

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The regular meeting was called to order at 5:33 pm by Chair Leas.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller – **absent** Mark Leas Allen Frechter – **absent** Keely Ambrose – **absent**
Ethan Guerra Elaine Gort Susan Propper

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the September 3, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the September 17, 2024 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Frith Residence New Single Family (SVC), 110 S. High Street, PL-2024-0274

Ms. Crump presented a proposal to construct a new two-story, 1,546 sq. ft. single-family residence with 1 bedroom, 1 bathroom, and a 2-car garage on a currently vacant lot. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the design fail Priority Design Standard 86 regarding roof massing and scale of building height?
2. Does the design comply with Design Standards 91, 92, 93, and 130 regarding architectural details and ornamentation?
3. Does the front façade design fail Priority Design Standards 95 and 96 regarding window glazing?
4. Do the other facades substantially comply with Priority Design Standards 95 and 96 regarding window glazing?
5. Does the design fail Priority Design Standard 121 regarding excessive dormers?
6. Does the design comply with Design Standard 122 regarding the height of the primary façade, recommended at 1 to 1 ½ stories?
7. Does the design comply with Design Standard 129 regarding the proposed second level deck?
8. What other comments does the Commission have for the project?

Commissioner Comments / Questions:

Ms. Gort: Would the home and the rear French doors be visible from the public trail? (Ms. Crump stated that she did not think so due to the slope of the property and the higher grade of the trail.) Ms. Gort reiterated that she thought the applicant should consider the visibility of the French doors from the public trail right-of-way. Ms. Gort asked if the bay window counted toward square footage. (Ms. Crump replied that they did not.) Ms. Gort suggested the applicant consider the design of historic houses with roofs that cover bay windows and to reduce the overall glazing. She continued that the Code talks about the railing defining the primary entrance and she did not think the railing related to the primary entrance in this instance. (Mr. Kulick noted that a primary entrance from an architectural perspective was not necessarily the same as the functional primary entrance, and the lower door was the architectural primary entrance. He noted other examples where staff had evaluated the primary entrance that way.) Staff and Ms. Gort discussed whether the garage was highly visible from the street. Ms. Gort summarized that she recommended that the applicant propose a more architecturally compatible historic-looking garage door. (Ms. Crump showed an example on Ridge Street of a

similar layout with a home with a garage in the same location and of similar height behind a historic home.)

Applicant, Dave Frith – We feel like a small, single-family home meets our current family needs. He stated that they owned both lots 7A and 7B, but the grade change was tricky to combine the lots and lends itself to a smaller separate structure. He noted that the access easement served two lots and described working with his neighbors on the EV charging location. He stated that they wanted to be respectful of the standards and the Town and described that there were challenges for rear access and the 10-foot plate for the project. He described the rear elevation as more like the front elevation, and they had designed the house that way since it was not at street level. He agreed with staff that there was a slope going up to the trail behind the house which would obscure this façade from view. He stated that the massing studies in the application were somewhat misleading because they did not show the context of the house and how the views would be obscured by the historic home in the front and the other surroundings. The steeper roof pitches were supported by other buildings in the neighborhood and the dormers invited natural light, and the steeper roof pitches and dormers made the home feel larger. He described the proposed mechanical system for managing groundwater. He finished by stating that this house was not a street-level, street-facing home.

- Ms. Gort: How far above on the slope is the trail from the French doors?
Mr. Frith: The garage is 9620' USGS, the first floor is at 9629' USGS, and the walking trail is at 9633' USGS for about 4-5' of grade change.
Mr. Guerra: Where would the discharge go to for groundwater management?
Mr. Frith: We are waiting to see what happens with the house on 106 S French Street currently under construction. With the new foundation we could store the water and then dissipate it back into the ground instead of a traditional sump pump.
Ms. Crump: Engineering is requiring a geotechnical report for the building permit application.

The hearing was opened to the public for comment.

Patrica Woollett, 108 South High Street A & B – Has lived in Breckenridge for 40 years and tried to buy the lot where the proposed house is going. She stated that they spend six months a year here during the summer. She stated that she had personal questions about the proposed building. The height would affect their gardens and the sunshine. She described opposition to the amount of glass proposed on the front of the home which would be visible from her property's main living area. She was confident that they would be able to come up with some plans that would take everyone's needs into consideration in this tight area. She stated that she and her husband would not be able to be in the back house during construction in the few years that she and her husband have left. She stated that she was sure the Code would all be met, but this was a crowded neighborhood, and she was hopeful that there would be accommodations. They had a chance to speak with the applicants and everyone wanted to be good neighbors.

There were no other public comments and the comment period portion of the hearing was closed.

- Mr. Kulick: In terms of the actual building height, this proposal was less than two stories. The specific question for the Commission was regarding the perceived bulkiness in Design Standard 86, which was more about how the height and bulk felt, rather than whether the structure met the actual height standard, which it does comply with at 23'. Staff, Mr. Frith, and the Commissioners discussed how height is measured per the Development Code.
Ms. Gort: Why did you show the height the way you did on the plans?

Mr. Frith: There was also a story requirement, so there were two different guidelines that he was showing compliance with. He noted that from the rear elevation you could have a 23' height, but the grade softened the height limit by following the natural grade.

Ms. Gort: Looks like a great house. There is lots of glass in the front, so try to make it more historic looking. She was not convinced that the view from the trail is not visible and she stated that the French doors were not compatible with historic precedent in the area. The garage will be visible and the applicant should do anything to make the garage look more compatible with the district.

1. Does not comply.
2. Does comply.
3. Does not comply.
4. Does not comply due to the French doors.
5. Does not comply.
6. Does not comply.
7. Does not comply. It needs to have some type of roof over it and it does not define a primary entrance.

Mr. Guerra:

1. The project does not comply.
2. Does comply.
3. Does not comply.
4. Due to the site, this does comply.
5. Does not comply.
6. Does comply.
7. Does comply.

Ms. Propper:

1. The project does not comply.
2. Does comply.
3. Does not comply.
4. Does comply.
5. Does not comply. If the roof massing is addressed, maybe this problem is resolved.
6. Does comply.
7. Does comply.

Mr. Truckey: The duration of a development permit is three years to make substantial improvements, including infrastructure such as utility installation and foundation. If you do not meet that deadline you may be subject to any code changes and you would need to go back through the permit process at that time.

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Workforce Housing Building Heights

Mr. Truckey presented a proposal to update the Development Code in relation to the heights for workforce housing. The proposed changes include assessing zero negative points if the design is no more than one story over the land use guidelines recommendation.

Commissioner Comments / Questions:

Ms. Propper: The workforce housing should be big enough to accommodate a family. Encouraging 500-square foot units and allowing the developer to have much larger market-rate units was unfair and was not consistent with the goal of encouraging workforce housing. She

- recommended going to square footage. (Mr. Truckey noted that there was a minimum square footage for the workforce units.)
- Ms. Gort: What are we gaining with this height if they are going to sell all the upper-floor units at market rate? (Mr. Truckey stated that we have a very limited amount of land and this is an option for private developers to incentivize some additional workforce housing construction.)
- Ms. Gort: You're bribing the development to bring more units that may sit empty. She wanted to see something in the code about encouraging garages under the units and stated that there should be no short-term rental of market rate units. (Mr. Kulick stated that the current short-term rental regulations would likely prohibit that anyway. He added that the market rate units created an incentive to add more affordable units. Similarly, having all underground parking would be difficult cost-wise. Mr. Truckey added that the Town's projects are mostly workforce housing, but we can't expect that from a private developer. There needs to be some incentive, such as having that additional floor with the market-rate units. Getting private developers to build affordable housing would be a big win.)
- Mr. Truckey: We're still worried about community character, so it was a balancing act. Going one story makes perfect sense, and going beyond that it was probably still worth assigning negative points, but staff wanted commissioner feedback on that.
- Mr. Guerra: I agree with what's been said about square footage. This was an important incentive, but it makes sense to assign buildings negative points that were too high, and this was a way to get a little bit more without compromising our ideals. He stated he was in full support and wanted to make sure it was equitable between market-rate and workforce housing.
- Ms. Gort: I like the square footage measurement versus unit count. She was concerned that the ceilings would be lower for the workforce units and higher for the market-rate units.

Mr. Kulick noted that the housing type could be more diverse than just apartment units.

Mr. Guerra agreed.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Attorney Hiring Process
2. Site Visit to Denver for Affordable Housing Units
3. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 pm.

Mark Leas, Chair