or Friends of Eagles Nest Wilderness Area)</li> </ul> |
| <b>Category: Transportation</b> |   |   |
| I-70                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion (particularly on weekends) and lack of multimodal/transit on I-70</li> <li>• I-70 Coalition work in progress on selecting preferred alternative for improvements and transit</li> <li>• Lack of funding for I-70 maintenance or improvements</li> <li>• No funding to create additional bores at Eisenhower Tunnel</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I-70 Coalition reaches agreement on preferred alternative for I-70 improvements</li> <li>• Overall sustainability issues associated with I-70 are not addressed</li> <li>• Increased congestion on I-70 (more noticeably on weekdays)</li> <li>• No multimodal/transit alternative implemented or provided <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The written analysis does suggest that the only impetus that will bring light rail would be hosting the Olympic Games.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Significant lack of funding (at state and federal levels) for maintenance or needed improvements on I-70</li> <li>• I-70 or major arterials institute “toll” fee</li> <li>• Increased carpooling and developed Park-N-Ride facilities</li> </ul>  |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue                                      | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”   |
|---|---|--|
| Parking   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth in day-visitors and employees has exacerbated the issues of capacity and parking</li> <li>• Growth in paid parking at ski resorts</li> <li>• Lack of parking structures</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity and parking are a more critical issue (a function of build-out and increased visitation – both winter and summer) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Breckenridge currently has a surplus of parking town-wide. Increased use of transit, as described below, may offset needs for creating additional parking in Breckenridge.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• See parking structures near gondola in Breckenridge</li> <li>• Parking on Main Streets exacerbated issue</li> <li>• Parking structures and funding being discussed by other jurisdictions</li> </ul>   |
| Highways 6 & 9  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of portions of Highway 9 from Frisco to Breckenridge approved</li> <li>• Highway 9 is under construction and continues to be widened</li> <li>• Not a lot of opportunities to increase road capacity</li> <li>• No new major arterial or collector roads planned</li> <li>• Traffic and congestion continue to grow</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of Highway 9 completed</li> <li>• More traffic and congestion on all arterials and roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This may not be the case on all roads. Traffic data for the last eight years on Hwy 9 north of Breckenridge has indicated traffic numbers have been flat. With road improvements and increased transit service and use, our traffic consultants have indicated we may be able to maintain traffic at today’s levels. In addition, at buildout there will likely be less construction activity and thus less construction traffic on area roadways.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• No new major arterial or collector roads planned</li> </ul>   |
| Mass Transit / Public Transportation                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridership / use of Summit Stage steadily increasing</li> <li>• Ski areas wanting to develop close in drop-offs for skiers (e.g., Copper, Keystone, Breckenridge)</li> <li>• Resorts promote convenience of mass transit</li> <li>• Policy foundation for promoting alternative transit</li> <li>• Issues exist with “connectivity” of Summit Stage routes (i.e. lack of convenient connections or routes to certain areas of the County)</li> <li>• Transit options being explored for workforce / workers living in outlier communities to address commuting</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional taxes passed via referendum to fund improvements</li> <li>• Ridership / use of Summit Stage and <i>Breck FreeRide</i> continues to grow</li> <li>• Summit Stage has developed better seamless connections or connectivity</li> <li>• More people cognizant of using mass transit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Increased environmental awareness and high cost of gas will encourage this. A shift to transportation modes other than use of automobiles will be noticeable, at least with a growing number of residents.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Outlier communities institute (in conjunction with local jurisdiction) mass transit options to help allay commuting issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Transit from Fairplay</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>Category: Workforce Housing / Affordable Housing</b> |   |  |
| Conditions and Challenges                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service sector jobs, lower income seasonal works, young professionals - cannot afford to live locally and there are not a lot of options</li> <li>• Cost of living makes living locally difficult</li> <li>• Possible land trades for affordable housing have been identified</li> <li>• Money generated from Affordable Housing Impact Fee needs to be spent</li> <li>• Anticipated to build 1,000 units of affordable housing within next 20 years</li> <li>• Lack of suitable and available properties to develop for workforce housing</li> </ul>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult for workers to live within a reasonable distance of their place-of-work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Town affordable housing efforts minimize this issue in Breckenridge.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Several successful U.S. Forest Service land trades consummated for workforce housing</li> <li>• Over 1,000 units affordable housing constructed, it does not keep pace with local needs (many of which are on former USFS lands) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This is understated. The Town’s goal is to construct 900 more units in Breckenridge alone (between private and Town projects), in addition to the 500+ deed-restricted units</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue                                     | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”  |
|--|---|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local land use policies, development or building code are tailored to incentivize affordable housing projects</li> <li>Necessary housing studies being conducted that assess the community’s and region’s needs, and provide direction to community leaders</li> </ul>   | <p><i>that have already been built. As such, we plan to “keep up” with local demand and maintain today’s ratio of 47% of the Town’s workforce living locally.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable Housing Impact Fee has sunset, new Impact Fee referendum does not pass <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Whether a new impact fee is approved by voters will largely depend on whether voters feel that progress has been made in addressing local housing needs. We feel Breckenridge will have accomplished much, but are unsure of the success of the other jurisdictions in Summit County.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Overall lack of funding for workforce housing initiatives</li> <li>Additional incentives created in local development or building codes to encourage or incentivize workforce housing</li> <li>Continue to conduct and modify necessary housing studies that assess the community’s and region’s needs, and provide direction to community leaders</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Category: Second Homes and Second Homeownership</b> |   |   |
| Second Homes   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing preference changing, aging, empty-nester and single-person household dominating future housing market.</li> <li>In the County, second homes are approximately 65% of the total housing units/stock (the highest in the Rural Resort Region)</li> <li>According to NWCCOG, growth rate of 2<sup>nd</sup> home buying is now about 5% per year, up from less than 2% in the 1990s</li> <li>Second homes have become a large and often dominate part of both the physical and economic landscape. Second home development has created demand for workers above that of the traditional tourists industry, especially in construction but also in their maintenance, operation and use</li> <li>Second homes drive up property values, including residential housing for workers</li> <li>Second homes have contributed to the escalating real estate prices</li> <li>The infusion of second homes in the County is having impacts to neighboring communities (e.g., increase in real estate values and providing housing for local work force)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued growth in the second home industry (ages 55-64) as Baby Boomers are just beginning to enter this age cohort in 2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In 2030, the Baby Boomer generation will be more elderly (65-80) and we believe many Boomers will actually be leaving their second homes in the mountains for warmer climates. This may be compensated by a continued market for second homes from residents in the Front Range, which will have grown by another million plus people in this timeframe. Demand for second homes will be less based on access to skiing and more based on a wider variety of amenities provided in mountain communities.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>More services to cater to absentee second homeowners and part-time vacation renters (e.g., property management companies)</li> <li>Demand for workers still exists, real estate prices continue to escalate, neighboring communities house more of the local work force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>As discussed earlier, Breckenridge is striving to maintain housing for its local workforce.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Second Homeownership                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The more a home cost, the less likely its owners will rent it out</li> <li>Social circumstance have evolved with three classes thrust together in one place: the second homeowners, the year-round local service workers who supply and cater to the owners, and the seasonal resort workers who are increasingly being drawn from foreign countries</li> <li>More second homeowners making the County primary residence or becoming extended part-time residents</li> <li>Second homeownership making it harder for locals that in work in town to live in town</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second homes become more of “investment” properties (not a residence), and an industry that continues to create demand for workers</li> <li>Retirees and aging second homeowners will take homes out of the rental market when they are paid-off</li> <li>Lose of sense of community, as second homes become just another amenity (“visitors become owners, and owners remake resorts in their image”)</li> <li>Weak American dollar is the norm; influx of foreigners invest in properties</li> <li>Infusion of Class B, C and D celebrities (e.g., seasonal presence of David Hasselhoff, Joey Buttofuocco, Scott Baio, Larry Craig and Star Jones)</li> </ul>   |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue  | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”  |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Category: Recreation and Trails</b>                                      |   |   |
| Recreation: Develop athletic facilities / organized recreational facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for more coordinated planning efforts</li> <li>• Hearty use of Green Mountain and Dillon Dam Reservoirs for water-based recreation activities</li> <li>• Planned expansion of Dillon and Frisco Marinas facilities and services</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational services provided do not meet needs of increased population</li> <li>• Existing recreational facilities maxed-out (e.g., ballfields and recreation centers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Recreation centers are already approaching capacity and may be woefully inadequate to meet demand unless expansions are completed in upcoming years.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cooperation and coordinated planning efforts promoted and needed (but not necessarily implemented)</li> <li>• Increase in summer activities on Lake Dillon as a result of expanded facilities and services</li> <li>• Increase in water-based recreation on Green Mountain Reservoir and Lake Dillon (or other recently created reservoirs), barring the Dust Bowl scenario does not come to fruition</li> </ul>  |
| Trails, Trailheads and Trail Access (County and U.S. Forest Service)        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land managers struggling to maintain existing trails due to increasing use levels and declining maintenance budgets. At the same time, land managers are being asked by user groups to develop more new trails</li> <li>• The need for funding to plan, develop and maintain trails and trailhead facilities will continue as the County’s population grows and trail use and demand for new trails increases</li> <li>• Increase use of backcountry trails and roads not originally designed for intensive uses.</li> <li>• Rely on outside help, such as volunteers and grants to complete trail projects (e.g., Friends of the Dillon Ranger District)</li> <li>• Trails and other recreation uses are somewhat of a low funding propriety</li> <li>• Difficulty in establishing seamless management between different jurisdictions (e.g., signage)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recpath around Dillon Reservoir completed</li> <li>• Some traditionally used areas/trails are displaced by development without being able to provide alternative areas/trails</li> <li>• Not enough support facilities or parking capacity near trails (e.g., Deer Creek snowmobile parking)</li> <li>• Need for more funding for personnel, volunteer programs, trail maintenance and development, planning and NEPA requirements, signs and support facilities</li> <li>• Over-use of some of the significant trails leads to significant degradation and erosion (e.g., Peaks Trail - tragedy of the commons)</li> <li>• Lack of regular maintenance or inadequate trail maintenance; littering and lack of routine custodial maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This maintenance problem is expected to be most evident on national forest. Breckenridge and Summit County both will continue to have funded open space and trails programs that enable regular trail maintenance.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Permitting system or Quota system to use Wilderness Areas to retain wilderness experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Unsure that wilderness use in Summit County has increased significantly in recent years (i.e., national park use has been on the decline in recent years). Thus, a permit system may not be warranted.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• No seamless management between different jurisdictions (e.g., signage) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Exceptions to this for the Golden Horseshoe area, where the County and Town of Breckenridge continue to cooperate on planning issues in conjunction with the Forest Service.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Continued social conflict (e.g., motorized versus non-motorized). Inability of managers to enforce regulations leads to continue user conflicts and environmental impacts</li> </ul> |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue  | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”   |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in unmanaged and unauthorized uses               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also an increase in demands for new trail and open space uses that cannot be envisioned or have not been invented today (much like the mountain bike and snowboard were not envisioned in 1980). These uses/activities will create greater management challenges. Advances in motorized technology will allow motorized users to penetrate further into remote and high alpine territories, increasing management headaches.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>Category: Community Amenities and Public Facilities</b>  |   |  |
| Local Service Providers                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consolidation of certain districts, facilities and services enacted or considered (e.g., emergency communication center/services and fire departments)</li> <li>Expansion of Dillon Water Plant needed</li> <li>Jurisdictions being fiscally responsible - consideration of where coordinated efforts are possible</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional taxes passed via referendum to fund improvements to existing infrastructure</li> <li>Certain metro-districts and providers have consolidated to provide more efficient services; continue to explore opportunities</li> <li>Town and County Governments do not consolidate and continue to manage own resources; however, more Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) are negotiated and entered into (e.g., road maintenance or road and bridge departments)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SilverDisco??</li> </ul> </li> <li>Minimal expansion of Dillon Water Plant</li> <li>Town of Blue River has a permanent dedicated police officer</li> <li>Airport in Kremmling is expanded to accommodate larger plans and more traffic</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Category: Environmental Sustainability and Resources</b> |   |  |
| Climate Change and Land Use                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Warming, probably throughout the year (though in some areas more in winter than summer and others more in summer than winter) appears inevitable over the next century (and has already been occurring in much of the West)</li> <li>Recognition and policy shift to address sustainability and carbon footprint (e.g., climate change and energy consumption)</li> <li>Warmer West impacting water availability</li> <li>Some resort have acquired more water rights to make snow</li> <li>Difficulty in predicting impacts or trends from climate change (i.e. what models to use)</li> <li>Growing concerns about hazards, like floods and droughts</li> <li>Models introduced: prospect of significant climate change undermines the basic notion of a “stable” base for many planning and regulatory regimes, particularly for water, habitat, and other climate-sensitive factors</li> <li>Precipitation trends are less certain than temperature trends (scenarios vary depending on the model one chooses and the time period examined)</li> <li>Reduced snow packs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All jurisdictions adopted plans to reduce carbon footprint</li> <li>Change frequency, duration and intensity of: snowfall, precipitation, wildfire, heat waves, drought, flooding, etc.</li> <li>Have experienced peak oil; alternative energy sources and technologies aggressively developed</li> <li>Lower elevation and more southern ski areas experience shorter winters and less annual snow pack (more northern flow or precipitation)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All ski areas are expected to experience, to some extent, shorter winters and less annual snowpack, because of expected increased temperatures. Warmer temperatures will delay the time in the fall when snowmaking can be commenced, and will result in rain instead of snow falling more frequently in the shoulder seasons (Oct/Nov and Apr/May).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Skiing as a sport in many coastal areas will lose popularity (not as many opportunities to learn)</li> <li>Reduced snow packs, increased evaporation, and the threat of overall reduced runoff</li> <li>Summit County, due to elevation, more reliable snow pack than lower elevation ski resorts; precipitation remains average               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summit County resorts will have a relatively more reliable snowpack than most other areas, but will experience some shortening of the ski season and loss in overall</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue          | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions   | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”   |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
|                             |  | <p><i>snowpack.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased reliance in snow making at all resorts</li> <li>• Increased reliance on more summer time tourism / visitors</li> <li>• Increase in water temperatures – reduces population of aquatic species</li> <li>• Long range community plans address risks (e.g., storm intensity and heat wave frequency)</li> <li>• Concerns about growing hazards, like floods and droughts, will interact with both mitigation and adaptation</li> <li>• More intense precipitation events (shorter, more intense episodes)</li> <li>• New floodplain maps are produced by FEMA to expand floodplain areas in already developed areas (as a response to more flooding)</li> <li>• Warming may create opportunities of agricultural expansion in County (lengthen growing season)</li> </ul>  |
| Forest Health / Beetle Kill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beetle kill reaching peak</li> <li>• Experiencing ramifications of beetle kill (lose of forest health/degradation, trees, view corridors)</li> <li>• Increased risk of forest fires (both urban interface and wildland)</li> <li>• Increase of invasive and noxious weeds</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County experiences a major fire as a result of beetle kill</li> <li>• Trees lost as a result of beetle kill have regenerated and come back to previous intensity and density <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Although there will be regeneration, the forest will not be nearly at the same intensity, as we will have many small trees instead of a more mature forest.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• New pathogens emerge for other species of trees (e.g., Aspens)</li> <li>• Increase in noxious weeds</li> <li>• Goats unionize and refuse to eat noxious weeds</li> </ul>  |
| Water                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake Powell inflow from the Colorado River has been below average every year but one since 1999 (when Powell was last full). It is now below 50 percent capacity and dropping</li> <li>• Water rights (acquisition, augmentation, legalities) critical issue</li> <li>• Plans for more local reservoirs being explored or developed (e.g., Old Dillon Reservoir)</li> <li>• Water level of Lake Dillon continues to oscillate</li> <li>• Enough water or water rights currently available to reach build-out</li> <li>• Increased sensitivity to: water supply adequacy, drought planning, public response to shortage and restrictions, landscaping, etc.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less reliable water supplies</li> <li>• Water in the West (beyond the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian) the most critical issue facing growth and development or sustaining it</li> <li>• Long range plans for greater firmer water supply developed</li> <li>• Land use regulations that reduce water use further developed</li> <li>• Price per acre foot of water to augment has increased significantly</li> <li>• Additional reservoirs developed in County (e.g., Old Dillon Reservoir expanded and Tarn in Upper Blue Basin expanded to the south) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Town reservoir on the McCain parcel.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• More pronounced oscillation of Lake Dillon, more frequent draw-downs of reservoir to service Front Range communities to tap capacity</li> <li>• More dust in the County as a result of draw-downs</li> <li>• Reach zoned maximum potential / build-out (reinforced by available water rights)</li> <li>• More pressures from California, Nevada and California for Colorado River water</li> <li>• Lake Mead is almost sucked dry</li> <li>• Shorter rafting / boating season</li> </ul> |

**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue                                   | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions  | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”   |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability or against the law to water lawns</li> <li>Increased sediment loading in local streams and reservoirs as aftermath to major fire event.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Category: Social Services</b>                     |   |  |
| Childcare  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficulty meeting the increased demand</li> <li>Need to grow childcare providers (both public and private)</li> <li>Grant programs help subsidize existing providers</li> <li>Schools are not experiencing decreased enrollment; growth in employment fueling more demand for childcare</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional tax to build capacity to meet demand</li> <li>Still a shortage of childcare providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>This shortage is not expected to occur in Breckenridge, because the Town has studied its childcare needs at buildout and is planning to construct an additional childcare facility to accommodate demand at buildout.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>School systems provide more systems than currently available and public sector more involved</li> <li>Continue to apply for and receive grant program funds</li> </ul>  |
| Ripple Effects / Demands as a Result of Baby Boomers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People are living longer, and life insurance actuarial tables now extend past 100 years</li> <li>Heavily used Community / Senior Center</li> <li>Baby Boomers wanting to be active; move into the community and looking to be involved</li> <li>Baby Boomers living longer and are healthier</li> <li>Increasing demand for more senior services (e.g., handymen)</li> <li>New hospital helping to provide care for elderly, trauma and patient advocacy</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased demand on Community / Senior Center</li> <li>Baby Boomers continue to be very active and healthy</li> <li>Infusion of more senior oriented events (e.g., Senior Olympics)</li> <li>Increased demand for “assisted service” type programs: geriatric care, assisted transportation, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Unsure if we will see a significant increase in elderly population (i.e., 70 years plus) and associated demand for these assisted services. We expect that retirees may spend the early years of their retirement here in the high country but then move to lower, warmer locations as they get older.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Baby Boomers exhibit increased political and economic clout</li> <li>Majority of elected officials, planning commissions and volunteer organizations makeup/composition is of retirees</li> <li>Over The Hill Gang really over the hill and sets record membership</li> <li>Hit end of Baby Boom era in 2030</li> </ul> |
| Inter-Cultural Resources                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant shift and change in demographics (i.e. increased ethnicity)</li> <li>Increase in demand for multilingual services (e.g., bi-lingual social services and employees)</li> <li>Non-profits present (e.g., Community Care Clinic, Victim Advocates, Family and Intercultural Resource Center) struggling to meet many existing needs and demands</li> <li>Lack of cultural diversity / integration transparent in organizations: elected officials, planning commissions, volunteer organizations, various boards, etc.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local demographics (the County’s makeup) continues to be infused with ethnic diversity (from Eastern Europeans to Latinos)</li> <li>Multicultural resources or non-profit organization continue to meet certain demands at a minimum level, operating resources and staff continues to be strained</li> <li>National health care reform, programs and providers help diffuse strain on Community Care Clinic</li> <li>Issues associated with domestic violence increase</li> <li>Increased need for emergency housing</li> </ul>  |



**Matrix of Issues: Summit Leadership Forum – Year 2030 Forecast for Summit County**  
**Prepared: April 2008—Town of Breckenridge Revisions December, 2008**

| Category and Issue                       | Snapshot of Existing Conditions in 2008 & Underlying Assumptions   | Forecast: Shape and Condition of Our Community in 2030<br>“Keeping the Present Course”  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Category: Education</b>               |  |   |
| Demographic Trends                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Households are having fewer children.</li> </ul>  |   |
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential increase in students at CMC and dormitories for college students.</li> </ul>   |
| Primary through High School              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information not readily available to make predictions.</li> </ul>   |   |
|  |  |   |
| Post Secondary (i.e. CMC)                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information not readily available to make predictions.</li> </ul>   |   |
|  |  |   |
| <b>Category: Economic Sustainability</b> |  |   |
| Important Considerations                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to NWCCOG, the labor force shortage in the County was 6,411 in 1997 and anticipated to be 10,291 in 2020 (“looming crisis”)</li> <li>Pending build-out has implications on construction industry (i.e. possible decrease in contractors)</li> <li>More people telecommuting and working out of the home (possibly)</li> <li>Retirees spend most of their money on goods and services: helps stabilize economy and uses social, police and school services significantly less than the younger population</li> <li>Do not have amenities to grow light manufacturing or high tech industry</li> <li>Construction, tourism, restaurants and lodging industries drive local economy</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus still winter and summer visitors (tourism business has not been replaced)</li> <li>Core of County’s business has to do with service industries (restaurants and lodging)</li> <li>Demand for labor continues to grow, labor shortage exacerbated and importing of more labor continues</li> <li>Jobs being created are service oriented type jobs</li> <li>Ski resorts automate more jobs (ski areas getting more efficient) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly offsetting this automation is more up-scale accommodations and wealthier clientele that create demands for higher levels of customer service (e.g., more workers)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Build-out of County impacts certain segment/sector of sub-contractors (to find work they leave town); replaced by property maintenance cottage industries</li> <li>County serves as more of a bedroom community to Denver (increased telecommuters) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This may not happen. See comments under Permanent Resident Population and Demographics.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Building industry still strong (as a result of increase in teardowns and redevelopment), but overall less volume in construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The question remains how “strong” redevelopment activity will be, and whether there will be a significant dwindling of construction jobs in the community. If the decline is significant, expect to see corresponding impacts to the local economy, based on the loss of support businesses needed for construction and less demands for local goods and services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Amenities not developed for light manufacturing or high tech type industries</li> <li>Increases in sales tax revenues will not be able to keep pace with growth in costs and demands for governmental services. As a result, local jurisdictions will face significant budget challenges and be forced to prioritize and cut back certain services and find new sources of revenue.</li> </ul> |

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Matt Thompson, AICP  
**Date:** January 28, 2009  
**Re:** Historic Structures Setbacks

---

As part of the recent list of tasks the Planning Commission has generated for possible code changes, we have been considering a modification to Policy (9/A) and (9/R) “Placement of Structures.” The discussion revolves around waiving negative points to proposals to move a historic structure onto the property, but not meeting the required setbacks. The Code currently discourages placing structures within the recommended setbacks on site. The importance is such that a 3 times multiplier is associated with the negative point assignment, which indicates a policy of average importance.

Below are portions of the existing Policy 9/R and 9/A with suggested additions in *italics*.

## **9. (ABSOLUTE) PLACEMENT OF STRUCTURES (9/A):**

- C. Residential Setbacks: For all structures within residential districts and for residential structures within commercial districts, the following setbacks shall be utilized as minimum standards:

(1) Within The Conservation District (All Residential Development):

a. Front Yard: No structure shall be built within ten feet (10') of a front yard property line. In those cases where a garage is located with driveway access in a required front yard, no portion of said garage doors shall be closer than twenty feet (20') from the front property line.

b. Side Yard:

1. Interior: No structure shall be built within three feet (3') of a side yard property line.
2. Street: For all platted lots greater than twenty five feet (25') in width or for more than one lot under single ownership with an aggregate width greater than twenty five feet (25'), up to one-half (1/2) the proposed structure may extend up to five feet (5') from a street side yard property line. The remaining half of said structure may not extend closer than ten feet (10') from the street side yard property line. For single lots less than twenty-five feet (25') in width, no portion of a structure may extend closer than three feet (3') from a street side yard property line.

c. Rear Yard: No structure shall be built within ten feet (10') of a rear yard property line, or within five feet (5') of an alley right of way. *In situations where a historic, non-habitable secondary structure currently encroaches into an alley or road right-of-way, and only when a new foundation and full structural stabilization are proposed for such structure, the secondary structures may be relocated not closer than one foot (1') from the alley or road right-of-way property line, with approval of the Planning Commission.*

d. Encroachments/Protection: Notwithstanding the above restrictions, and in those instances where a violation of the Uniform Building Code is not created, bay windows, roof eaves and other similar projections may extend within any required yard up to a maximum of eighteen inches (18") with approval of the Planning Commission.

## **9. (RELATIVE) PLACEMENT OF STRUCTURES (9/R):**

The following setbacks are encouraged for the placement of structures on site:

(1) Within The Conservation District (All Residential Development):

- a. Front yard: Fifteen feet (15').
- b. #1 Side yard: Five feet (5').
- c. Rear yard: Fifteen feet (15').

*d. Exceptions: The provisions of this subsection D (1) shall not apply to the development of: 1) historic, non-habitable secondary structures which currently encroach into an alley or right-of-way, and when the structures are relocated onto the applicant's property, and a new foundation and full structural stabilization are proposed for such structure. In such cases, an applicant may place the historic secondary structure not closer than three feet (3') from the property line without the allocation of negative points. If the property line in question is along an alley or right-of-way, the historic structure may be placed not closer than one foot (1') from the property line without the allocation of negative points.*

Point assessments shall be as follows:

3 x (0/-3)

- 0 All four (4) setback requirements are met
- 1 Three (3) of the setback requirements are met
- 2 Two (2) of the setback requirements are met
- 3 One or none of the setback requirements are met

**Questions for the Planning Commissioners:**

1. Should Staff add the new language to (Absolute) Placement of Structures Policy 9/A, section c to allow historic structures along alleys and right of ways to be placed not closer than one (1) foot to the alley or right of way? Or, should the policy remain unchanged, which would still require a variance for such request?
2. Do you support a change to the Relative policy, to not allocate negative points for relocating and restoring secondary historic structures that do not meet the recommended setbacks.
3. Staff welcomes any comments regarding this draft. Specifically, we seek input on the assignment of negative points for placing historic secondary structures between three (3) feet and five (5) from a side property line.

# Memorandum

---

**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Michael Mosher, Planner III  
**Date:** January 26, 2009  
**Re:** Extinguishing Density Worksession – Policy 5/R

---

As part of the recent list of tasks the Planning Commission has generated for possible code changes, we have been exploring a modification to Policy 3/R “(Relative) Compliance with Density/Intensity Guidelines” to include awarding positive points for extinguishing portions of available density in conjunction with a development permit review. The current code strongly discourages any application exceeding the suggested density associated with a development. The importance is such that a 5 times multiplier is associated with the negative point assignment, which indicates a policy of significant community importance.

It has been suggested that a voluntary reduction of available density might be rewarded with the assignment of positive points. Since the basis for assigning negative points is based on the percentage a project goes over the suggested density, we suggest that positive points also be based on a percentage of the available density.

Below are portions of the existing Policy 5/R with suggested additions in *italics*.

## **(RELATIVE) COMPLIANCE WITH DENSITY/INTENSITY GUIDELINES (3/R):**

Compliance with the maximum allowed intensity/density as calculated in policy 3 (absolute) of this section, and with regard to commercial, from the land use guidelines is strongly encouraged. *However, any reduction of the maximum allowed intensity/density for a development as calculated in policy 3 (absolute) of this section, may also help benefit the community by reducing the negative impacts of infrastructure requirements, reducing parking and traffic impacts, preserving more open space and treed backdrop on the property, and other site related concerns.*

Deviations in excess of the maximum allowed total square footage shall only be allowed through density transfers pursuant to section 9-1-17-12 of this chapter and shall be assessed negative points according to the following schedule:

5x (point deduction)

| <u>% Deviation Up From Guidelines</u> | <u>Point Deductions</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 0.1 - 5%                              | 2*                      |
| 5.01 - 10%                            | 3                       |
| 10.01 - 15%                           | 4                       |

|                  |    |
|------------------|----|
| 15.01 - 20%      | 5  |
| 20.01 - 30%      | 6  |
| 30.01 - 40%      | 7  |
| 40.01 - 50%      | 8  |
| 50.01% and above | 20 |

\*Excess density is exempt from a 2 point deduction if the density is transferred pursuant to subsection 9-1-17-12B of this chapter and if the total excess density for the project does not exceed 5 percent of the maximum density allowed. This exemption does not apply to any transfers of density into the historic district. (Ord. 20, Series 2000)

*Any voluntary reduction of allowed intensity/density for a development as calculated in policy 3 (absolute) of this section is strongly encouraged. This calculation would be based on density that has been established by a valid and current master plan, subdivision, vested development permit, or the Town's Land Use Guidelines.*

*If a legal nonconforming structure, which is over density, is removed or destroyed, the density for the redevelopment of the property would be based on the current applicable master plan, subdivision, or Land Use Guidelines associated with the property, not on the non-conforming pre-existing density.*

*The review process includes:*

- *Class B minor or in association with any Class A or B Development Permit.*
- *An exhibit showing that the maximum allowed density would otherwise fit on the site and would likely pass a point analysis.*
- *A condition of approval requiring a covenant establishing the total new allowed density for the property be recorded with the Clerk and Recorder of Summit County, Colorado in connection with the issuance of a development permit pursuant to this chapter.*

??x (point addition)

| <u>% Deviation Up From Guidelines</u> | <u>Point Additions</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 0.1 - 5%                              | ??                     |
| 5.01 - 10%                            | ??                     |
| 10.01 - 15%                           | ??                     |
| 15.01 - 20%                           | ??                     |
| 20.01 - 30%                           | ??                     |
| 30.01 - 40%                           | ??                     |
| 40.01 - 50%                           | ??                     |
| 50.01% and above                      | ??                     |

Staff welcomes any comments regarding this draft. Specifically, we seek input on the assignment of positive points and multiplier.





## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Chris Neubecker and Peter Grosshuesch  
**DATE:** January 28, 2009  
**SUBJECT:** Footprint Lots and Condominiumization within the Conservation District

Over the past several years there have been a few cases where footprint lots have been approved where the result may have compromised site functions and the historic character of the property by allowing primary looking structures to be built in back yards. There are a couple of issues related to this that need to be sorted out, and depending on the outcome of the discussion, there may be some code changes needed.

Previously, (1970's and 1980's) we had seen a number of problems in the Conservation District with owners subdividing their lots and new primary structures sprouting up in those back yards. However, the 5000 square foot minimum lot size provision of the Subdivision Ordinance addressed that issue fairly effectively - for some time.

More recently, some developments, some within the Conservation District, have requested the use of footprint lots and condominium plats to create separate salable lots and units. This allows developers to sell the structures individually, giving the project a revenue stream to help pay for improvements. The result, however, has been that primary structures are being proposed and approved in the rear yards contrary to the goals of the "Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts".

Footprint lots were initially allowed in the Subdivision Code to accommodate master planned residential communities, where there is common open space but very small individual lots, essentially reflecting the footprint of the structure. Some examples of earlier footprint lots include Wellington Square (at Wellington Road and Harris Street) and Sawmill Creek Village (at Ski Hill Road and Sawmill Road).

One of the main goals of the design standards is "To protect the town's historic character through the careful preservation of our historic structures **and the sensitive design of new buildings in their context.**" (Emphasis added.)

In addition, Priority Policy 4 states:

**Respect historic settlement patterns.**

- Site new buildings such that they are arranged on their sites in ways similar to historic buildings in the area.
- This includes consideration of building setbacks, orientation and open space, all of which are addressed in more detail in other design standards that follow.

The predominant development pattern for historic single family lots was to position the primary structure to address the public street, as would the homes across the street. This intentional urban design pattern created



the historic streetscape and block pattern that makes the District the special place that it is. Historically, back yards frequently featured several secondary structures, that were smaller in size than the primary structures. “Each residential site included a collection of secondary structures that housed supporting functions. Storage sheds, barns, outhouses and stables were typical outbuildings. Many were located at the back of properties, some on alleys. These outbuildings were a smaller scale, made of unpainted wood, usually “barn wood” siding. Most had metal roofs”. (East Side Character Area Design Standards).

The 9 units per acre above ground density ordinance was written cognizant of the secondary structures in the back yard historical pattern. It places limits on “module size” for all buildings. Where it comes up short is in differentiating between how large secondary structures can be relative to the primary structures on the lot. It also doesn’t address their appearance, and is not therefore weeding out primary looking structures in back yards in some cases.

The current Subdivision Code reads:

9-2-4-5 C. *Lot Dimensions and Standards:*

1. *Lots for residential uses and all lots located within residential neighborhoods shall be a minimum of five thousand (5,000) square feet in size, except lots created through the subdivision of townhouses, duplexes, or building footprint lots created as part of a single-family or duplex master plan or planned unit development, which are exempt when the lot and project as a whole is in general compliance with the town comprehensive planning program and have little or no adverse impacts on the neighborhood.* (Emphasis added.)

It is the second part of this provision in the Subdivision Ordinance that creates something of a loophole. One approach would be to address this issue like we do with Accessory Units (ADU’s). These are allowed on single family lots, subject to the following limitations:

- A. The total dwelling area of the unit is no greater in size than one-third ( $\frac{1}{3}$ ) of the total dwelling area of the single-family unit.
- B. The total dwelling area of the unit is no greater in size than one thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet.
- C. **Legal title to the accessory apartment and single-family unit is held in the same name.**

This accomplishes several purposes. It keeps the second unit subservient in size to the primary unit; it enables control by a single owner over site related issues such as parking, trash removal and maintenance; and it enables ADUs to be rented rather than allowing them to be sold for high dollar amounts, therefore potentially contributing to the supply of affordable housing for employees. If we were to change the rules and prohibit the subdivision of lots to create new salable units within the Conservation District (but outside of the Downtown Overlay District), we would be equalizing the rules that owners of single family lots with accessory apartments have to comply with.. We may want to consider a similar rule change for single family lots outside of the Conservation District as well. This is a relatively simple fix that we think we should seriously consider making.

Duplex Development

Duplexes proposed on adjacent single family lots are also covered by the 9 UPA ordinance, which limits the module size. Further, so long as the new regulation prohibits creation of additional lots/salable units, beyond the number there were originally on the development parcel, we shouldn’t experience the problem of additional primary structures in back yards.

There are other issues however that this remedy does not address, and those are with development within the recently adopted Main St. Overlay District created to regulate ground floor residential uses.

Downtown Overlay District (with ground floor residential prohibition)

For mixed use developments within the Downtown Overlay District, where we recently prohibited first floor residential uses within 40 feet of the street, we probably have a situation necessitating further study and discussion. Because of the mixed use nature of the development pattern, we seem to be ok with allowing these units to be sold off separately from the primary structure fronting the street.

The problem we are having in this district is that we've seen a number of new structures in rear yards that do not follow the intended historic design pattern. Many of those new structures are as large as the primary structures in the front of the lot, and appear equally as primary. This is pattern is seriously weakening the quality of the historic setting we have taken such care over the decades to preserve.

We may be able to address the issue here with a form based policy, where we articulate the desired historically accurate urban design pattern, irrespective of the ownership configuration chosen by the owner.

Staff would like to discuss the footprint lot and Condominiumization issues with the Commission. We look forward to hearing your perspective on the issue and whether or not and how you think this policy needs to be changed. Some issues for the Commission to consider include:

1. Should we repeal the ability to use footprint lots or condominium plats in the Conservation District on historic single family lots (outside of the Downtown Overlay District)?
2. Within the Downtown Overlay District, are we still supportive of allowing owners to further subdivide ownerships from and possibly within the primary structure?
3. Should we develop a methodology to discourage primary looking structures in the rear yards within the Downtown Overlay District?

A site visit may be scheduled for a later date to view some of the built projects that led to this concern. You could visit the following sites in advance of the worksession on your own to see examples of the issue. The alley behind the Fire Station on Main St., and the two blocks on the west side of North Main, north of Ski Hill Rd.



---

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Chris Neubecker  
**DATE:** January 29, 2009  
**SUBJECT:** Free Basement Density under Historic Commercial Buildings

---

As an incentive to encourage the installation of foundations under historic structures, the Town developed a policy to waive the density in the basement of such buildings. The current policy waives the basement density under a historic residential structure. It also allows for storage under historic commercial buildings, but does not allow the free basement density to be used for leasable space. The intent of this memo is to discuss changing the policy, to allow leasable space in the basement of historic commercial buildings, as an additional incentive for restoration/preservation.

New language proposed is shown in *italics*. Language proposed for removal is show in ~~strikethrough~~.

The current policy defines how density is calculated, and reads as follows:

### Policy 3(Absolute) Density/Intensity

#### C. General Provisions

##### Commercial:

Density shall be calculated by adding the total square footage of each floor of the building. Except as provided below, this shall include any basement areas or storage areas, no matter what the proposed use shall be, and shall be measured from the outside of the exterior walls. Exceptions: a) any portion of a basement area of a "town designated landmark" as defined in chapter 11 of this title, which is: 1) located directly underneath the existing building, 2) completely or partially buried below grade, ~~and 3) properly restricted to use as storage for tenants or occupants of the building~~, shall not be counted toward allowed density for such building so long as the historic USGS floor elevation of the building is maintained; ~~and~~ or b) any underground portion of a building *for which the density is waived* which is used to provide required or approved parking for the project. *This exception shall not apply to any other provision of this code.*

Residential:

"Single-family" - the total square footage of the building from the outside of the exterior walls shall constitute the proposed density. This shall include any basement areas (finished or unfinished) and entryways, but shall not include the garage nor other unfinished areas that could not constitute living area under the uniform building code without substantial physical renovation (i.e., crawl spaces, attic).

"Townhouses and duplexes" - same as for single-family.

"Multi-family" - the total square footage of the residential portions of the building from the outside of the exterior wall to the outside of the interior wall, if adjacent to a common area, or to the outside of the other exterior wall if not. Common areas such as lobbies, hallways, and amenity areas shall not be counted against the density.

"Hotels, lodges, etc." - same as for multi-family.

\*In those instances where commercial uses are being proposed within a multi-family building, hotel, etc., the density of those uses shall be counted against the allowed density; and, where the allowed density is calculated in units rather than floor area ratio, the one thousand (1,000) square foot equals one unit calculation shall be utilized. (Ord. 24, Series 2001)

Exception: Any portion of a basement area of a "town designated landmark" as defined in chapter 11 of this title, which is: a) located directly underneath the landmark building, and b) completely or partially buried below grade, shall not be counted toward allowed density for such building under this policy so long as the historic USGS floor elevation of the building is maintained. This exception shall not apply to any other provision of this code. (Ord. 16, Series 2005)

One of the main reasons that this policy did not allow for leasable space in the basements of historic commercial structures was that commercial uses would tend to create more intensity and site impacts (e.g. parking). However, at this point, staff feels that these concerns need to be balanced with the desire to create incentives for the restoration of historic commercial buildings.

We look forward to your comments on the proposed code amendment.