

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Mathews-Leidal.

### ROLL CALL

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

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the September 18, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the October 2, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

#### 1. McCain Master Plan Update & Work Session

Mr. Lott presented the updates to the McCain Master Plan. The main function of this proposal is to accommodate a future school parcel. The area is 128 acres in LUD 43. Existing site is heavily dredged and the river has gone through restoration work which is on its way to completion. The property was originally annexed in 2003 under LUD 43. In 2013 the first MP was adopted. In 2015 the original MP was modified to incorporate additional uses including work force housing and service commercial. In early 2018 the Town engaged in conversations with the Summit School district about a property exchange, to switch a parcel in Block 11 with one in McCain. Updates to parking, snow storage consolidated and relocated, solar garden modified, work force housing tracts were also modified. Mr. Lott pointed out parcels on the map and explained the acreage of each, and discussed differences with the 2015 Master Plan. We intend to bring the Master Plan Modifications as an official hearing at a future date.

The Open House was opened for Public Comment.

#### Public Comment:

Gail Quigley, Peak 7: What is the designated TDR space for the housing area? (Mr. Truckey: A potential receiving area. It must go through a fit test first.) What does the Master Plan call it now? (Mr. Truckey: A receiving area.) Is the proposed bike trail where the gravel was just put in? (Mr. Truckey: Roughly, it's on the bank looking toward the river.) Has the school area or recreation area been considered for the new field house discussion? (Mr. Grosshuesch: No.) Have you talked about Tract 10A being a camping area or is that off the table? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It did come up but was rejected as a suitable site.)

Eric Degerberg, 428 Silver Circle: The bike path, by the roundabout, I think you want to consider an underpass due to traffic and safety. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Under Stan Miller Drive?) Yes.

Art Albin, 512 Shekel Lane: I have been to several meetings relating to this property, today I'm here representing the Peak School, an independent school in Frisco. We are looking for school sites that might be an alternative to our current land. We want to keep our options open. When it came to our attention that the council was considering this as a possible school site, I wanted to bring to your attention that we are seeking something similar.

Mitch Ringquist, 13203 Highway 9: I'm right across from the water treatment plant. As feedback, high traffic in that area to do snow storage would be pretty extreme. I think we can deal with it given the fact that the proposed right of way will go in. If I'm correct, that right of way would go from Coyne Valley, past the

Building Center, past Stan Miller if I'm not mistaken? (Mr. Lott pointed on the map where it would be.) Wouldn't snow storage also be available and possible on portion of Tract 8? It would give you some right of way access from Coyne Valley up to the right of way and right into Tract 8. There is a lot of people coming through there right now with the Building Center and the Water Treatment Plant. I look forward to more open dialogue about this.

Tom Vitalone, 741 Fairview Blvd., also own 2V's Landscaping on Tract 2: Were you planning on filling in the pond for snow storage? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes.) Well that's a bummer because that's water that flows all year round, there are hundreds of geese and ducks that seem to winter there. And there's a lot of trout in that pond in the summer. It's too bad that can't be an asset as opposed to filling it in. It would be a big mistake.

Lee Edwards: What happened to the open space guys? That's why we got the property. (Mr. Grosshuesch: almost half is open space.) I don't like adding the tagline for housing. We already consumed Block 11 for housing and putting an isolated chunk for housing just doesn't make a lot of sense to me. Housing here and public works and commercial uses and isolating that little chunk doesn't make sense. Leave it open space.

Allen Robertson, 13203 Highway 9: Number 1, that pond is my son's lake for fishing and there is all kinds of wildlife there. I was told that was supposed to be the gateway to Breckenridge. What people saw. I'm being told that we are going to see piles of snow, DOT stuff, open lot possibly for a school, and now we're adding homes. I was told when I moved here that the idea was open space and that's not what I'm seeing. I hope to see open space to make it prettier, not just more stuff. I thought that was what Block 11 was for. And there's no kids out there for a school, no houses with kids.

Tony Lord, 132 Braddock Court: I've been a Summit County resident for 46 years. Talking about the lake, look at the size of the pond. This is 300 yards across by 100 the other way. It's been there a long time. When the Town started this project I talked with the Army Core of Engineers and was told the Town could do what it wanted with it due to no permanent inflow and outflow that was on the surface. So the Town can fill it. However there is a permanent inflow and outflow that goes through the dredge. The water that used to come through has disappeared and that lake is just about gone since the river restoration. I took my kids to learn to fish and it was kind of a local's secret. However, when the reconstruction of river was done, there is one spot that would be a great spot to over dig and channel water to the pond. If it could be lined and made to be year round, it could be a place for the ducks and geese. There is another pond by the Shores. Basically the development is taking over all our open space. I put a bridge in this area that has washed out several times. It would be helpful if Tract 10A would be some sort of parking instead of here on this side. So people can access the Forest Service land. It would help to add open space. We are shutting it off with the bike path. We need to talk about what the town and the county needs.

Leigh Girvin, 13 Meadowlark Green: I've been involved in the Master Planning in our community for over 20 years. We looked at this parcel in 1997 or 98 when we started working on the first ever Joint Upper Blue Master Plan. It was identified at the time as a parcel that was important for service commercial. You need these businesses to run the community and it's important that use is recognized and possibly that's not enough acreage for something like that. That was an important part of the original Master Plan for this parcel. I'm glad the parking area has been removed, I thought that was an eyesore. But my main concern is for open space and scenic views. Peter pointed out that there is a lot of acreage, but it is cut off from the view from the highway by potentially more housing. Tract 8 had long been planned as a reservoir, which would have preserved a sense of open space and that view is gorgeous as you're coming into Breckenridge. Having a reservoir there would have allowed that. Maintaining the view from the highway is an important aspect of Tract 8. In order to help preserve the scenic view and be maintained for open space and recreation.

Paul Semmer, 272 Blue Grouse Trail, Blue River: I'm here representing the Forest Service. I want to make you aware that last year the Forest Service, CDOT and Summit County completed a wildlife connectivity

study to look at safe passages throughout travel corridors in Summit County. I would implore you to take a look at that study for recommendations to apply to this project.

Carol Rockne, 547 Broken Lance Drive: I agree with Lee, I think that snow storage area behind it for housing is ugly. Can you put the housing where the snow storage is and keep the beautiful reservoir? It's a nice area and I think it should have the open feeling when coming down the road. We do need the service commercial because we are losing that to all the pot shops on Airport Road. I hope you massage this whole thing a little bit.

Jan Degerberg, 428 Silver Circle: My biggest concern is the noise of the snow storage. Trucks backing up and that kind of noise, even with the properties around there, I think that is in the wrong spot. Tract 10A would be a good spot because it's off Coyne Valley Rd. It makes more sense. And do something different with that snow storage spot.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Dudney: I think the comments are excellent. We as the Planning Commission are just like you – we make comments but Town Council decides. Some of the comments I heard were view corridor, and service commercial – this is an improvement and moving in the right direction. The housing that's in an area by itself might make more sense to be connected with the other housing rather than by itself. There is a notation for bike underpass, can you show that? (Mr. Lott pointed it out on map.) I wonder why you need it there as opposed to off the street. That bike path is a disaster waiting to happen currently. One thing that this does, it allows the parking with the Vail Resorts agreement to remain on Block 11. The last Master Plan showed them moving onto the McCain property. By making the change with the school district, they can leave the parking on Block 11. (Mr. Lott: that's correct.)

Mr. Schuman: Thank you all for your comments, they are all valid. The thing everyone has to understand is that more and more people are coming to Breckenridge to live, and the town and staff have to figure out how to make it work. I've been here 20 years and I remember Lake Breckenridge, but we have great needs in the Town. Glad to see the service commercial is increased. A lot of the trades are being pushed out so this is an improvement. We could use more open space but at the end of the day we are victims of our own success and this is a popular place to live and recreate. Let the Town Council know your priorities because they are trying to juggle the open space, views, and less noise; but here we are.

Mr. Giller: Those are good points, I think that the Town has done a good job. I think service commercial is important but is getting pushed out of other areas. I'm a fan of open space and parks. Breck is fortunate for this Brownfield area to redevelop. The plan needs a little work and I think the comments are great.

Mr. Schroder: Thanks, the Master Plan is something we layout as a future possibility. It's laid out today as a loose idea of what might occur. We are looking at future plans. There is an expectation of more people coming here, and I wonder where do we put them? There might be a few of us that were born here, but most came here. Just like I got that opportunity, more people will come here. This piece of land will have things on it, it's up to us to decide what things. We may see another Master Plan in the future. At one point there was a lake. The solar garden did get put in place. We have competing interests all the time, I'm glad to hear it all so Council can look and make a solid decision.

Mr. Gerard: The chance to have a meaningful dialogue about one of the last buildable parcels in Town is very important. When this is built out we are pretty much done. A lot of people pointed out significant things about the site. I think the river restoration was a great job. The school trade is an important matter for the Town to work out. It lets the town fulfill the skier parking requirement with the mountain. I'm surprised no one asked to push the skier parking further out. The difficulties with F Lot and bringing more people to town, some thoughts are that it's

better further out. The trade keeps the option of the parking. What the school district will do who knows. I hope everyone writes their comments as Planning Commission doesn't make any final decisions. We only offer opinions. Thank you and please continue to send comments to the Planning Department.

Ms. Leidal: We have a lot of pressure and there's so many conflicting opinions on usage. The public brought up a lot of good points on view corridors and service commercial because we need them and they are getting pushed out. Puts more strain in infrastructure for services to travel. There are a lot of good ideas but the plan needs massaging. I'd like to see this come back to us more refined. Thank you everyone for joining us and taking time out of your night.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Breckenridge Market and Liquor Exterior Modifications (CL), 311 S. Ridge Street, PL-2018-0320 (Continued from 8/21/18 Meeting)

Mr. Giller: In the packet, there is a cap flashing that needs to be labeled in the drawing. (Mr. LaChance: It's called out in the note section, item number 4 on the elevations. It's not called with a label, but all the cap flashings are proposed to be replaced.) Mr. Giller: Should it be black? That's an unusual color. Mr. LaChance: All of the existing cap flashing is currently a tan color. (Zach Jankonsky, Assistant Store Manager at Breckenridge Market: The color is more galvanized metal. The metal structures are all black. This accented off the brick.) (Mr. LaChance: All of the colors proposed meet the chroma and quantity requirement per Policy 5.)

Ms. Leidal: Thank you.

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

**PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1. Casey Residence (CK), 112 N. French Street, PL-2018-0262

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to rehabilitate, locally landmark, and add a connector and addition to the existing historic residence. For the record, we did a site visit to the residence and Lee Edwards, the applicant, was present. Since the previous meeting the changes outlined in the staff report include reductions to mass and height, reducing the footprint related to setbacks, windows were modified, and glazing reduced. A materials board was provided along with a landscape plan. The project also proposes energy conservation measures.

Mr. Kulick discussed policies relevant to the project, precedent related to preserving outbuildings. Mr. Kulick pointed out on the map outbuildings that are partially on the applicant's property. Sanborn Fire Maps from the 1800's verified the structures were there. Staff supports the outbuildings remaining in their historic locations. We encourage primary structures to stay in place through the code and their inconsistency between primary structures and outbuildings since the policy does say that outbuildings must be moved onto the property to be eligible for historic preservation points. However staff has found precedent for awarding positive points for historic preservation of outbuildings straddling property lines when there is permission from the adjacent owner.

Clarified interpretations on how to calculate mass and density. Explained building height and related policies. The connector was revised to 23 feet in length. Discussed relevant policy for connector. Windows have been simplified and reduced. Landscape plan drawn by Thetford Landscaping. Reduced the number of trees, pointed out cottonwoods, spruce, and aspens and discussed the landscape plan and relevant policies. The footprint has also been revised and shrunk and they are exceeding the relative setback. In terms of landmarking, they are looking to get free density under the historic main structure. The property meets the criteria for local landmarking.

Ms. Puester: Let the record show that the Planning Commissioners were emailed a letter submitted by

Colleen Sheehy, resident of Longbranch condos separate from the packet.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schuman: Have you calculated snow storage? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, and now there is more space.)

Mr. Giller: Have you looked at the North garage and the turning radiuses, and the porch for the connector? (Mr. Kulick: I can't say I have exactly, but we do not have standards for turning radiuses. Looking at similar projects it is probably in the ball park.) Mr. Giller: On the two-story addition, can we get an elevation on that? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, we can request that for next meeting.) Mr. Giller: On elevation of connector, the battle is that the ridgeline is only 8" below the house ridgeline. The idea of the 2' drop is so there is a differentiation. There are three steps between threshold and connector, so it would be easy to drop the height solving that problem. There's a lot going on there and that needs to be more closely considered. (Mr. Kulick: Applicant can speak to that. We did talk about reducing the height of the connector; it was discussed quite a bit with the applicant.)

Mr. Giller: Phase 1 and Phase 2 shown on the plans, is that relevant? (Mr. Kulick: That will be for their building permit, they will separate the project into phases.) Mr. Giller: Did they speak to meeting the HERS requirement? (Mr. Kulick: They submitted a preliminary report, and they are more than comfortable that they can get there using basic building methods. They have a very high score to begin with.) Mr. Giller: How they plan to achieve their HERS score should be in a building section that shows insulation or notes. (Mr. Kulick: It's not required at the planning phase to that level.) Ms. Puester: We require they get a report before final, that shows the calculations not just a letter.

Mr. Gerard: Since we were on site today, I think you told us this once, but what's the height of the roof on the Fireside Inn? (Mr. Kulick: I'm not sure but I may be able to track it down.) Mr. Gerard: Last time we looked at this, it was my recollection that the easements were not worked out, has that been taken care of? (Mr. Kulick: It's in the process of being executed and recorded. What parties did we get easements from? (Mr. Kulick: The Town, the adjacent property owner, and Longbranch HOA.) What about the property to the south? (Applicant: We have an easement signed.)

Ms. Dudney: Chris, what is the height of the historic home? (Mr. Kulick: It is 12.5'.) Ms. Dudney: How does that compare to other one story homes in the historic district? (Mr. Kulick: It's somewhat representative, but many are 1.5 stories. I would guess about 30% are one-story only.) Ms. Dudney: You said the flat roof and shed roof that you wouldn't want that. Can you explain why? (Mr. Kulick: Typically we want to be able to differentiate between old and new, but not too different. We want the building forms to still reflect the character of the Historic District.) Ms. Dudney: Since this is a Priority Design Standard, I was present when we changed this language on the connector, it was never brought up and we didn't consider the situation where you have a very low historic house. Perhaps, it wasn't written right; but how do you get around it? (Mr. Kulick: Looking at the Noble House as precedent, we were trying to achieve the overall spirit and we could add an additional finding stating why. Based on your direction tonight, we could craft a finding support a different outcome.)

Ms. Leidal: Just some clarification, you are suggesting positive points for the landscaping, but the quantities do not match the report. (Mr. Kulick: The plan needs to update the calipers of trees to reflect what has been agreed to.) I have a question, I know accessory apartments are allowed, but there is a pocket door with a few different ways to connect to the room upstairs; has staff looked at this plan for an accessory unit? (Mr. Kulick: No because it hasn't been requested by the applicant but it would have to meet guidelines if that was the case. Since they are not asking for an accessory unit at this time we have not reviewed it as an accessory apartment.)

Mr. Gerard: This is outside of my knowledge, but I am troubled by the two foot separation between the historic home's ridge height and the ridge height of the accessory apartment. Since they are

putting the historic property on a foundation, could they make the foundation taller? (Mr. Kulick: We don't want to change the overall height and alter it.) Ms. Leidal: There is a rule that says you can't. (Ms. Puester: You can't alter the elevation of a historic building.)

Mr. LaChance: The height of the Fireside Inn is 27'8", per the elevation drawings in the December 2017 Work Session packet.

Lee Edwards, Applicant: Thank you for the comments. Chris did a very nice job. Going through the report I highlighted things to touch on. Starting with the mass: we are looking at it a different way. I understand that rule interpretations can change over time. However, I did a spreadsheet that went back as far as May of 2015 and then without researching all the files, back to December 2011. There was a memo by Chris Neubecker describing how the density was to be applied to a property across from the Community Center. From what I can tell, that's how properties have been reviewed. There's a bunch of them. Typically, for the most part, you have used the total density allowed on the property with a 20 percent bonus to arrive at mass. I want to review that with staff and I want you to understand that we are being calculated on above ground density while everything else has been calculated on the entire density of the property. As recently as April of this year you were reviewing projects using the entire density. We are in district 18-2. This came about because the bank of Breckenridge wanted to have an empty lot for a drive up window. So the Town made the block 18-2. If you use the 18-2 multiplier I believe our mass calculation would be over 4000 sq. ft. We haven't got that number quite worked out with staff. We don't feel the 15 negative points applies for a mass overage because of past precedent. Staff and I will continue to work on this but there is seven years' worth of projects using the whole density to calculate the mass. Thank you very much for the positive point recommendation on the shed. We're not hurting for points. Most buildings like the Fireside Inn and Mr. Giller's house have a roof area that you're able to put living space into. We don't have that. However, if we look at the connector, I'd like to point out to the commission: (on map) If push came to shove, you can say the ridge of the connector is higher than two feet to the original roof. The ridge on the historic home is approximately 6 feet from the historic part to the connector ridge. There's a clear distinction between the connector and into the garage itself. Ms. Dudney: Can you estimate the ridge going down to the connector? Mr. Edwards: Yes, it must be 3.5 or 4 feet. It will make more sense when I do a model of that area. We are trying to meet code. Mr. Kulick: I want to point out the connector picture in the staff report is the picture is from the previous plan. I apologize for any confusion. Mr. Edwards: I think that is pretty much it. If I can address some of the comments from the Commission – yes, we will do sections for the final set of plans. We talked about doing a step inside but one level made a lot more sense. HERS, yes, everything will be done to the existing building. Turning radius: we followed the design Tony and Anne Harris used and they can get their vehicles in and out comfortably. Flat roof – I can't really find an example of a flat roof in the residential area of the historic district. And we will update the landscape plan.

Ms. Leidal opened the hearing for public comment.

Public Comments:

Lynn Hoffman, 107 N. Harris, Unit 213: I've owned property for 25 years. I am president of HOA for Longbranch. You asked about the easement agreement; we have signed it and the neighbors have signed it. It protects us and we are excited we got it solved. Anytime there's a transfer of property it will come up. The easement agreement says that we agree to keep the historic buildings on our property as long as they conform to the existing use and don't make it too disruptive. We hope the commission will work with the applicants on different options for stabilizing. We do have some concerns on this project. We are concerned about the height. If you look at the standards, they say additions shall be compatible in size and scale to the main building and character area. Standard 80 says an abrupt change is inappropriate. The houses neighboring are one level houses. The question I'm raising is what is the character area that we're referring to. In that block the historic character is single level buildings. This project is too high.

Gary Branson, 107 N Harris, Unit 216: We've owned the property for 21 years. One of the reasons we

bought that condo was because of the historic district. We wanted to live in the historic district. We appreciate what you all have done in keeping any project consistent with the neighborhood. I piggyback on the previous comment about height. My concern is that my unit sits directly behind the project. I couldn't hear everything, but was it mentioned the new project height compared to the Fireside? (Mr. Kulick: 25.5 feet to the ridgeline on the structure, the Fireside is 27'8".) Consistency of the houses, the houses are small. As I look at this lot, the size of the house will swallow up the lot and seems overbearing. Across the street they finished new houses that appear to be 1.5 stores. They look very consistent with others. My concern isn't seeing a house built there, but the size and the height taking away from the aesthetics and I'd like to see it scaled down. Thank you.

Deb Edwards, 103 N High Street, 50% owner of 108 N French: I believe the building is too high. I'm not an expert, Lee can analyze something to death, but just because something is different than how it used to be done isn't bad. I'm not an expert but I hardly understand. But I would look at that again. Like you Christie, I'm very concerned about the non-accessory space above the garage. If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck it's most likely a duck. It has all the things you need to make it an accessory unit. You can say it won't, but it doesn't mean it won't and there should be additional scrutiny relative to that space and I speak from experience. It's a huge building compared to the Craig's building and others. You (directed to Mr. Edwards) presented an original project that took up a lot of time, so why didn't you present this plan then? It was a waste of time that Lee knows darn well wouldn't pass. We have preserved two historic buildings in the historic district and I can't believe this plan wasn't presented first. Perhaps a lesson learned so everyone's time is respected and appreciated.

Mr. Kulick: I did a quick calculation and the space above the garage meets the required of being no greater than 1/3 of the total density required for accessory apartment.

Mr. Edwards: We did eliminate the exterior door that could go directly to the area in question and the other comment is that this property is a double lot, as is the Fireside Inn. The property's frontage is 50' wide while the other houses are on 25' wide lots.

Ms. Dudney: The mass; I do not deny that there are precedents that show the mass was calculated on the basis of total density but I have to go by the language in the Code. Lee, it states very clearly that you're allowed 20 percent of above ground area. Mass is the total above ground. The deviations are only allowed with the transfer of density but it's not allowed in the historic district so it's irrelevant. I have to say unfortunately that you're limited in terms of mass to the 10UPA which means you lose 160 some square feet. But I think you could probably challenge this because it seems unfair to be changed midstream. I see no course of action other than following the staff's recommendation. Bad precedent makes bad law. On the connector; I would be in favor of getting relief from the two foot requirement. If you could cut the height of the connector that would be great, but I have confidence in the staff that it's not the best solution. I would be in favor of a special finding. This situation was never considered when Standard 80A was drafted. The issue about the character of one story: We're not given direction as to what is the character area, but considering precedent and language, and all the other projects that have been approved, I think the character area is more than just that small part of the block. I'm sorry for the people in Longbranch that get views obstructed, but we have to consider the property owner rights.

Mr. Schuman: I agree with point one on the mass. I think the staff has it right and two wrongs don't make a right. We shouldn't continue to mess up. I agree with positive +3 points for onsite efforts. Height and roof design I'm ok and I think it does comply. The connector, I think Gretchen was on to something about the connector, we didn't know they were as offset as they were and there's probably more than 2' difference. I appreciate the landscape update. I support the windows and doors. Do think it's eligible for local landmarking. Character area is discussed as the three buildings, but I think it's a full area and you can't just say the large buildings don't count. Also, we have been working long and hard for many years to get

preservation projects going. We've crafted a lot of codes to encourage livability within historic preservation. I think the code allows you to add height and density for the payoff of restoration. I look forward to seeing more detail in the next presentation. Staff has done a great job.

Mr. Giller: I'd like to start with HERS. The applicant's agent spoke to the integrity of the interior, which is special because lots of houses have been gutted. If you are meeting HERS because you're tearing out old materials, that isn't good. Moving on to questions: I agree with Chris's analysis, the mass interpretation is correct. On historic preservation, I agree with three points for outbuildings but please get that right. If you're going to restore the outhouse keep the wallpaper. Under height and roof design, I think it does comply but it feels too tall. Connector, I disagree, I think there's an easy means to correct it with an interior step or two. It's a perfect example of a connector that needs to be differentiated from height. The connector should come down. Landscape yes, windows doors yes.

Mr. Schroder: The issue is the size. I believe the mass is above ground density and it's too big. The size of the property meets the height requirement, but that's counter to the design standards so I'm looking forward to the next review because it's challenging to know that 23' is acceptable. The neighborhood isn't just the three houses, but the whole East Side Character Area of Breck. I look forward to next presentation and think the project needs a little more work. The roof design meets criteria of Design Standard 121. On the site visit, Lee mentioned that 40" frost depth concrete is required by the building code. I am supportive of points for historic preservation. Connector: It seems like a running ridgeline. It's offset in a minor manner. It's perceived as a running ridgeline and needs to be dropped. Landscaping is great, windows doors comply. Support local landmarking.

Mr. Gerard: I agree that we can't make two wrongs into a right. The fact that the mass policy has been mis-applied in the past doesn't mean we can do it again. The points for the restoration of outbuildings is fine, providing easements work. The height and roof design is a tight fit, and I sympathize with those who live behind, but if it is legally conforming that's how it goes. The difference between the historic building and the new part, the average was an 8' difference. The connector, I think the rule is mandatory and it shall not exceed one story in height. I don't see how you get around it. The rule we were working with and tried to be creative just talked about standards and minimums, and some of the applications were ludicrous. The 2' distinction is important to separate the buildings. I'm voting against it if we don't drop to 2' lower than the main building.

Ms. Leidal: Thank you for all the changes. I appreciate them. I agree with number one. Number 2, I support the historic points for outbuilding with a specific finding. In regard to 3, yes, I think you meet height but I don't think we meet mass. The East Side Residential Character area says it's one of the most important parts of the area and protection is extremely important. Most of the historic buildings are perceived as original structures, but some are pockets of historic context. Which is our three buildings in a row. I think that addition overwhelms it and fails to meet a number of policies. I think you can easily remove the roof on the porch. Number 4, I'm not comfortable with the connector. 5, I support landscape points. 6, windows are fine. Additionally, I'm not comfortable with the amount of corrugated metal siding and I think we should assess negative points for exceeding 25 percent. (Mr. Kulick: Past precedent shows we have never awarded negative points under Policy 5/R for the use of rusted corrugated metal on outbuildings, further it is historically accurate.) I think the addition looks like a primary structure. That's my personal interpretation.

#### **OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)



**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 pm.

---

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair