

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal	Mike Giller	Jay Beckerman	Mark Leas (arrived at 5:38 p.m.)
Tanya Delahoz	Steve Gerard	Allen Frechter	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the August 3, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the August 17, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No public comments.

Mr. Leas made comments that the mask mandate for public meetings should not be required for vaccinated individuals. In his opinion, this is punishing those who were vaccinated since the CDC has such low transmission rates for vaccinated people.

OTHER MATTERS:

Ron Schuman Service Recognition

WORK SESSIONS:

1. ADU Code Updates Work Session (LS)

Mr. Sponable presented an overview of proposed changes to the Development Code in regards to Accessory Dwelling Units. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission have any comments or concerns on the proposed code changes?
2. Does the Commission favor ADUs on single family lots only? Duplex lots? Multifamily lots?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Delahoz: How is the rental rate dictated? (Mr. Sponable: It is set by the Town through the deed restriction process and is not specifically determined by this code. It is typically set by AMI; rate will ultimately be determined by the Town through the Housing division/Housing Committee.)

Mr. Gerard: Paragraph G, Page 13. Wouldn't the secondary entrance be "from" the exterior versus "to" the residence? Should there be more clarification on what is considered a lock-off. We may not be all the way there yet with the proposed code updates. (Mr. Sponable: There is a lot of gray area regarding lock off and how to define that.)

Mr. Leas: I echo Steve's comments. Section G is terribly written. Too ambiguous, need input from the design community. What we are really talking about is lock-offs. (Mr. Sponable: We need specific physical elements to specify in the Policy to make code determinations.)

Mr. Frechter: No questions.

Ms. Leidal: Can you bank positive points? (Ms. Puester: This would not effect existing ADUs only new proposals going forward. Points are valid for the term of the vesting period however.) I only support ADUs on single family lots. May have to clarify language pertaining to multi-family and duplex. In regard to wetbars it allows unlimited square footage for wetbars, I think people are taking advantage of that. Cooking facilities can be added very easily. The county limits size. Is a three month minimum enough? How will ADUs be rented. (Ms. Puester: This is covered in a covenant, which is very detailed, and we are hiring a deed

restriction compliance position in the Housing Division to better track these. The multifamily question is there because it's another opportunity for adding workforce housing for uses in older condos for example that have an old office or common area that is underutilized-we get that question occasionally. An older multifamily complex might have additional density that they could add an attached or detached ADU depending on the site configuration.) The County does not allow owners of the unit to use the ADU even if they meet the requirements of the covenant. (Ms. Puester: We would not allow owners to use the unit unless they meet the requirement. As far as the County placing people in unrented units for property owners, it is my understanding the County does not actively do that due to legal issues (not knowing if it is a good renter).)

- Mr. Giller: Would Section G. be better defined with illustrations similar to the Handbook of Design Standards? I echo what Christie said about the requirement to rent.
- Mr. Beckerman: Possibly consider adding language that legislates the potential for additions after the fact. I agree with Christie that ADUs should only be associated with Single Family Residences.
- Ms. Puester: Related to total area that Christie mentioned, I would like the Commission to weigh in on that, should it be calculated off of density or mass? Should it be limited to 3 or 6 months? We can add a provision for no 220 electricity.
- Mr. Truckey: We could address the positive points a bit better, clarifying how they could be used (to offset negative points associated with principal structure). Staff has worked hard on this including subsection G. and although it needs work it's proven to be a difficult issue to regulate (e.g., lockoff potential).
- Ms. Delahoz: ADUs should be limited to 6 months and only apply to Single families.
- Mr. Gerard: Maybe we want to keep the definition broad and not specific. The number one item is an exterior entrance and the ability to lock-off. I re-wrote section G. (areas of the primary dwelling which contain a secondary entrance from the exterior or from a common entryway which may include, but not limited to a mudroom, garage, or foyer, and is or could be with minor modifications, locked off from the primary dwelling shall be considered an accessory dwelling unit.). ADUs should be focused on single family home lots. We need to focus on mass and density. I prefer 6 months.
- Mr. Frechter: I think we should consider allowing ADUs on duplex and multi-family lots. I prefer a 6-month minimum. No comments on density or mass. Garage should not be counted (count only density). Decks and patio entrance designs may inadvertently be classified as ADUs.
- Mr. Leas: I favor simplifying the definition. I think patio doors could be an issue with Steve's proposed definition. I favor ADUs on SFH lots only. Cannot comment on Mass and density. Prefer 6 months.
- Ms. Leidal: Support only on SFH lots. Should limit 220. Density and Mass should both be counted. Prefer 6-month minimum.
- Mr. Giller: Provide diagrams. 1,200 sq. ft. maximum density. Allow on all types of properties. Should be 6 months.
- Mr. Beckerman: Should debate density vs. mass. Prefer 6 months. Should be limited to SFHs. I encourage Town Council to weigh in on their feelings.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Chlipala Building Façade Modifications (CL), 401 S. Main Street, PL-2021-0330

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to modify the front (east) façade of the existing building, including removing the sloped glass covered entrance and replacing with a fully vertical façade featuring new windows, painted wooden 1x12 trim and stained half round wooden shingle siding to match the existing building, and a flat roof. The existing brick low wall is proposed to remain. There are not any proposed changes to the building's floor area, height, or to the site with this application.

Peter Chlipala, Applicant: Building was repainted two years ago. The three windows will be all the same size.

All proposed windows will be wood framed windows. The three upper windows are to the lofted space and provide light to the ski shop level.

Public Comment

Jim Beck, owner of Columbine Square at 325 S. Main: The renovation is an improvement and will match the flat roof entrance of our building next door. I support the proposed project.

Commissioner Comments:

Ms. Delahoz: No comments, fully support the project.

Mr. Gerard: This is going to look a lot better. Would prefer the lighting be upgraded and all siding improved if we were looking at an application for the whole building. I hope the windows are not going to be crammed together and there is some spacing between them to separately identify them.

Mr. Frechter: I like the project and approve of it. I like that it adds some irregularity. I am concerned about a tenant of the residential unit upstairs trying to climb down on to the proposed flat roof, but that is just a safety issue.

Mr. Leas: No further comments or questions.

Ms. Leidal: I recognize that this is a non-historic building that predates our historic design standards. I appreciate you are doing as much as you can. Should we add a condition to memorialize the window matching and sizing? (Mr. Gerard: Yes).

Mr. Giller: No further comments or questions.

Mr. Beckerman: I understand the urgency of the proposed work and I would support a motion to approve with the Conditions mentioned.

Mr. LaChance: Read two additional conditions into the record to be re-numbered thereafter. New Condition #11: *Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the final plans shall specify the proposed window framing to match the existing window framing on the remainder of the building.* New Condition #12: *Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the final plans shall specify the three windows proposed on the lower level to be equal in all dimensions.*

Mr. Gerard made a motion to approve the Chlipala Building Façade Modifications with the additional two conditions read into the record, seconded by Ms. Delahoz. The motion passed 7 to 0.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Jay Beckerman, Chair