

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:34 p.m. by Vice-Chair Delahoz.

### ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Jay Beckerman-absent	Mark Leas
Tanya Delahoz	Steve Gerard	Allen Frechter -absent

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the following changes, the September 21, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

Part of Mr. Leas comment on page 2 was cut short. Should add to the comment that “there is the possibility of short term rentals and should ask Town Council’s clarification for exemption of town houses and duplexes.”

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the October 5, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Hotel Breckenridge Outdoor Heated Area and Public Trail Easement (CL), 655 Columbine Rd., PL-2021-0431
2. Gold Creek Condos (Odd Lot) Exterior Remodel (SS), 326 N. Main Street, PL-2021-0287

Mr. Giller made a motion to call up the Gold Creek Condos (Odd Lot) Exterior Remodel (SS), 326 N. Main Street, PL-2021-0287 project, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed 4 to 0 and the project was called up.

Suitability of the siding and material composition is questioned. Samples were provided of proposed Diamond Kote siding to the Commissioners. Mr. Giller believes negative points should possibly be awarded for the composite engineered wood siding material which he believes cannot be considered a “natural” material.

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: Would the town and the code consider an OSB (oriented strand board) plywood siding as a natural material?

Mr. Kulick: That discussion has not occurred with staff.

Mr. Truckey: It is up to the planning commissioner interpretation as to whether that would meet “natural materials” under the code. It would be new precedent.

Mr. Giller: We could create a condition that the material would be cement fiber siding (such as hardi board) that would meet policy 5R.

Mr. Kulick: A condition could be added that siding be switched on plans to a cement board siding. Mr. Giller then read a proposed condition #8.

Mr. Gerard: How will the HOA be paying for the improvements?

#### Sonny Neely, Applicant:

I am unsure how the HOA will be financing the project, whether it’s a special assessment or not. Cementitious material has a lack of supply and delivery at this time. It will be difficult to obtain cementitious material before the second quarter of 2022. The existing planned material is available now. The planned material is considered the superior product.

- Mr. Leas: I would consider the cementitious material to be superior product but am not familiar with the product's durability in the western climate.
- Mr. Neely: The proposed Diamond Kote material has a 30-year guarantee and a durable coating. Cement products can break apart once a crack occurs in the exterior coating. I believe that the proposed material is by far superior.
- Mr. Giller: Would you be favorable to switching as a condition of approval to fiber cement siding material?
- Mr. Neely: We can switch to fiber cement but the supply is limited right now. The project wouldn't be able to move forward until spring.
- Mr. Truckey: It is also possible to take negative points on the project for the siding and offset with positive points. However, the site is tight and potential for positive points is limited.
- Mr. Neely: There is no room for landscaping or other potential points to offset the negative points on this very tight lot.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Giller: I do not believe the proposed siding is a natural material. I am agreeable to adding the condition to use fiber cement siding.
- Mr. Gerard: Agree with Mr. Giller. Applicant must make a decision to accept negative points or switch to hardy board as a condition of approval.
- Mr. Leas: Agree with Mr. Giller and Mr. Gerard.
- Ms. Delahoz: Agree with previous comments.

Mr. Giller made a motion to add a condition of approval to require fiber cement board siding as opposed planned material, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed 4-0. Mr. Giller made a motion to approve the project with the additional condition, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed 4-0.

The Hotel Breckenridge Outdoor Heated Area and Public Trail Easement project was approved as presented.

**PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

Disclosure- Mr. Giller lives one block from the property and had a conversation with a neighbor regarding the project when he visited the site earlier today. There were no concerns with regard to Mr. Giller's impartiality from other commissioners.

1. Amerine House Demolition and Construction of Ploss Single Family Residence (CL), 224 S. Ridge Street, PL-2021-0381

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to demolish the existing Amerine House and construct a new two-story, 3,194 sq. ft. single-family residence with 4 bedrooms, 3.5 bathrooms, a 1-car garage, a 1-car carport, and 2 additional exterior parking spaces. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission support the proposed 6 ft. retaining walls without the assignment of negative points under Policy 7/R Site and Environmental Design?
2. Does the Commission agree that the demolition of the existing structure meets Priority Design Standard #20 because demolition would not cause a reduction to its already Non-Contributing rating?
3. Does the Commission find the location of the proposed Cottonwood trees complies with Design Standard 172, or should they be specified closer to the street to comply with Design Standard 172 and to avoid negative points?
4. Does the Commission agree the proposed building height complies with Priority Design Standard 81, Priority Design Standard 163, and Design Standard 83?
5. Does the Commission find the proposed 7.5 inch dimension of the primary siding material is consistent with Priority Design Standards 90 and 165, or should it be reduced to 4.5 inch to comply

with these Standards?

6. Does the Commission find the proposed bracketry on the front porch and front façade meets Standards 91, 92, 93, and 170?
7. Does the Commission agree with the preliminary point analysis?

*Commissioner Questions to Staff:*

- Mr. Giller: Questions on the west elevation windows - there would be more compliance with guidelines if there was vertical separation between the center window? Is there precedent for the large group of windows that cover most of the first story of the front facade? (Mr. LaChance: There are several examples of a group of windows on the first story of the primary façade within the Character Area, so staff is OK with the group of windows proposed.)
- Mr. Gerard: This is a difficult lot. How is it decided how much fill is too much on a site? (Mr. LaChance: The Code says the objective is to avoid a “benched” site. This plans propose 15 ft. of fill between alley and street side. Staff is acknowledging that the applicant is not proposing to fill to obtain all of the first floor at one grade, only to reduce the slope from the alley enough to have the garage and carport off the alley.) (Mr. Kulick: The site is short in depth. If you have to park on-site and off the alley- it is not possible to grade down to allow for parking. Staff is looking at obtaining all parking on site and meet grade at alley.)
- Mr. Gerard: The only other fill site in precedents was the Paul Residence. Can you speak to that site? (Mr. Kulick: That site is in the Highlands where it is easier to obtain necessary grade with less fill because of greater space.)
- Mr. Gerard: Has it been determined whether the original barn on site is still there and on the interior of the existing home? (Mr. LaChance: Lets have the architect speak to that.)
- Ms. Delahoz: Considering the existing structure has a deck that does not meet setbacks- does that mean the proposed structure should still receive negative points for not meeting setbacks? (Yes. Once the existing structure is demolished, the new house must comply with the setback recommendations or receive negative points.)

Andy Stabile, Allen-Guerra Architects:

Thank you to Chapin and Chris for working with us on this project. Our intent was to keep the non-contributing historic barn, but after inspection, the historic fabric of the exterior of the barn is not salvageable.

Suzanne Allen-Sabo, Allen-Guerra Architects:

There are not side-walls left of the historic barn. The existing structure is wrapped around the historic barn. Investigation of siding removal was completed and determined that the end elements of the existing structure are not historic material.

Mr. Stabile: There is a clause of the code that allows retaining walls over 4 ft. if the walls limit site disturbance. This allows for room to landscape and screen the property instead of two smaller walls that would not allow for landscaping. Happy to move proposed Cottonwood trees closer to the street. The applicant would like to save a mature tree close to the proposed residence; if it is not possible to save this tree it will be replaced. Bracketry on proposed structure is a standard detail within this character area of the Town. This bracketry adds architectural detail and is a modest elaboration of the structural materials. The code does recommend 4.5 inch siding reveal. We began with mimicking siding on another historic structure and believe adding 7.5 inch siding reveals add architectural detail. Happy to move west center window vertically higher to add space between the lower and upper window. We agree with the staff’s point analysis.

*Commissioner Questions to Applicant:*

- Mr. Giller: Would like to revisit the question about benching. There is a steep bench in the rear proposed. There is an arbitrary bench in what looks like a way to have more density that

doesn't count toward mass below grade. The aboveground density and mass really should not be based upon the site grading. Would you speak to why the laundry room and powder room are at below grade? (Mr. Stabile: We are trying to create appropriate grade for the carport, and there would need to be accessible locations for the meter locations and we think that is best on the south side of the structure. The fill allows for 3 ft. of walkway area on the south side for access to the meter location.)

Mr. Giller: Would it be possible and safer to eliminate the fill and put the meter at grade, instead of having a 6 or 8 ft. drop? (Ms. Allen-Sabo: We could consider that.)

Mr. Gerard: Maybe you would not have to do all that benching and fill and burying of first floor under garage at the south elevation if you only filled what you need for the driveway. What material is being considered for the walls? (Mr. Stabile: We would prefer to use siloam stone if it will fit but could consider an engineered concrete wall with stone facing if there is not enough room.) Mr. Gerard: Is there a chance to preserve the existing barn materials for reuse on site? (Mr. Stabile: We would like to reuse some of the materials on the interior of the proposed residence if possible.)

Mr. Leas: I have no concerns with the amount of fill, grading, or setbacks that are proposed.

Ms. Delahoz: No additional questions.

Public Comments:

Bart Miller, 208 E. Adams: The architects did a nice job with this project. I represent other neighbors, Scott Long and Kirk Berry. All of us believe the current structure does not have any historic value and we do not have any concerns with demolition. I don't believe that the existing structure materials should be required to be reused. Neighbors are excited to see the project take place and have the following recommendations and points:

1. We would like to see the parking limited to four (4) not five (5) spaces.
2. Height of the property is assumed to be similar to an adjacent property which is okay. We do not want our views obstructed.
3. The amount of fill and benching is not a concern to neighbors.
4. We would like to see natural materials used in the retaining walls.

Mr. LaChance: There is an error in the written staff report, there are only 4 parking spaces proposed, not 5.

*Commissioner Comments:*

Mr. Giller:

1. No. Strongly disagree with arbitrary benching at south side, which artificially pushes above grade density to below grade.
2. Yes. Existing structure is a non-contributing resource and demolition is okay.
3. No. Cottonwood trees should be aligned with others on Ridge Street.
4. Yes. Height complies.
5. No. Siding of 7.5 inches is too wide. Some variation is okay, but 4.5 inches is what is accepted in the district.
6. Yes. Brackets are very ornamental
7. No. Project warrants negative points for the benching at the south side and retaining walls.

Mr. Gerard:

Nice looking project and will be a great infill project that we want to succeed.

1. No. Retaining walls create artificial below-ground density. Disagree with point analysis because of the retaining walls and unknowns of materials for the retaining walls.
2. Yes. Demolition is fine. Appreciate the old materials and some people in town would like to see those materials reused. I think the architect will do a good job of reusing these materials on the inside.
3. No. Cottonwood trees should align with others on the street.

4. Yes. Building height is acceptable.
  5. No. The thinner 4.5 inch siding should be used as the property is in the district.
  6. No. Bracketing is a bit much. The interior brace seems too complicated. Some is fine, but what is proposed is too much.
  7. No. My concern with the point analysis is the retaining walls.
- Mr. Leas:
1. Yes. Support retaining walls.
  2. Yes. Demolition OK.
  3. No. Cottonwoods should move.
  4. Yes. Building height is within what is allowed.
  5. No. Suggestion of the 4.5 inch will fit the smaller proposed residence better than wider siding which is more suitable for a larger building.
  6. Yes. No issue with bracketry.
  7. Yes. Agree with preliminary staff point analysis.
- Ms. Delahoz:
- This is a pretty project. This will be a nice project on this prominent corner.
1. Yes. No issue with fill.
  2. Yes. Demo is okay.
  3. No. Move cottonwoods closer to road.
  4. Yes. Building height is good- it complies.
  5. No. Smaller narrower siding will comply better with standards.
  6. No. Ornamentation above west windows looks too busy. Brackets on posts is okay. Reducing brackets near door and separating center window would better comply with historical guidelines.
  7. Yes. Agree with preliminary point analysis.

#### **TOWN PROJECTS:**

1. McCain Master Plan Third Amendment (CL), 12965, 13215, 13217, 13221, and 13250 Colorado State Hwy 9, PL-2021-0438

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to amend the McCain Master Plan in order to accommodate a new housing development planned for Tract 14, just south of the Alta Verde Workforce Housing Development on Tract 3, and a non-profit / institutional campus on Tract 6. Other modifications include a reduction in the amount of open space and additional public works storage, snow storage, and solar uses.

#### *Commissioner questions:*

Mr. Gerard: No questions.

Mr. Leas: Tract 6 has an odd shape. Is that because of the former pond? The odd shape can be problematic regarding setbacks when developments are proposed. (Mr. LaChance: The Master Plan is also proposed to authorize building footprint lots, so this would avoid the setback issues at time of Development Permit application review.) (Mr. Truckey: Yes, the odd shape is because of the pond. We did not bring in structural fill to allow buildings to be located on that.)

Mr. Giller: Institutional and non-profit plans for the master plan amendment is an acknowledgment of relationship between non-profits and the Town? (Mr. Truckey: Yes, the Town was approached by FIRC proposing a location at this site. The Council is looking at having three 7,500 sq. ft. pad sites, 2 stories, 15,000 sq. ft. Town Council has also considered this location for other non-profit uses, such as potential childcare facilities, considering all the housing planned in this area.) That has merit. Kudos to the Town.

Ms. Delahoz: Does childcare fall under Community Facilities or Institutional Use? (It would be Institutional because it is a non-profit use. It is disappointing that there is not an area allocated for a grocery store or gas station. There is so much congestion in downtown proper. Having the services up north would remove some of that. It makes sense because

we are building all of this housing on the north side of Town. No questions.

Public Comment:

Alan Roberson, 13203 Hwy 9: I can answer why there cannot be a gas tank at this location. The pond that was filled, fills every year. There is ground water at this location to would not allow for a gas tank installation. The existing Land Use Guidelines currently states one unit per 20 acres, which would equal 3.6 units. How is the proposed plan more dense?

Mr. LaChance: The land use guidelines do say residential at one unit per 20 acres. Under code, additional density of up to 20 units per acre may be allowed if density is transferred to this site through transfer of development rights specifically for affordable housing.

Mr. Roberson: These amendments keep adding up that eliminate open space. What is the percentage of open space at this time for this plan? Open space is being lost in this area.

Mr. LaChance: 70.3 acres of open space are proposed, which is approximately 54 percent of the Master Plan area.

Mr. Roberson: Whittling down the open space. Who owns the housing properties?

Mr. Truckey: There will be a long-term land lease with Gorman and the Town will retain ownership.

Mr. Roberson: Someone other than the Town will make money on this project?

Mr. Truckey: The developer will make some money on the project, but this is a public/private partnership that will provide affordable deed restricted housing units.

Mr. Roberson: I have lived here for the amount of time this has happened and open space continues to be removed and whittled away.

Mr. Kulick: Regarding the open-space comment, when the McCain property was purchased it was purchased with 1/3 open space funds and 2/3 general funds with the idea of preserving 1/3 of the property as open space.

Mr. Truckey: The current Council wants to see the open space protected and the Open Space Fund will be contributing to acquire the 15 acres at the south of the site as open space. The open space area along Hwy 9 also has no proposed development and we will maintain a 150-foot setback from the highway with no structures.

Mr. Giller: I appreciate the public commenter's thoughts on open space.

Public Comment:

Suzanne Allen-Sabo, Allen-Guerra Architects, Frisco, CO: I am working with FIRC on their project at this location and they are very excited about this project.

*Commissioner Comments:*

Mr. Leas: Chapin was going to speak on the gas station and supporting uses. (Mr. LaChance: Ms. Delahoz, your comment was suggesting the grocery store, gas station, or supporting use somewhere within the Master Planned area, not on a specific tract, correct?)

Ms. Delahoz: Not on the pond. Since we are talking about land uses, it makes sense to add the potential of adding a gas station/grocery store use on Tract 2 in my opinion because of the added development on other tracts. Close to highway, does not interrupt wildlife habitat in the river corridor, not near river bed, etc. Makes sense to allow this use on Tract 2 so we do not have to back track later on when we realize the need because of the housing. (Mr. Truckey: Previous Town Councils had decided not to proceed with that. Your comment on needed supporting commercial uses is well-taken. We can add that comment to our report for Town Council if other commissioners agree, because it would reduce vehicle trips into Town and we are about to have a larger bed base on this side of the Town.)

Mr. Gerard: It may appear we are chipping away at this property, but that was the plan originally. There are open space investments in this plan, and they are trying to keep more than the minimum required. Bike path going through the open space is a fantastic investment. I get asked a lot

of questions as a Commissioner about when we are getting a new grocery store. Everybody wants it but nobody knows where it should be located or who will operate it. My voice would be that we should be thinking about locating a grocery store and childcare facility at this location since we are putting 500 units of housing there. But I don't think it needs to be planned right now with this amendment. There is a specific purpose to this master plan amendment to authorize workforce housing and a location for FIRC. The Master Plan can be further amended at a later time. I support the plan and project at this point.

Mr. Leas: I too support the project. There are great things going on with the river corridor and bike path realignment. The planning commission purpose is to look forward to future community needs. We don't need to nail down the need for a grocery store location now with this Master Plan amendment, but this is a need the Town Council should be aware of. Eventually remodeling the only existing grocery store will create chaos and the Town needs to look forward to what issues that might create.

Mr. Giller: I agree with fellow commissioners.

Ms. Delahoz: I agree with fellow commissioners. We need to look forward. If we are adding all this housing on this site it makes sense to consider the need for supporting services like a grocery store. This supports Town goals of walkability, reducing vehicle trips and promoting sustainability. I approve the proposed amendment that is before us today.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to recommend approval of the McCain Master Plan Third Amendment to the Town Council, seconded by Mr. Giller. The motion passed 4 to 0.

Ms. Puester: I want to note for the audience that there will be another hearing on the McCain Master Plan next Tuesday, October 12 at the Town Council meeting.

#### **WORK SESSIONS:**

##### 1. Land Use Districts Related to Short Term Rentals (STRs)

Mr. Truckey presented an overview of the recent Town Council ordinance placing a cap on future short-term rental licenses in the Town, and the request from Council for Planning Commission input regarding the geographic areas where some additional short-term rental licensing could be authorized in relation to the Land Use District (LUD) guidelines. The Commission was asked for feedback.

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Delahoz: Tonight's discussion concerns only the LUD zones not feelings on STRs or exemptions. I would also like to note that I make an income from real estate.

Mr. Giller: I would like to disclose that I own an STR that is a modest part of my income but can remain impartial during discussion.

No Commissioners voiced concern about the impartiality of Mr. Giller or Ms. Delahoz.

Mr. Truckey: We will not discuss merits of Council decisions. Based on public comments- there are areas in Town that were always considered to be the bed-base for the ski area and the Council may wish to consider those areas differently than residential areas that had not served that purpose in the past. There are a few LUDs that have uses related to lodging or bed base. If the Council makes exceptions, they may allow some additional short term rental licenses in these focused LUDs and the Town Council is looking for input from Planning Commission. The spreadsheet has bolded LUDs identified which will need your input on whether they should be considered as traditional bed-base and areas of lodging. The LUD 6 recommendation is to carve out the Ranahan area. This is an area that was constructed with the purpose of STRs.

Mr. Leas: Would the Ranahan area not be exempt because they have a front desk?

- Mr. Truckey: The exemption may not be used to determine who gets more STR licenses in the future, not sure on what the end result at Council will be. It may be based on location.
- Ms. Delahoz: We are not just a ski-resort community. We have year-round uses. We have to plan for allowances that feed into the different uses that we have marketed the Town that occur all year like golf and nordic.
- Mr. Truckey: Staff believes that there are areas that are more suited to residential and were not intended for STRs.
- Mr. Gerard: The Council has the right idea at limiting the STRs in specific areas. The Council should consider the Salida method. If you apply the Salida method for example, only 3.5% of the Highlands could have an STR license. There should be considerations for limiting STRs by block or street as well as by area. I recommend the Town Council look at carving out areas like the Ranahan and then applying the Salida method.
- Mr. Leas: Can you enlighten me on the Salida method?
- Mr. Gerard: The zoning for the Town of Salida outlines how many STRs are allowed in each zone district by percentage and block.
- Mr. Truckey: We would like your general feedback on recommended LUDs regarding their wording and if there are outliers.
- Ms. Delahoz: It is important that streets and subdivisions not be separated when a neighborhood is in two different LUDs which happens pretty often. We do not want to pit neighbor against neighbor in essentially the same location. Specifically, in LUD 6 which includes Highlands and Braddock Hill. Should be all treated the same.
- Mr. Gerard: In LUD 10, they are building homes specifically for STR in this district.
- Ms. Delahoz: Agree.
- Mr. Leas: Agree.
- Mr. Giller: Agree.
- Ms. Delahoz: LUD 19 should be a no but carve out Main Street Station and Tannhauser.
- Mr. Truckey: Main Street Station should be carved out but staff questions if you want to allow additional STRs on Main Street where residential is only allowed on second floor.
- Mr. Giller: I do not see an upside to including all of Main Street because it might disrupt the important character of Main Street. But with the caveat of excluding Main Street Station I think most of Main Street should be left out.
- Mr. Leas: I agree with Mr. Giller.
- Mr. Giller: 25 should be a yes because of Breck Mtn Village.
- Ms. Delahoz: 25 should be a yes because of Breck Mtn Village; 28 as a yes north of Boreas Pass Rd.
- Mr. Giller: 28 as a no for me.

Public Comment:

David Garret, 140 Windwood Circle: You talked about Main Street on first level and second level is residential? If you removed residential from the second floor would you allow commercial on the second level? We would like to see no one injured by legislation that would prevent STR rights to transfer with property rights. Peak 8 and 9; the Ranahan is surprising to allow for STR when it is not near the ski area. I agree with Tanya's comment that Breckenridge is a year-round community. Before mountain biking summer was dead, now with timeshares the town is busy on a year-round basis. I appreciate that you are looking at these areas, but there should be more consideration for the many uses in different areas of the Town of Breckenridge.

Public comment was closed. Commissioners were asked to weigh in on LUDs that need discussion.

- Mr. Leas: LUD 10 was annexed and developed with intention of the properties being developed for STR. Agree that streets and neighborhoods should not be carved up and separated. LUD 20, does it include North Gondola lot?



- Mr. Truckey: 20 includes Gondola lot.
- Mr. Giller: Agree on LUD 10.
- Mr. Gerard: Agree on LUD 10.
- Ms. Delahoz: Agree on LUD 10.
- Mr. Leas: The Commission should consider the development from BGV which would allow for STRs at the townhomes proposed and potentially homeowners on Woods Drive as well so they are not excluded but on the same street. LUD 20 I am a yes. Timber Trail in LUD 40 should be a yes because LUD 10 has similar uses.
- Mr. Giller: Agree on LUDs 20 and 40.
- Mr. Gerard: Agree on LUDs 20 and 40.
- Ms. Delahoz: Agree on LUDs 20 and 40.
- Mr. Gerard: Concerned with residential areas of Highlands, with the exception of carving out Ranahan in number 6-other areas should be a no; 1 should be a no; 38 should be a no.
- Mr. Giller: Agree.
- Ms. Delahoz: Parts of subdivisions and streets should not be divided.
- Mr. Truckey: We would pull in all parts of subdivisions that are separated by LUDs to avoid being unequitable to neighbors on different sides of a street.
- Mr. Giller: 19- Main Street and 11-North Main, and 28- because Main Street is so fundamental to Breckenridge as previously discussed I believe all these should be a no. Through attrition, eventually the east side of town may have fewer or no STRs. There are still opportunities in LUD 10 for local residential. All of 10 may not be acceptable for STRs.
- Mr. Truckey: There could be consideration for a percentage of STRs in each district based on unit counts.
- Mr. Giller: A simpler way to communicate this with the public may be to say west of Park Avenue STRs are allowed and east of Park they are limited. There is need for refinement.
- Mr. Leas: If the objective is to promote long-term rentals, some subdivisions in LUD 10 are suitable to that, such as Grandview and Gold Camp. It does not make sense to use STR caps to promote long-term rentals in areas like Shock Hill. No opinion on 28, not familiar with that one.
- Ms. Delahoz: Carve out Tannhauser, otherwise Main Street is a no. Also carve out Main Ridge condominiums (18.2). Other Commissioners agree.
- Mr. Leas: Is the Council looking at those who have multiple STRs? Could be more fair to everyone to have one shot versus one person having multiple?
- Mr. Truckey: Not sure if that has been considered.

#### **OTHER MATTERS:**

##### 1. Town Council Summary

A school district presentation on LUD and housing for the school district. Housing is not at the top of the school district as a priority. Council and School District agreed to work together on the issue.

Update on housing- the Town is moving forward with programs “Landing Locals” and “Lease to Locals” and are focused on converting STRs to long-term rentals through cash incentives. “Save the Season” is the focus and is an immediate focus for the next six months.

Provisions for STR cap discussed include: Allowing for existing building permits to pull a short-term license; Clarification that a security guard and front desk staff on exempted properties cannot be the same person; Allow for STR transfer in cases of divorce, death, execution of wills etc.; Allow six months of STR transfer after property sale to accommodate bookings that have already been made.

Mr. Gerard: Thanked Mr. Truckey and Housing Division for showcasing Breckenridge’s affordable housing projects to a group of planners from across Colorado last week.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 pm.

---

Tanya Delahoz, Vice-Chair