

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m. by Chair Beckerman.

### ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Jay Beckerman	Mark Leas	George Swintz
Tanya Delahoz	Steve Gerard- <b>Absent</b>	Allen Frechter	

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The November 16, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes were approved with the below changes:

Page 3, Mr. Giller's comment. Change to "Spanish/Mission Revival or Romanesque."

Page 4, Mr. Swintz's comment "connector isn't as steep but for solar is fine" the intent of the comment was "the slope of the gable over the entry door to the connector is not as steep as the other two rooflines."

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the December 7, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No public comment.

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Tyra IV Riverbend Lodge Condo Meeting Room #2 Conversion (CL), 655 Four O'clock Rd.; PL-2021-0554

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

### FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Father Dyer Addition, Landmarking, and Remodel (CK), 310 Wellington Rd., PL-2021-0373

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to locally landmark and expand the Church through a 2,496 sq. ft. addition to the non-historic part of the existing building. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Building Materials: Staff finds the proposed materials comply with Priority Design Standard 145. Does the Commission Concur?
2. Windows: Does the Commission believe the revised windows and doors comply with Design Standards 95, 96 and 148?
3. Trail Easement: Does the Commission support awarding positive three (+3) points for providing a 6' trail easement?
4. Does the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design or point analysis?

Staff notes a special finding (no. 7) showing the solar panels do comply with priority design standard 69. Staff recommends a cumulative project score of positive three (+3) points.

### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: On page 17 the changes since Nov 16. Overall changes list the "scale" of the of the siding was corrected. Was "color" what was meant instead of scale? I think what was being said was the color of the first addition was changed. (Mr. Kulick: that sounds correct. I will let the applicant speak to that term as it was copied directly from their latest update.) Second, I want to confirm that the bellyband was lowered on the south side? (Mr. Kulick: yes the bellyband was lowered on the south elevation and the windows were raised to be at the

same height as the windows on the west elevation).

Mr. Swintz: My first question is on condition number eight. Could you explain the 23 ft. height limitation? I am curious if the building is lower than that? (Mr. Kulick: the 23ft is measured from the gable mid-point to the ground. And the ridge line matches the existing addition. Guidelines state that additions should be subordinate in height. This was designed to be just under 23ft for the newest addition. They will present Improvement Location Certificates (ILCs) during construction to confirm that the planned building height is what is constructed.) Was condition 22 meant to be blank? (Mr. Kulick: no that was inadvertently left blank). What will the mechanical systems look like in the future, is that something that Staff catches in the future? (Mr. Kulick: the mechanical systems likely haven't been designed at this stage. In the future if there is some kind of venting or metal exposure we require those to be painted to match the roof and not have exposed reflective metal. Additional venting is encouraged to be in a placement where it is least visible. Optimally on the rear of the existing or proposed addition. Definitely not on the historic structure.)

Nick Johnson, Arapahoe Architects, Agent for Father Dyer:

The scale of the siding in the previous submittal was showing closer to an 8 inch siding. The proposed siding size was corrected to match the size of the of the existing. We did lower the bellyband by one foot and the window sills were raised by one foot. Regarding venting, we haven't gotten to that point of design yet, but it will be located on the back of the existing addition or new addition.

Mr. Swintz: On what basis was the trash enclosure sized? Is the trash enclosure large enough? (Nick Johnson: Yes we believe the trash enclosure is large enough based on the current usage to accommodate the three roll-off trash cans used by the facility.) (Mr. Kulick: The applicant's typical procedures for waste disposal are one 90 gallon can is used for waste, cardboard and recycling is removed from the facility within a day as well as compost. Based on this we feel the trash enclosure is adequately sized.)

Mr. Swintz: The gas meter on the east elevation is currently covered by a roof but it should be better screened. Do we have a viable project without the solar? Why are you advocating for the solar? (Nick Johnson: It is part of the goal to incorporate the solar because of the sustainability aspect. It makes sense to add the solar at this time during construction.)

The Chair opened the hearing to public comment. No public comment and the hearing was closed.

Ms. Delahoz: 1. Yes 2. Yes, the new window looks great. It does comply. 3. Yes, 3 points for the easement. 4. I appreciate the church working with the Commissioners' comments and coming back with changes. New window elements on the west side look much more balanced and in line with the area's historical character. The new addition is needed for the church and I am excited to see it get off the ground.

Mr. Frechter: 1. Yes 2. Yes, changes through the hearings have made the whole project come together. 3. Yes. 4. No additional comments.

Mr. Giller: 1. Yes 2. Yes. 3. Yes

Mr. Leas: This is a great project, sometimes it is difficult to understand what the Commission is looking for, but you have done a good job. 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. No additional comments.

Mr. Swintz: 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. I appreciate the efforts for sustainability and appreciate that everyone on the panel is interested in alternative energy. How does the Town balance historic preservation with the effort for sustainability? Quotes design standard 69 code on solar panels: Locate solar panels so they are not visible from the street. It is my opinion these panels will clearly be visible from the road. This is a precedent setting issue. I think our town is best experienced on foot and these panels will be visible to pedestrians. There are trees that will block the panels, but they will be visible by people on foot. The wings of

the building might block the solar panels but not completely. The number of 24 panels seems massive. This is close to 1,000 square feet of solar panels so they will be evident. There are only six other buildings in the historic district (excluding the County building) which have solar panels, none are as visible as this proposal. We should do our best to preserve our historic nature. The historic district is a small microcosm of Town structures where we should avoid placing solar panels. Do we put a preference on sustainability or history? I hope history takes precedent.

Mr. Beckerman: 1. Yes, not overjoyed with corrugated metal, but it does fit the priority design standard. 2. Yes, the changes from triple to double hung windows has brought the windows into compliance. 3. Yes 4. I wanted to acknowledge the work the applicant did to make the architectural changes and make the design compliant. I do want to discuss the solar issue and Mr. Swintz' comments. This is an important discussion where two good things are at odds--sustainable goals and historic preservation.

Mr. Leas: Mr. Swintz makes some very good points. There is a conflict of values, which should be discussed. The fact that panels are going on the non-historic addition does not dissuade the public from interpreting the whole building as historic. All of us support solar panels, but I am torn by your comments and they are valid. The Commission should discuss a little further.

Mr. Frechter: A lot is left for interpretation when discussing this issue and reading the code. The Town Council must decide, which is more important, sustainability or historic preservation? Based on what I read here, I think this is acceptable.

Mr. Beckerman: I agree that the words "overly" and "overly visible" in the code provides us with the ability to make a judgement. I think currently Town Council is more on the side of sustainability, than on historic preservation if they had to rank. And I think this project should move forward with those panels in place.

Mr. Swintz: As an alternative I would support the panels if they were downsized and on the west elevation.

Mr. Giller: This is close to a tipping point of too large an impact. It is on a secondary roof and painted to match the roof shingles. Within the historic district I would say preservation is more important than sustainability. The National Park Service and Secretary of the Interior standards and historic guidelines are evolving on solar panels. I would not be surprised if this project becomes a published example of how to integrate solar panels with a historic design. The scale is perhaps a little large, but this does get my vote.

Ms. Delahoz made a motion to approve the Father Dyer Addition, Landmarking, and Remodel at 310 Wellington Rd., PL-2021-0373; seconded by Mr. Giller. The motion passed 6 to 0.

#### **OTHER MATTERS:**

##### 1. Town Council Summary

Mr. Truckey presented. The accessory dwelling units ordinance was approved after a second reading with a few minor changes. The Exterior Loudspeakers ordinance was also approved.

Accommodation unit fees were passed. A \$400 fee per bedroom will be implemented for 2022. Scheduled to increase to full amount in 2023. There is an exception for locals renting the home 21 days or less per year.

The Tourism Overlay Task Force held a meeting today. A map has been generated showing three different zones. The level of short-term rental licensing in each zone has not been determined at this time. But the general idea is that some additional licensing will be allowed in Zone 1, there will be some reduction in licensing in Zone 2, and a significant reduction in licensing in Zone 3.

Exterior food and beverage areas. Some changes made by the Council including removing the requirement to bring density to the food and beverage area and the first 200 square feet of outdoor food and beverage area was exempted from the rules to provide relief for smaller businesses.

Justice Center housing, a joint project between Breckenridge and Summit County, proposes 50-55 units on Airport Road. Likely pursuing modular housing through Fading West out of Buena Vista. Council has supported three stories for this project to get a higher number of units.

A preliminary overview of the Alta Verde 2 workforce housing project was shown to the Council. The Council suggested some revisions and Gorman is reworking the plans for the project. A future work session on Alta Verde 2 will likely happen with the Planning Commission in January.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 pm.

---

Jay Beckerman, Chair