

attorney), an easement is the ideal tool to address the parking issue which is over the existing property line.) Okay.

Mr. Allen: When this is eventually deeded over to Mercy Housing, what happens if the project isn't completed? Is there a way to have the Town get the property back? (Ms. Puester: It is an issue that has been discussed at the Housing Committee and the agreements can be drafted to address the potential issue. I can have an answer to the exact method the Town will use when we come back with the site plan in June.) (Mr. Lamb: There could be a clause in the agreement with a specific timeframe for approvals and construction.) (Mr. Neubecker: They will build in phases; only start units for which they have contracts.) Okay.

Mr. Allen opened the public hearing. There were no public comments.

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to approve the Valley Brook Subdivision Plan, PC#2009011, 1100 Airport Road, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Girvin seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Single Family Home Parking Requirements

Mr. Kulick presented. Recently it was requested that staff research parking utilization of single-family residences to ensure adequate parking is being provided on site. Following up on this request, staff presented a PowerPoint presentation to the Commission and then took questions and comments from the Commission. Mr. Kulick recommended that no action be taken at this time.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Mr. Bertaux: People are using the free parking lot, and the inundation of parking on my block hasn't been as bad this year. The free lot has been filling up. (Mr. Kulick: Some of the ski-in / ski-out lots also have bus service.) Approach it from a different angle – seasonal long term rentals. (Mr. Neubecker: Seasonal rental is the issue. Renters find out after they sign the lease that there is only room for 2 cars and cannot get a permit to park on the street.)

Mr. Pringle: The reality of single family parking doesn't match up with the emotional perception? (Mr. Kulick: There was no evidence of the parking problem in the single family areas we surveyed.) Is the problem in the long term rentals that sleep 6 rather than the short term rentals? The problem doesn't seem to show up in the large lot homes. Where is the real problem likely to be? (Ms. Girvin: In the historic district.) (Mr. Neubecker: In the historic district or holidays.) Mr. Bertaux: The Harris Street alley gets plowed, and people that park there get towed. (Mr. Lamb: Agreed that this is more of a long term rental problem.) We aren't seeing a lot of day skier parking "poaching" with this survey. (Mr. Kulick: CMC isn't very well utilized and the south lot average is 9 cars and the north lot is between 16-19 cars. It would be a great weekend parking area and is underutilized.) If we can have dual parking use it is better than more pavement. (Mr. Kulick: The infrastructure is there (CMC) and served by transit, without having to add more bus miles traveled.) (Mr. Lamb: Enforcement issue in many instances.) It is the homes that have consistent issues that should be dealt with.

Mr. Lamb: Many of the longer driveways are able to accommodate overflow parking. (Mr. Kulick: Many of the surveyed homes had bump-outs and turnaround areas that could be used as parking, just as Mr. Lamb mentioned.) I don't think any one solution is going to work throughout town – need multiple solutions. The problem still exists in some areas, and it doesn't sit right when a 7,000 square foot house is approved with two parking spaces. (Mr. Allen: Agreed, maybe we can look at homes on large lots and make sure adequate parking is required.) (Mr. Neubecker: At what point is the driveway not enough? Should we start requiring additional square footage of pavement for certain number of bedrooms, master bedrooms, etc?) (Mr. Allen: As long as it isn't a nuisance to others, driveway parking is okay.) (Mr. Kulick: I don't think there has been a house we have reviewed that is 7,000 square feet without a minimum of 4 parking spots.) Much rather manage automobile traffic and use transit. (Mr. Neubecker: Would we consider having zones that some areas allow short term rentals and others don't? There is a difference between short term rental parking, which is a business, and resident parking.)

- Ms. Girvin: Is there recourse for homes that do over-park? (Mr. Kulick: The police department is patrolling, or it is a neighborhood issue. It becomes more of an issue when snow plows are out. There is a fine and towing.)
- Mr. Allen: What if someone wanted to build a large number of parking spaces on their lot? Would they get negative points? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, possibly. Impervious surfaces and site disturbance are not positive planning principles. We also don't want to encourage every person to bring their own vehicle.) Are there many complaints about parking? (Mr. Kulick: Occasionally we get complaints. Staff has been working with Community Service Offices on the parking issue when we've been doing parking studies in town. This hasn't been a problem that has shown up on the radar.) Adjust the parking based on the use of the house, for example if you have a "wedding house" you need to provide mitigation for the use, parking and buffer. Maybe we go forward in that direction? (Mr. Neubecker: Management and enforcement seems to be the issue.) If someone comes in and wants to build a wedding house on a large lot, should we have some rules in place that allow for providing the parking without the negative point impact? Right now we don't let them put in the parking. (Mr. Kulick: Our flexible zoning is supposed to address that, if you don't meet one part of the code you can make it up with other areas of the code.) (Mr. Neubecker: If it's operated as a business and required to have four parking spaces, and they can't fit the spaces for the business of the wedding house, they can't do the house/business. Look into management similar to what is done in Three Peaks neighborhood, providing a sign when an event is going on there is a phone number of manager, event date, etc.)
- Dr. Warner: One home in my neighborhood is used as a rental home/wedding house and they have up to 10-15 cars in the cul-de-sac most summer weekends. We do not want to overlook parking issue with certain single family homes. Concerned with homes that have many bedrooms and only a few parking spaces, and poised to see an issue with this in the future. (Mr. Kulick: Chalet homes are closely monitored. Clientele is 90% British and are not typically renting cars. Transportation is provided and meals are cooked in the home. Regulations for chalet homes are very strict.) (Mr. Neubecker: This may be an exception to the rule. Possibly it is a management issue; we may need to require permits and bus shuttle service. We can look into the specific property. We don't want to start requiring extra paving on everything; we would rather address the problems with management and permit solutions.) Would prefer to see less automobile use, and do not want parking lots in single family neighborhoods. (Mr. Kulick: What you are describing is taking place during summer; we can revisit it during the heart of wedding season – a Saturday night in July – to take the survey again.) (Mr. Pringle: How do we monitor when homes are doing commercial use inside, such as weddings?) (Mr. Kulick: When this occurs typically it isn't an event that causes a disturbance, most other residents in the area are 2nd homes and there isn't an issue.) (Mr. Bertaux: Is this a planning issue or a police issue?) (Mr. Neubecker: In most cases we never hear about the disturbances, and when we hear about it we discuss licenses, permitting, etc. We need to look more into the rentals that have consistent problems.) (Mr. Kulick: Don't want to burden the short term renters, need to respect the tourist nature of the Town and economy. I live in a building that primarily has short-term uses and parking is rarely an issue. If someone takes my parking space, there are HOA ways to handle it.) (Mr. Pringle: In single family homes there isn't a way to enforce it without HOAs. Problem is in historic district, smaller lots.) (Mr. Neubecker: We issue permits for a specific number of cars per unit. If the number of cars/people in a home is greater than the number of rooms, we don't provide a permit for those extra cars. Those persons "poach" parking. We could do special use permits for parking.) (Mr. Kulick: There is nothing historic about adding parking areas in the historic district. The people that see it (illegal parking) the most may be the plow drivers and public works.) (Mr. Neubecker: We do use the ice rink lot for overnight parking. We can look at other town lots for places to accommodate that overflow.)

2. Historic Structure Setbacks

Mr. Neubecker presented. On February 3, 2009, the Planning Staff brought a proposal to the Planning Commission considering a modification to Policy (9/A) and (9/R), "Placement of Structures." The discussion revolved around waiving negative points on proposals to move a historic structure currently encroaching on an adjacent property, moving it back on to the subject property but not meeting the required setbacks. The Commission generally supported the proposal, but offered ideas on how to implement the policy. The Code currently discourages placing structures within the recommended setbacks on site. The importance was such that a 3 times multiplier would be

associated with the negative point assignment, which would indicate a policy of average importance. Staff welcomed input on the proposed changes to the policies.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Bertaux: Must it remain “uninhabitable”? (Mr. Neubecker: That is our thought.) We need to clarify that language in the proposed update to the policy. (Mr. Pringle: Structures used for storage?) Once it is on a foundation it may have other uses than storage.
- Mr. Pringle: Policy 103 discusses moving the structure off the lot. (Mr. Neubecker: We weren’t planning on getting into that policy and design standards today. We want to discuss setbacks.) We have two different situations here, setbacks on the lot and setbacks on another lot which relate to setbacks, which relates to Policy 103 and 9. (Mr. Neubecker: We shouldn’t discuss the policy that affects a currently active application. But it needs to be discussed at some point.) We need to address the situation where you are moving historic building on the site, and it is going to be used for re-adaptive use. The policy that we have been using isn’t germane to that use. I thought that Policy 9 (Setbacks) would be a place to explore that issue.
- Mr. Lamb: How do you define habitable? (Mr. Neubecker: If it is considered density it is habitable.) We don’t want to ask people to provide a foundation for a structure if we won’t allow them to use it. (Mr. Allen: We want to allow people to use their space.) (Mr. Neubecker: If people want to use a structure for habitable space they should follow the setbacks.) I like this as well.
- Mr. Schroder: What about incentives? Are there points associated with doing this? For moving and restoring the structure? (Mr. Neubecker: Points assigned under Policy 24/Historic Preservation. Incentive would also eliminate the negative points for setbacks.)
- Ms. Girvin: Are hot tub rooms considered habitable? (Mr. Neubecker: If it is considered density.) (Mr. Neubecker read the definition of “habitable area” from the code; possibly look at a better definition.) (Ms. Puester: Going to need to look at the building code.) I think that this is a good way to address the issues that we have seen. I think Mr. Bertaux’s point about uninhabitable was good, as well as design standards application. (Mr. Neubecker: I don’t want to add the design standards language to this one section because they already exist in the Handbook of Design Standards, and always apply anyway.) (Mr. Allen: I agree.)

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

No report was presented.

OTHER MATTERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Rodney Allen, Chair