

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Beckerman. The meeting was a virtual electronic meeting through the Zoom platform, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Jay Beckerman	Mark Leas	George Swintz
Tanya Delahoz	Steve Gerard	Allen Frechter	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Leas: Clarified his comments on net zero development and pointed out that although the goals and intentions of net zero are good, it doesn't mean that the result is always the best environmentally built building. In the case of solar panels, we need to balance with other goals in areas such as the Historic District.

Mr. Swintz: On Page 5 four lines up it says "...the residential cars will stay at the residences" this was germane to workforce housing. I was suggesting that workforce housing cars will stay home. I will drive there because I am far enough from a bus stop, to get groceries. This needs to add "workforce housing cars" will probably stay at the residences.

With no additional changes, the January 18, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the February 1, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Lea's Littles Home Child Care Business (SVC), 459 Floradora Drive, PL-2021-0597

Ms. Crump presented a proposal to use a residence of 1,246 sq. ft. at 459 Floradora Drive for the operation of a home childcare business.

Commissioner Comments / Questions:

Mr. Leas: Is this next to Block 11? (Ms. Crump: It is, just to the south.) Is Floradora the main access? Worried about traffic issues. (Mr. Truckey: Block 11 will be accessed by this road. Eventually there will be a master plan for the remainder to the south and there will be a through connection from Airport Road).

Mr. Beckerman: Is there insurance requirements in Town's purview. (Ms. Crump: The applicant can answer but the State's requirements are much more stringent). Has there been public comments? (Ms. Crump: No. It was a mailing to residents within 300 ft. and a physical notice). (*Lea Dreux, applicant*: I received a few notes from neighbors in support but I figured this was more of a formality. I didn't submit these). How long has this been in operation? (Ms. Dreux: I started family and neighbor care in January 2021, and I got a State license for infant and toddler care on September 7, 2021).

Lea Dreux, Applicant:

I don't want to come off like a jerk, but I am curious what the goal of this application is, and as Sarah mentioned, the State is more stringent. As we know there is a childcare crisis now in town, I feel capable to apply but not all childcare providers are good with emails or English that this could be discouraging to someone in applying. I know we want a high standard of childcare. Why is this application necessary? (Ms. Puester: We have had a policy for home childcare for years, we have loosened it to encourage more centers.

In past years, there were complaints and issues with home day cares. Pick-ups, drop-offs, noise, circulation etc. That is why we have the public notice. The fee is low, but we want to make sure that the neighbors are aware).

- Mr. Gerard: On Mark's explanation, I believe this property is also next to an intersecting road, which will have parking adjoining Block 11. There will be two areas where cars could park for drop off. (Ms. Dreux: There is parking and EV parking there.) Good presentation Sarah, thank you for the visuals. I want to make a recommendation to change a condition of approval. What if you changed paragraph 7 to read "Applicant shall be in possession of a valid State childcare license and Town of Breckenridge Business License at all times and shall submit a copy of each to the Town of Breckenridge Planning Department on an annual basis" (Ms. Crump: Combining 7 and 8?) Yes, improving condition 7 and combining 8 into one.
- Mr. Swintz: I know that the park is on the development plan but has it been dedicated to the town so that the use cannot change. (Ms. Crump: It's a Town owned park). Why is the permit to Lea and not running with the property? (Ms. Crump: Since she owns the State license our requirements run with that. We want to license her and this development permit to stay with her and not the property since she was vetted by the State to operate the business.). Interesting because we are dealing with land use. It is "personal" to Lea. But it isn't running with the real estate. If you were to sell the land, they would need to do this again. (Ms. Crump: These home childcare licenses are unique, and other business aren't affected by this policy). Thanks.
- Mr. Leas: I have a comment, it is great you provide this service and it's unbelievable that you are the only one in the county, so I commend you.

Commissioner Comments:

- Ms. Delahoz: No comments, I think it's great!
- Mr. Frechter: Thank you Lea for providing this service, nice job Sarah.
- Mr. Gerard: I agree with Lea that this is greatly needed. Not every property is the right property, which is why we take a look. I commend you for doing this I wish we would get more and I wish you success.
- Mr. Giller: Nice work, congrats Lea. This meets Policy 38.5.
- Mr. Leas: I already made my comments, nothing further.
- Mr. Swintz: You seem more than capable. I am in favor. Kids will be safe if they use the striped crosswalk over to the playground.
- Mr. Beckerman: I am supportive and since Lea watches my kids as well I support this greatly.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to approve Lea's Littles Home Child Care Business with an amended Condition #7, seconded by Ms. Delahoz. The motion passed 7 to 0.

2. Colorado Mountain College Addition Courtesy Review (CK), 107 Denison Placer Rd., PL-2022-0014

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to provide a 6,827 sq. ft. addition to the south side of the existing campus building. The property is subject to a Memorandum of Understanding and any substantial addition requires a public hearing in front of Planning Commission and Town Council.

Commissioner Questions:

- Mr. Swintz: Asked for clarification on the MOU running with the property. Mr. Kulick explained there is specific language in the MOU dealing with if the use would ever be changed. Per state statute the Town doesn't have jurisdiction over the building but the MOU allows for us to review the project. We go through the PC and TC and hold public hearings, but essentially

it is a good faith effort for CMC to incorporate the comments. This has been reviewed with the Town Attorney.

- Mr. Leas: Asked for clarification on parking, EMS vehicular access, parking lot ownership, and previous work done to grade the property for an airport. Mr. Kulick provided background, including that plans for an airport were eventually abandoned and the Town acquired the property through eminent domain.
- Mr. Giller: Had questions about the new access drive and concerns about the width of pavement/asphalt needed. Mr. Askeland explained the extra paving was done to accommodate truck and trailers for rafting, etc and equipment will be moved in and out of storage on a regular basis. Also questioned brick material and precedent.
- Mr. Frechter: Good job Chris. The emergency access lane will only be for authorized use? With appropriate signage? (Mr. Kulick, that is correct, it is existing so they are tying into it with the new access drive.) (Mr. Askeland: Correct, there is signage and is existing. It is tight but appropriate for a fire truck).
- Mr. Swintz: It was helpful to see the list of 5-6 things with the Leed certification. I have had experience with this. I haven't done one on an addition. Do they keep the certification or is it applicable to first phase only? (Sean Nesbitt, Applicant: We didn't go after Leed for the original build, but the standards we go for are similar.
- Mr. Beckerman: I want to echo concerns on precedent. I realize this is courtesy review but if it could be helpful to add a finding indicating that the failure of an absolute policy and it going with negative points does not set precedent. The above 25% of brick and the absolute policy concern me in future applications. (Mr. Kulick: We can add a Finding that this was subject to the MOU with no formal point analysis nor therefore precedent.) That would make us feel better. We could have another point or read into the motion that EVSEs are recommended due to the size of the lot. (Mr. Kulick: In the motion or in the comments is fine, we will modify the staff report and commission recommendations. You can put it in the form of a motion.)

Commissioner Comments / Questions:

- Mr. Swintz: Design comments, I recognize the use inside of the nurses training area has the smaller windows, in the future it could be areas used for classrooms, you might want larger windows. On the EV charging, even Ford is designing an F150 that might be in your fleet. We think of it as students and faculty. The comments on the brick and the concern, what I gathered is that brick is for Civic. To me I don't know that there was precedent set since this is a Civic building. Lastly, when I visited I noticed that there is a thicker stone band below the second story windows that are missing on part of the addition. Might be good to keep consistent. Great project, love having CMC here. The new program needs in our country are huge so this is right on target. I favor.
- Mr. Leas: Great project, I agree with George, it fills a need that we want and a move towards academic but technical education that is needed. I think it's great.
- Mr. Giller: Solid Report, good project, I encourage the applicant to look closely at the U Shared drive. It is several times the size needed for fire access. Crushed gravel or less pavement. I support the project.
- Mr. Gerard: I too support, this is forward thinking to expand the nursing program as George said, we need it. It will be a draw to this campus. No particular comments or concerns. I don't think the negative points or policy failures can be used as precedent due to the nature and our review. The MOU takes away anyone's right to claim that we are ignoring. I vote to recommend.
- Mr. Frechter: For Sean: maybe someone will schedule an event to train, etc. it could coincide with another event, so keep in mind if the town is using the overflow. Could be no space at

CMC. For the EV chargers and proximity, and housing, the EV chargers could be made available in evening hours to the residents nearby. Well integrated, this will be a great addition to the area.

Ms. Delahoz: Good strong project. I see Dave left the comment about EV Chargers being located in the North Lot. I think that's great but I would like to see the chargers on the north side to be located at the main parking lot as well. It is a big haul to get around the building on the off hours. There are different times of day the building is utilized like by organizations like churches. It is also used during off hours. It would be an asset. Those are my only comments.

Mr. Beckerman: I agree with the commission that this is a fantastic project that is very forward thinking and set up for the future. I too I recommend more EV stations, either to be functional or wired.

Mr. Giller made a motion, that despite a failing point analysis and a failed absolute policy, that the Commission recommends approval of the Colorado Mountain College Addition, seconded by Mr. Frechter.

Mr. Beckerman recommended a Motion to amend the original motion to include finding #7.

Mr. Giller moved to amend with a new finding number 7, seconded by Mr. Gerard. This motion passes 7 to 0.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 pm.

Jay Beckerman, Chair