

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal - absent
Mike Giller
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb - absent
Steve Gerard
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the November 20, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the December 4, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

BROADBAND

1. Broadband Update

Ms. Haynes presented an update on the plan for Town-wide Fiber Infrastructure. Project will take a considerable amount of time. Town Council approved an 8 million dollar expenditure for the first phase. Once Council decided on the spending, they started to move very quickly. Service providers have shown a lot of interest. Intent is to get started on a contract by the end of the year. Our consultant Foresite is working on the engineering. Construction is planned to begin in May 2019. There will be considerable disruption on our streets once construction is started. Multiple crews will be working at the same time. We are also working with Launch, a marketing group, to brand our network.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: When do you anticipate construction? (Ms. Haynes: May 2019.) Can you use existing, or all new dig? (Ms. Haynes: We hope to use some existing but much of that is dependent on CDOT.)

Mr. Moore: When you have the backbone there, and someone is 100 ft. from it, will they come to the Town and ask to be hooked up? (Ms. Haynes: Part of the marketing will be to communicate that to the public. Council has committed to paying for the line from the backbone to a home unless we work out something else with the providers during this next phase of the process.)

Mr. Schuman: Will that be done by a commercial provider? (Ms. Haynes: Plan to be done by the Town but connected by the provider.)

Mr. Schroder: Is there a campaign that will identify the disturbance? (Ms. Haynes: Yes, it will all be part of the marketing plan.)

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Craig Parking Pad (JL), 110 N. French Street, PL-2018-0581

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

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Breck 365 Work Session

Mr. Lott presented a proposal to construct 102 workforce rental apartment units in eleven buildings, to include a neighborhood community center, lease office, and associated parking on approximately 5.3 acres south of the Blue 52 neighborhood on the Block 11 parcel with access from Flora Dora Drive. Included in the presentation were changes and updates since the first work session on this project last June. Construction has been changed to modular, where last time it was stick built. The footprints on some of the buildings have changed slightly, and they were able to fit more parking spaces. (Mr. Lott pointed on the map to the parking lot access points.) The sizes and mix of the apartments has changed. Mr. Lott reviewed the relevant policies. Specific questions for the Commission are: 1) Are there any Commissioner comments regarding the architecture, colors, or site layout? 2) Does the Commission have any comments on the number of parking spaces provided or layout of the parking areas and circulation? 3) Does the Commission support the preliminary point analysis?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Under parking, does the deed restriction limit the number of last names in the unit? Are they required to be family members? In my neighborhood there is a restriction on that. Three independent people may have three cars versus a family with less. (Ms. Best: It will likely be the standard deed restriction and have leasing guidelines, but we haven't gotten further into the management. We don't think there will be a limit on names. We expect families and roommate situations. Pinewood 1 consists of a variety of household compositions.)

Mr. Giller: Any requirements or thoughts on storage for bikes and sports equipment? (Mr. Lott: There was concern about not having bike storage. It's currently being looked at and likely we will see some outdoor storage.) (Ms. Best: Council directed us to have lots of secure bike storage.) (Ms. Puester: You can see on the floor plans there are some pop outs and internal areas for additional types of storage.) Mr. Giller: I think that's great. What about solid railings for visual screening for items that will be on balconies? On other Block 11 apartments we did that to screen what ends up on the porch. I think that's important here too.

Mr. Schuman: You said you're getting positive points for trail connections, can you point those out? (Mr. Lott pointed them out on the site plan.)

Matthew Wiedenman, 359 Design:

Overall we're looking at a 5.2 acre site. The mix of units is studios and 1 bds., two and three beds. It's pretty well mixed. There's 181 parking spaces, 149 are required. We've provided a lot of overflow parking as shown on the plan. We have trails and open space that connect throughout the site. You can see there's a spot that's designated as a bike parking area on the north end of the site. We can secure it. (Images of the site were shown with renderings.) We looked at flat roofs and low slope roofs, we think we will look at a mix of both or one or the other based on recommendations. We feel a combo of both would help with the character. The layout of site was shown, pointing out the dispersion of types of units. We've tried to accommodate the mass of parking for each building close to that building, with overflow parking a little further out but still close. We have open space and landscaping in the center. Examples of the unit size and stacking was shown. We want to break up the facades with windows and decks. We've looked to step some of the decks to break up the scale. We've also expanded our material palate to look at earth tone colors. We're looking at all high durability exterior materials. They won't need a lot of upkeep and won't show age for quite awhile. We want railings to include a timber look, per your advisement we can make them with better screening. Design elements such as windows and railings were shown. We are under the building heights as measured to the mean.

Lindsey Newman, Norris Design:

The updates to the landscape plan include sustainability to the view corridor. We've redesigned the center and minimized sod and landscaped areas. We have removed the large lawn areas and replaced them with sport court and a community garden space. The sport court is multi-purpose and low maintenance. The

gardens provide community members with involvement. Low maintenance and less irrigation is added to the tree design. Overall the goal was to reduce the maintenance while still blending in with the other neighborhoods.

Mr. Wiedenman:

In closing, we will continue to develop and take into account all the comments we've received. Look forward to refining our schemes to meet the intent of the town.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Moore: Where the shed roofs come together into a V shape, will that be a problem here with the snow? (Mr. Wiedenman: We've removed those now. However, we do still have some on the rear of the buildings and we plan to heat tape those.) (A new rendering was shown.)

Mr. Moore: Will you use assigned parking? (Ms. Best: Probably not, parking is not as efficient when it's assigned.)

Mr. Schuman: Can we see more elevations? (More renderings with elevations were shown.) That tower shown, is that stairs? (Mr. Wiedenman: Yes.) Should add more articulation to that to break it up, more windows and a base.

Mr. Schroder: Building 6, is that side view from the street? (Mr. Wiedenman pointed out which side was which.) The articulation is nice on the Flora Dora side, what you call the back will really be used as the front for residents. It will be what they see so it would be nice if there was a little more articulation. (Mr. Wiedenman: We realize that, we are trying to work through that.) In terms of bike racks, most bikes are thousands of dollars. I would recommend we not waste time building racks at a distance from the units, if I lived there I would never put a bike there. I would put them in my unit. Could we use that space differently? (Mr. Wiedenman: Good point. Each unit will have an outdoor storage area that is sizeable.) The community center, that is where all the studio units are? (Mr. Wiedenman: Yes.) Really what I'm getting at is, how much are community centers used? Doesn't seem necessary. Could a few more units be put in place of a community center that may be under utilized? (Mr. Wiedenman: In general it's a modestly scaled center. It's basic and we would look at a kitchenette and TVs and a few small offices. In theory, we could add in a few more units on the first floor. It could be looked at making it higher but it would push a lot of studios into one place. It's nice to have some sort of community space. It's especially useful for people who live in studios.)

Mr. Schuman: No murphy beds in community space.

Ms. Puester: To clarify the height, in the staff report you will see that we measure to the top of a shed roof not mean, so we gave it -5 points as it is over the 35 foot max. This is consistent with how we've been measuring shed roofs.

Public Comment:

Lee Edwards, 1802 Airport Road: I have property next to this. I'm going to push back against the sacred cow. Employee housing has a need. I would like to know when the most recent update was made to the study. Now we have many new units along Airport Road and the old runway space since the last version. I'm a little disappointed with this. One of the first large scale housing projects was Breck Terrace, at the time the Town started review we knew there was a need but we still wanted the mountains in the backdrop and it worked. Here with the perspective shown, much of the mountains are blocked with this. With the Blue 52 project, the Town established a pattern on the architecture and they wanted to tie in historic elements and I bought it. I can also see how they kept the river and brought it into the project. How long do you think the community area that's enclosed in the center of this will get any sunshine and use? This is a view that we are going to see (referencing the Highway 9 view). You've got a freaking wall now with this when you come into Breckenridge. I understand the Commission and staff can only do what they're directed but this is atrocious. You're going to jam open space into the interior where it won't get used. You cannot tell me that this is architecturally compatible with what's on Airport Road or with Blue 52.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: We have a few questions proposed. Colors and layout: It was stated that the colors will continue to be reviewed and we will see a color board in the future, needs to be more subdued backdrop colors. It's important to keep the natural backdrop. We have a chroma requirement in the code. Layout: I made note that the interior playground is wonderful in the fact that it's protected, but the units on the far south it might be somewhat imposing to go into the playground. The roadways we looked at quite a bit previously, I think it's laid out appropriately in terms of bus approach. We need housing, high density housing, so I think the layout works pretty well. Maybe some of the buildings could move west and the parking move out toward the river. I think the architecture with the shed roofs flaring adds interest. It makes it more palatable. It's different but we are seeing more of the shed roofs in the community and I think it speaks to the styles in the 21st century. We have ongoing parking issues. There will likely be 2 cars per unit so parking could be tight but I know staff is looking into it. I support the point analysis. Wonder about snowload here.

Mr. Gerard: Interesting project, and necessary. I agree with some of Lee's comments about differing from Blue 52, but it has to because of the density. I'm okay that it looks different than Blue 52. I like the difference. I agree with Dan's observation with the rooflines. The colors are too harsh but I know you'll be adjusting the palate. I personally think it's a good use of the limited space. It's a lot of housing in 5 acres. I appreciate we are able to add the exit to the west off Flora Dora. I support the project. I've lost half a dozen good friends that had to leave due to the housing shortage.

Mr. Schuman: Site layout is good. We have a great need for a lot of housing. It doesn't seem real compatible to me against Blue 52. It seems disjointed. I think different styles might work, but it doesn't seem to fit really well here. I do like the modules and unit sizes, I like all the windows. We usually have solar but not on this project. The community space I do question if that really is a valid need. I don't know of many other projects that have a community space that functions that way. I too question the internal sports activities, open space and garden. If one group of people are playing ball no one else will go near it. It will get used by one group on a consistent basis. I think it's a good project and I think we'll probably see a number of changes. Off to a good start.

Mr. Moore: I agree with Ron. Understand what Lee is saying. The architecture is not compatible to Blue 52. One thing I've heard people say, is "are you guys going to fill up the Blue River area with these projects?" Is there any way to get 100 units in 5 acres without doing this? Probably not. I'd like to see the final architecture. The shed roofs don't exactly fit here but I don't have a problem with them. A little diversity in architecture doesn't hurt. I'm going to withhold judgement until I see it come back. The layout makes sense. Parking is always a problem but as long as we are within code I don't have a problem. I agree with the point analysis.

Mr. Schuman: I do support the parking space and point analysis.

Mr. Giller: Number one, the design is good. The shed roofs are nicely wrapped and integrate the modular units. I think the colors, materials, and composition are getting there. A heavier darker base would anchor this a bit more. Opaque railings in a dark color as well. It is too disparate in terms of colors. I would urge you to look next door for their colors so that it relates. On the site, the shared garden and landscape are good improvements. Do develop the site furnishings such as picnic tables that make this useable. I feel strongly about opaque railings. In Aspen the work force housing looked bad, but that can be solved in part by screened decks. Develop the details.

Mr. Schroder: Thank you for keeping the snow load into consideration.

2. City Market Expansion and Remodel (CL), 400 N. Park Ave, PL-2018-0554

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to increase the total gross floor area of the City Market supermarket and adjacent retail building by 4,292 sq. ft., including a 7,826 sq. ft. (gross floor area) retail grocery store expansion through the absorption of existing adjacent retail space, with associated landscaping and site modifications. In 1989, the property was master planned. Just recently, the Town Council approved a Development Agreement, which approved the transfer of density to this lot for grocery store use. Mr. LaChance reviewed the relevant policies. Renderings were shown of the proposed plan. Proposed density is 2.4 SFE's over recommended even with 7.0 SFE density transfer, but Development Agreement exempts application from compliance with Policy 3 Density. Development Agreement also exempts application from negative points under Policy 24 Social Community for non-provision of employee housing. Materials are proposed to match existing, and the supermarket portion of the building will be painted brown and tan, including the portions that are currently green. There are renovations proposed to the site in the front and back of the store. Staff has concerns regarding the landscaping, because 18 trees are proposed to be removed in the front and back of the supermarket. The supermarket received positive four (+4) points for the landscaping when it was originally approved in 1985, and there was a Restrictive Covenant and Agreement recorded in 1995 that required the landscaping quantities to be maintained on the property. Staff believes the net total tree quantity should not be reduced, and screening and buffering should be maintained between the recreation path and the supermarket's "back of house" operations. We will come back to the Commission with a Combined Hearing in January. Specific questions for the Commission include: 1) Does the Commission concur with staff on the preliminary point analysis? 2) Does the Commission support additional landscaping to provide buffering and screening from the proposed development? 3) Does the Commission have any other concerns regarding the proposed expansion and remodel?

Carl Schmidlein with Galloway and Company, Inc.: Thank you to Chapin and the rest of the staff. We do not have a formal presentation, but I wanted to touch on a few items, and am open for feedback. With the proposal, we want to minimize the impact to Highway 9 and Main Street. Behind the store, it is rather hidden. The only area you will see the expansion from is Main Street/Old Highway 9. In regards to the trash enclosure, we will have a similar one but will match the store. (An aerial site plan was shown.) What we have tried to do is maintain the front as much as possible, but that sidewalk is very narrow. Talking with the arborist, there may be an opportunity to save trees. However, we have proposed 10 aspen trees on the back of the store and 8 evergreen trees. We are still working on the front, and are open to feedback.

Marc Breetz with Naos Design Group: Expansion area was pointed out on the renderings. We will be keeping with the existing height to modify the mezzanine and store space. We want to bring the building up to a more neutral color. (The interior layout of the store was shown with proposed additions and modifications.) Interior design and ceiling height will be modified. Décor will be community based with King Soopers Neighborhood Market model. The employee and storage area will all be moving to the expanded mezzanine.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: There is currently not anywhere to put bananas so they are all on the floor. Have we gained storage space? (Mr. Breetz: Yes, space was shown on the rendering.) Do you have any numbers related to other stores on our visitation? (No, but that data could be found). Do not worry about it. That is outside the scope of this application.

Mr. Giller: What are the green areas shown on site plan? (Mr. Breetz: Those are existing and remaining.)

Mr. Schuman: What is the transition period time? (John Atwood, Project Manager with King Soopers: When we remodeled the store in Eagle, December was the goal. We would love to get the majority finished by December. Normally the whole thing is about a year. Because of how this is going, we could be looking at going past Christmas and still doing some work. We want to open expansion first.)

Mr. Giller: Typical construction time is a year? (Mr. Breetz: Yes, in this style expansion there are some

long pieces of construction. The actual impact on the sales area will be less.) (Mr. Atwood: Anytime we do a remodel, the store is open all the time. We work at night.)
Mr. Moore: The old break room, does that go away? (Mr. Breetz: It will be modified.)

Public Comments:

Lee Edwards, PO Box 1063, Breckenridge. I shop there. Regarding the Development Agreement, is the town donating the additional SFEs, or are they being purchased? (Ms. Puester: They are getting the TDRs from the Town as it was one of the terms in the Development Agreement document.) That is a lot of hard surface with the parking lot. Is there any opportunity on the parking lot side to put in a landscape island?

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I love that it will get a fresh coat of paint. Is there any way that we can get the rest of the complex painted at the same time? I understand the tree situation in front. I am glad to see the applicant is willing to provide a remedy with the trees. We are talking about the building itself, if there is any way to incorporate a refreshment to the parking lot that would be great. Support point analysis. Look forward to seeing what is coming. It's sorely needed. It's quite crowded most of the year. For about 6 weeks, there is not any bread on the shelves. Thanks for bringing this forward.

Mr. Gerard: I think the community is excited about this project, and it is a Council goal. People will be excited for the refreshments. The trees are good for screening. I am glad to hear that you think the arborists can move them; it would be great. Color palate is good. It would be nice to paint it all, but not painting the others would separate the other business. Agree with the points. Good project.

Mr. Schuman: Concur with preliminary point analysis. I wonder why the parking does not get some positive points, since they are greatly exceeding the requirements. To be 50 percent over the requirement should have some value. Support the additional landscaping. Look forward to seeing more on that. I think it is a great plan and I support.

Mr. Moore: I totally support the plan and think it is a fantastic project. I do agree with the point analysis. Additional landscaping looks like it will benefit a lot. I walk to the rec center and I will appreciate it, and I think the public will too. Other than that, I have no additional comments. Thank you.

Mr. Giller: I concur with the point analysis. I support additional landscaping. Other concerns: I think the entry could still use some help. The current entry is cluttered. This is an opportunity to clean it up. We know there is ample parking, so one thought is to lose a row of parking spaces along the drive aisle, move the drive aisle further away from the building's entrance, and expand the sidewalk and entry to create to create an enhanced exterior pedestrian environment. We look forward to this project, and are happy about. (Mr. Giller pointed out on the map his thoughts on expanding the entry area and sidewalk.)

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Eighth Amendment to the Amended Peak 7 & 8 Master Plan (CK), 1599 Ski Hill Rd, PL-2018-0546
Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to amend the Master Plan in order to authorize density in excess of the current permitted amount by up to 58 SFEs, including up to 2 commercial SFEs, from the density included under the Gondola Lots Master Plan. This is in addition to the 71.6 residential SFEs and 9 commercial SFEs remaining for the Peak 8 Base in the Amended Peaks 7 & 8 Master Plan. Also modified are the Design Standards and Heights of Building sections of the Master Plan. Since the packet went to print, the applicant's attorney wanted some wording tweaked on the height. I've printed out what he's proposed and highlighted it (Mr. Kulick passed out handouts). Graham Frank, representative of the applicants, is also here.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Can you define more what it means to have less rustic? (Mr. Kulick: I think rustic is just

defining a character that may or may not be there, and the applicant's desire is to design a project that has a more mountain contemporary style. They have no desire to design a building that is rustic in character. The more recent buildings on Peak 7 & 8 are more contemporary versus being beholden to rustic.) I understand, but we should have a better understanding of what the desired architectural character of the Master Plan is.

Mr. Schuman: What is staff's position on removing the rustic? (Mr. Kulick: Staff is comfortable removing rustic since there is still language that calls for sheltering roof forms over large windows and specifies natural materials such as wood and stone are required.) (Ms. Puester: I think it would allow for modern mountain architecture.)

Mr. Giller: I think they're saying they want to use transitional but it should be clarified. (Mr. Frank: We agree with you. People like the look of the recent BGV buildings. By no means going to a contemporary style. The palate of materials would stay the same.) It should be clarified. (Mr. Frank: Transitional works for us.) (Mr. Kulick: Rustic is clearly not what they want but everything else from the previous Design Standards is left in there.) (Ms. Puester: I think we would need to be clearer if changed.) Mr. Giller: I think you could come up with a sentence or two that ensures we don't get a contemporary looking building there. (Mr. Frank: We will be in front of you guys in January (with the site plan and elevations). We want to stay with similar to what you saw in the fit test.) Mr. Giller: You should still write it down. (Mr. Kulick: It's up to the applicant if they want to add language to the Design Standards since it is their application. We are here to review their application against the code which as presented it meets the criteria of Policy 5/R and complies with style of Land Use District 39 which calls for contemporary architecture.) Mr. Giller: If you're going to strike some of your development agreement criteria, it should be clear. (Ms. Puester: What is it that you don't want to see?) Mr. Giller: The applicant referenced the W in Aspen. Something out of context up there. Rustic defines strong massing, stone at base, vertical stone at chimneys, mullions in the windows, not large expanses of ribbon glass. All of these are standard understanding with respect to architectural style, and we have a great development up there and I'm worried that striking the word rustic will open the door too much. (Mr. Frank: I think what you mentioned are all there with the design. I think our intent is the same is yours. But we are not rustic.) Mr. Giller: When you strike rustic, cable railings and low slope roofs are an option. (Mr. Kulick: In terms of code provisions, there's nothing we can say to withhold their proposed amendment.) Mr. Giller: My advice would be the word transitional but I will yield to you. It's an open door in terms of style and compatibility. But I'll rest. (Mr. Frank: I'm not the designer, but I feel the other buildings there now are transitional.) Mr. Giller: Just clarify, thanks.

Mr. Gerard: Chris, I'm thinking back to the fit test. My recollection is that there was language in the master plan that required the new building not just be equal, but below One Ski Hill. (Mr. Kulick: In terms of height they are limited to the elevation of the One Ski Hill Place east cross gable which is lower than the center of One Ski Hill Place. In addition to the height, One Ski Hill is supposed to be the largest single module at the Peak 8 base.)

Public Comment:

Richard Himmelstein, 19 Peak 8 Place, which is at the base of Peak 8, I also have a condo at One Ski Hill Place: I read the master plan, it's been quite some time. The way I saw the master plan, it talked about how, One Ski Hill was supposed to be the flagship and everything was supposed to step down. The original massing showed the other buildings at 35 feet. When BGV built Grand Colorado 1 and 2 buildings, they ended up being physically higher than One Ski Hill. At that time the Planning department said that it was upslope so it was fair for it to have a higher visual look to it. I was very disappointed with that but that was their position, and moving forward to Grand Colorado East or building 3, they've now added another small roof form at the top on the mountain side of it, and again One Ski Hill was supposed to be tallest building from the plaza level, it has 5 floors above the plaza level. This new building now has 6 floors that will be

above the plaza level so it will be physically above it. I know for a fact that going out on the 5th floor of One Ski Hill you're actually looking up at this building and they're at the same exact height on the same size plaza so it just, I just don't think it's proper to be done that way and that it's really against the master plan. So I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention. I also wanted to discuss some other issues I had. This is back to the SFEs offered. I've lived on Peak 8 for nine years now and I've seen a tremendous uptick in traffic. This past season when Grand Colorado opened traffic was backed up constantly to Shock Hill at that bend and sometimes as far as Christie Heights, and my concern about allowing additional SFEs is that the road, the infrastructure, it can't handle it. And I think there needs to be a better evaluation of that. I'm also concerned about the parking study that was allowed previously for the Grand Colorado. They were allowed to reduce the number of parking places based on this study, and when marketing got involved selling time shares, they ended up allowing, ah, originally it was represented in front of planning that the only people that would be in that building using that facility would be people with their current week. And they ended up changing that to now allow anyone who spends, I don't remember the amount, 50 thousand or something for a time share, can come anytime as long as they're "out of towners", and park and use the facility and ski for the day. This just brings that many more people to the site and that impacts our infrastructure and everything. I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention. Does anyone have any questions for me? Thank you very much.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I agree with your (Mr. Giller's) comments on Rustic. When it comes back we can see what it's like.

Mr. Moore: I agree with that too, I think that's the way to handle it.

Mr. Giller: If we can work with them on their design and keep the protection of the rustic, but know that we would allow "transitional," something short of contemporary. (Mr. Kulick: We have to evaluate their application against the code.)

Mr. Schroder: I support the project.

Mr. Gerard: This is an amendment to the master plan, not the building yet. But I agree that pulling out Rustic without replacing it is problematic. There ought to be something in its place, transitional I would support.

Mr. Giller: I can't quite support this. I don't want to be difficult. You could design a contemporary building. (Mr. Frank: We are open to the term Transitional.) Mr. Giller: Thank you. (Ms. Puester: Can you further define in the added language what the term transitional means?) Mr. Giller: Add language, While the design need not be rustic, it cannot be contemporary. (Ms. Puester: Can you state Transitional and then in brackets put between rustic and contemporary, just to further clarify it?) Mr. Giller: Yes that sounds good. (Ms. Puester: Graham, is that acceptable to you?) (Mr. Frank: Yes) (Ms. Puester: Ok then.)

Mr. Gerard made a motion to approve with the amendment presented today concerning the language in paragraph 7a and 7b and 7e, along with the definitional language, striking the word rustic and replacing it with the word *transitional (between rustic and contemporary)*. Seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

Mr. Schuman: I have a question on the possible code change on bedrooms and parking requirements. (Mr. Truckey: They are concerned about single family residential uses that don't have enough parking, particularly with short term rental situations. So, the code changes propose two parking spaces for the first three bedrooms and one additional parking space for each bedroom after the first three.)

2. Ms. Puester: There is currently a date conflict with the Saving Places Conference and the first meeting in

February. We propose to move the first February meeting to the last Tuesday in January. The conference is at the Sheraton this year. It is especially important as we are about to open up the Handbook of Design Standards for revisions. (Present Planning Commissions could attend the January 29th meeting date).

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair