

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Giller.

### ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal  
Mike Giller  
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb  
Steve Gerard  
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On page 2 there is a public comment opening and closing in in Ms. Leidal's comment, leaving house "amenable" not "amendable."

With the above changes, the November 6, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the November 20, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Comments

### WORK SESSIONS:

#### 1. Comprehensive Code Amendments

Mr. Truckey presented an overview of the proposed Code Amendments, and asked for feedback from the Commission.

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Leidal: I am wondering if uneven gable rooflines should be addressed in the changes to 6R and how we measure height? Should you measure both? (Mr. Truckey: It is easy enough to add it in. We just need to know how we want to measure it.) (Mr. Kulick: We measure rooflines to the highest point.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We use whatever yields the highest height.) (Ms. Puester: It does say that on page 19.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We may not need to address it because it is already there.) I don't think we need to allow positive points for single family and duplexes stepping down their rooflines. Were we trying to find ways to make up points? (Mr. Truckey: If the intent is for it to apply to multifamily housing we can change some wording.) (Mr. Giller: I think it is a good idea and not a hard requirement to meet, so positive points are not necessary.)

Mr. Lamb: Regarding moving historic structures, what happens when a historic structure encroaches on another property. (Mr. Truckey: They don't incur negative points for moving it out of that encroachment.)

Mr. Giller: I think the code changes address the moving structures issues.

Ms. Leidal: Under Site Buffering, we crossed out tree stands and tree backdrops because they were moved under landscaping, ridgeline and outcroppings were left. I think 4 positive points is too many points for preserving ridgelines and outcroppings. (Mr. Truckey: We want to retain some value but maybe not positive 4. May be worth positive 2 now.)

Mr. Giller: I think you should avoid ridgelines and outcroppings at all cost. 2 points is easy to make up.

Mr. Schuman: It seems like a lot of negatives here and we need some positives as well. We need direction both ways. I would leave it.

- Ms. Leidal: 14R storage. I think we should retain the option of assigning negative points if enough storage is not provided. It says encouraged but you need the ability to assign negative points if someone does not allow any storage. 4R mass provides bonus space for garages, common areas, and common storage. They shouldn't use all the mass to provide other things that do not include storage.
- Mr. Giller: I agree it is very important for multifamily structures to have storage.
- Mr. Lamb: I can't think of any recent multifamily project without storage. (Mr. Truckey: We did look at it and we have never awarded negative points for storage.)
- Mr. Schroder: I like idea of giving negative points.
- Ms. Leidal: I am uncertain about the 500 square feet for sodded/lawned areas. I don't have the answer for commercial space. Maybe 500 is correct.
- Mr. Lamb: A sliding scale makes sense because you can't compare small lots in town and big lots in the Highlands. I assume we are lumping sod as Kentucky Blue Grass.
- Mr. Giller: I think it works. Sustainable landscape cuts back significantly on sod. (Mr. Grosshuesch: There is an equalization between town lots and the Highlands which has disturbance envelopes.) I think the minus 2 works for excessive sodded areas works.
- Mr. Schroder: I think it works with the 500 sq ft.
- Ms. Leidal: Do you have more ideas about the lot line issue? (Mr. Grosshuesch: An example is difficult. Our thought is to include a general enabling clause. If a development permit comes in we could require a lot line vacation, where we have various encroachments and setback violations to the Building and Development Codes to deal with.)

The work session was opened for public comment:

- No public comments.

- Ms. Leidal: 1(Is Commission comfortable with changes to Employee Housing Table)—yes. 2 (Does Commission agree with changes to 24R regarding moving historic structures)—yes. 3 (Does Commission agree with reclassification of historic structure applications)—yes. These are very time consuming applications. 4 (Does Commission agree with leaving positive 9 or 12 points to projects that do not include above ground additions?)--yes. 5 (Should landscape walls be made of natural materials and is 20 feet a good length?) Yes. I like landscape walls. I think we should try a 20 foot length to start with. 6 (Does the Commission agree with a 500 square foot limitation on sodded areas without negative points?) 500 sq ft I am not sure and would consider a sliding scale. 7 (Other Commission comments)--no more changes.
- Mr. Schroder: I agree with each of the code revisions. The third bullet has an opportunity for issues to arise. It seems the process lends itself to a Class A, currently the applicant is getting much more than they paid for. 4<sup>th</sup> bullet I agree that positive 9 & 12 points should be retained for projects without additions.
- Mr. Gerard: I agree with all seven points. They are all changes that work well for the town. 500 square feet for sodded areas works well. I think that staff should come up with a clear lot line vacation requirement. That is something that needs to be cleaned up. It is important to give negative points when failing to provide adequate storage.
- Mr. Schuman: 1- 4 yes. 5 open to small changes for non-natural materials. 6, agree. 7, agree.
- Mr. Lamb: 1 yes, 2--the point assignment for moving structures is getting pressure from the state so yes. 3--I think the class A is a big price jump. I'm okay with keeping a Class B if, for example, it's just a foundation replacement. 4--I agree with 9-12 points. 5--Are we talking about landscape wall or retaining wall? 6--The 500 sq. ft. works. I think the code changes have all gone a good direction.
- Mr. Moore: 1, 2, & 4 yes. 3, I would like to see a separate classification for minor additions. 5, I think 20 feet is not very long for a landscaping wall but we need to start somewhere. We should allow wall materials based on the site and what the use of the wall is. 6, 500 sq ft is fine.

Minimizing water use is a top priority. Storage needs to be encouraged.  
Mr. Giller: 1, concur. 2, concur. 3, Historic preservation benefits the town and I feel a Class B is still sufficient. 4, 9 and 12 I concur; 5, I concur; 6, I concur. We should keep negative points for storage.

2. Hoopes Cottage (CK), PL-2018-0521, 204 N. Ridge Street

Mr. Kulick presented options for potential historic renovation at the Hoopes Cottage property at 204 N. Ridge Street, and asked for input from the Commission.

Janet Sutterley, Architect, Presented:

We really don't want to see the current non-conforming two story addition remain on the house. I think it is an exception that we have an owner willing to tear down the addition and end up with less square footage as a result. I think it is an opportunity to correct a bad situation created in the 70s. It would be a great tradeoff to have the addition removed and the mass bonus included. This drawing is a good representation of how it will sit along the lot line. (Mr. Giller: What does square feet ML and UL mean?) Main level and underground level. This will be a one story structure and have a small garage. (Mr. Gerard: Looks like there is a driveway permitted in the back.) (Mr. Kulick: We will look at that in the future. It may get narrowed down to meet current engineering standards.) It currently is one big gravel lot. We will have to follow the engineering guideline. What we are looking for tonight is a general yes or no on the garage bonus and does it warrant a mass bonus.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Gerard: I think it is a great project. The mass bonus makes sense here.

Mr. Schuman: I am in favor of the bonus.

Mr. Lamb: I was originally worried about the precedent but this is different because they are losing above ground square footage (17.59 UPA to 12 UPA mass), which is a pretty tall standard to set.

Mr. Moore: This is an ideal situation to grant the mass bonus.

Ms. Leidal: I support the mass bonus. I want to make sure this does achieve substantial compliance with the handbook of design standards. I support.

Mr. Schroder: I support a variance for the mass bonus.

Mr. Giller: I too support a variance for the mass bonus but we need to make it clear why.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Tyra Riverbend Lodge Condominium/Hotel Meeting Room Conversion (CL) PL-2018-0540, 655 Four O'clock Rd.

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

**COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. Village at Breckenridge Plaza Large Vendor Cart (CL), 655 S. Park Avenue, PL-2018-0532

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to install a large vendor cart on the Village at Breckenridge plaza, which if approved would be the third large vendor cart in the plaza.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schroder: Can you show on the map where the previously approved vendor carts and the proposed vendor carts are located? (Mr. LaChance explained the location on the map.)

Mr. Lamb: There is only one vendor cart currently in the plaza.

Mr. Giller: Will they be including a seating area? (Mr. LaChance: It is not required.) If the applicant adds seating, will it be reviewed? (LaChance: Yes)

Mr. Schroder: Is The Village taking care of the trash? (Mr. LaChance: Policy 49 does not address trash receptacles, but there are several trash receptacles in The Village.)

Micheal Halouvas, Applicant:

I have been coming to Breckenridge for years and moved here permanently in the past year. The to-go containers we use are ecofriendly and recyclable. (Mr. Schroder: Is the village aware that you will be generating trash? Will you put a trash receptacle onsite?) Yes, I would. (Mr. Giller: Will you add seating?) The village has seating there now and we will just use that.

The hearing was opened for public comment.

- No Public Comment.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schroder: I look forward to enjoying a gyro.

Mr. Schuman: The trash is an HOA issue not a Planning Commission issue. I agree with staff's analysis.

Mr. Lamb: I have no concerns.

Ms. Leidal: I agree with staff's analysis.

Mr. Gerard: It looks like a good plan.

Mr. Giller: I support staff's analysis and look forward to your opening.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed unanimously.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary

Mr. Grosshuesch presented an overview of the November 13<sup>th</sup> Town Council Meeting.

- No planning applications called up
- City Market expansion Development Agreement approved
- Noble House land marking approved
- Approved trash ordinance
- Mill levy approved
- McCain master plan reviewed. Asked for a change to Tract 9 Open Space/Housing/Recreation designation. Would like to see housing and recreation removed.
- 2040 Study Population, employment, traffic, parking, housing etc. increase projections to inform a Tourism Management Plan done by the Breckenridge Tourism Office to establish how to manage growth in tourism and how much growth is manageable.
- Isaack Heartstone was moved to storage.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:13 pm.

---

Mike Giller, Chair