

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Leigh Girvin                      Michael Bertaux                      Rodney Allen  
Jim Lamb                              JB Katz                                  Dan Schroder  
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:05pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the minutes of the February 2, 2010, Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (6-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda for the February 16, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (6-0).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. AT&T Temporary Tower (CN) PC#2010006, 103 South Harris Street

Ms Girvin made a motion to call up the AT&T Temporary Tower, PC#2010006, 103 South Harris Street. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Neubecker presented the request. The proposal is to include a temporary cellular telephone tower at the old CMC parking lot; the space would be leased from the Town. Representatives from Black and Veatch and AT&T were in attendance, and presented a photo of the potential temporary tower. The Town has received 10 letters of support for the temporary tower. The Town has received no opposition to the tower. The main concern is that with the increased population during busy times of the year, there is a decreased level of service in Town, and users experience many dropped calls or failure to connect. This is a temporary solution for up to six months, and AT&T is looking at different options for a permanent solution.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Girvin: Were there any private property sites approached before the Town? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: We looked at the Post Office at French and Park, also the building next door to Town Hall in the rear. We need it near the center of town, next to power and telecommunications, and the old CMC campus provides that.) How many parking spaces including the fencing around the trailer? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: The trailer sits in one parking space, with the fence it takes up about two spaces, not 50.) Did you do a site visit with staff? The location will block a public pathway between the two parking lots. Is there another place in the lot that it can be placed? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: We looked at a couple of locations around the lot and there were obstructions with trees and buildings. The proximity to the power and telecommunications makes this the best location. Access for technicians is also a factor.)

Final Comments: I want the Town staff to understand how popular that parking area is. I did a parking count and it is very well used by residents. We can certainly give up a few spaces for this temporary tower, but whenever it is a busy weekend that lot is full. We need to not continue to over-program CMC. We also have an issue in this area with graffiti. I am afraid that an urban use like this tower will encourage more graffiti. The path between the lots is very well used, and if there is a way that the trailer could be situated to not block pedestrian travel it would be beneficial. I have an issue with public lands being given up for a private use, but that since this is a short term duration there is a balance.

Ms. Katz: When would it go up? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: We would like to get it up as soon as possible, as early as the first week of March if possible.)

Final Comments: I hear what Ms. Girvin is saying, but I am in favor of the project. The need of the community has to be met. Please get this done as soon as possible.

Mr. Schroder: The report says that the fence would be six feet (6') in height? How big is the trailer? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: The mast is 35'. The trailer is approximately 12'.) (Mr. Neubecker: We

picked a six foot (6') fence because it is readily available.) Will the tower's permanent location be accessible to technicians? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: We are pursuing rooftop locations, which will be accessible to technicians, even on a roof. That is normally where we are located.)

Final Comments: I think that this project needs to happen. I am in full support of having a permanent solution for this problem.

Mr. Lamb: The language seemed vague on the temporary nature of this. This is temporary correct? It doesn't come back in six months for renewal? (Mr. Neubecker: The temporary license agreement we are working with the applicant on says specifically six months, but allows it to be extended for three months.) Do you expect it to go six months? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: We anticipate it will be less than six months, we are looking at four - five months total. We need to solidify the permanent location and then obtain Town approvals.)

Final Comments: I agree with everything that Ms. Girvin said. This really needs to be temporary, especially because of the location in the historic district. I understand the problem with phone service, but we need to be careful with this issue as Ms. Girvin states. I have some concerns with the precedent we may be setting with this temporary use.

Mr. Bertaux: Final Comments: I don't have a problem with it. I will support the project tonight, but it isn't likely I would support it again. I don't have a cell phone.

Mr. Pringle: Has there been any negative comment? (Mr. Neubecker: Not that I have received.)

Final Comments: I don't have any problem with it. It is temporary.

Mr. Allen: Final Comments: I concur with everything that has been said, but this needs to happen for our community businesses. It needs to be a temporary solution.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

Andrew Biggin: I would like to encourage the Town to allow this to happen as fast as possible. The disruption to commerce in the Town is devastating. We can't communicate with our business partners, and I am getting feedback from property owners that are frustrated with AT&T. I think this is overwhelmingly needed and I encourage the Town to approve this. (Ms Girvin: How long have you been complaining to AT&T?) Two years.

Katherine Bitzer: I am a local virtual office employee and would like the temporary tower installed as soon as possible. I do my work here in Town. I support this tower. I think we will have a permanent site soon.

Lee Edwards: I have a few questions as a neighbor and resident. How tall is the mast? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: 35'.) Will the power be underground? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: No, in a rigid steel pipe on the ground.) Why CMC as opposed to the Riverwalk? (Mr. McCreedy/ Mr. Kenney: We pursued other options, but this is the best physical location for telecommunications and power.)

There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Pringle moved to approve the AT&T Temporary Tower, PC#2010006, 103 South Harris Street. Mr. Bertaux seconded. The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

#### WORKSESSIONS:

##### 1. Footprint Lots (JP)

Ms. Puester presented. Staff held work sessions on footprint lots with the Commission February 3, March 17, and October 20, 2009. The concern around these discussions was the development occurring in the Conservation District, where primary looking structures were being approved in rear yards, leading to development patterns and street appearance in conflict with the historic character of the District.

After these meetings, a few consensus points seemed to arise. These included:

- Secondary structures should utilize a form based code which results in a smaller scale building and simplistic design (e.g. little ornamentation, simple windows, simple siding, etc.).
- Setbacks would be needed for separation of structures/footprints and follow the historic character.

- Footprint lots should be identified by the applicant during the site plan application and review process. Staff asked the Commission to verify that there was consensus on these items.

Staff believed that the most effective method of limiting footprint lots as discussed to date would be to permit footprint lots within the overlay district. This would essentially allow for footprint lots in more commercial areas and prohibit footprint lots in areas with more residential character. Did the Commission concur?

Before proceeding forward with draft language to the Subdivision Code, which currently addresses footprint lots and minimum lot size, as well as the Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts, which addresses design, Staff asked whether the Commission had any additional concerns.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Girvin: I am pleased with the proposed approach to move forward. I would like to have the option that this be a variance outside of the overlay district.

Ms. Katz: I am pleased with the proposed approach to move forward. I would like to have the option that this be a variance outside of the overlay district.

Mr. Schroder: I am pleased with the proposed approach to move forward. I would rather have a variance option outside of the district, but to otherwise to prohibit outside of the overlay district. Comfortable with staff's approach.

Mr. Lamb: Footprint lots can start to take on the look of two homes on two lots, which is the character issue that is being discussed. I am trying to think of a scenario in which the only way the project will work is with a footprint lot. (Mr. Pringle: We have had a case with a steep lot where this scenario was used for the better.) Ok with limiting footprint lots to the overlay district where there is more activity and permitting them only in special circumstances outside of the district with a variance.

Mr. Bertaux: I like the three bullet points in the staff report. (Mr. Allen: I agree.) The footprint lots should be more than "discouraged" in some areas. Ok with prohibiting in the residential character areas. They could always apply for a variance if the site works best for it. I would like to see draft language for this.

Mr. Pringle: On the secondary structures bullet item, would this be a concern of footprints lots in terms of the subdivision ordinance? (Ms. Puester: This would be addressed in the Subdivision Code. The form of the buildings would be addressed in the design standards or Development Code.) Should a footprint lot subdivision standard be co-mingled with design standards? (Ms. Puester: No, separate codes. Where it will somewhat co-mingle is at the site plan process, where the applicant would determine the footprint lot lines for planning purposes but it will be in separate codes.) Historically in the residential area, footprint lots were a way to get around the minimal lot size. I like the idea that footprint lots would only be allowed in the overlay district and would be highly discouraged in other areas, not prohibited. We should allow the Planning Commission to use the tool if necessary. (Mr. Neubecker: Do you think we should prohibit but allow it as a variance? The Development Code allows us to discourage something with negative points; however, the Subdivision Code does not. For that reason, the variance route may be better.) Concerned that there may be a case where a footprint lot may be the only tool to move forward. Other solutions should be explored before we would allow for a footprint lot solution outside of the overlay district. (Mr. Grosshuesch: If we leave the door open and don't prohibit it, we may need to write criteria for which it would be approved. There is still a way to approve it with a variance.)

Mr. Allen: Why not in residential; is it an intensity issue? (Ms. Puester: Yes. There was some discussion on density, parking and community and historic character impacts.) If our code addresses the form of the structure is there any other difference except intensity? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Intensity as well as character.) We shouldn't write an ordinance to cater for an exception; ok with utilization of a variance. Looking at the overlay map, why are some parts of Ridge Street in the overlay district and others not? (Mr. Neubecker: This was an existing map that we developed for a different policy. At the time we looked at areas of town that were the most commercial and tourist oriented. These were areas we wanted to prohibit residential on the ground floor. We didn't draw this map new for this policy.) (Mr. Lamb: If someone wanted to take an area not on this map, they could go for a variance to the Planning Commission.) (Mr. Truckey: During the ground floor office/residential ordinance, we discussed whether or not to extend that map further down Ridge Street, but because of

the mix of residential and commercial we did not. We also wanted to try and keep existing boundaries in place.)

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

Lee Edwards: Have you had a chance to study the Sanborn maps to make sure that the secondary buildings are smaller than primary structures historically? (Ms. Puester: No, but we can. Following the design standards for the historic character areas.) The overlay district you are talking about is basically around Main Street, or does this affect the entire historic district? (Mr. Pringle: Not the entire area. It is the tighter area around Main Street.) What are you adding to the existing code that is not there now? Thought that you could not footprint lot in residential areas anyhow. (Mr. Neubecker: We are proposing to clarify that outside the overlay district that footprinting would not be allowed. Right now, you could create a footprint lot. With this, it would be allowed within the overlay district only. That type of intensity is anticipated in the commercial area, but not in a residential area.) Is there a good example of this in Town? (Mr. Neubecker: A recent example was a footprint lot created to allow for a historic barn and new buildings on North Main Street, near Contino's old offices.) What is the difference between a PUD and a footprint? Why are we pursuing another mechanism if it is in place? What more does the footprint lot allow? (Mr. Pringle: Parking and access are reasons for allowing footprint lots.) (Mr. Mosher: Footprint lots allow the density of a site to be met. Historic standards can be met with this approach.)

There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed.

## 2. Bistro Lighting (JP)

Ms. Puester presented. Staff has been directed by the Town Council to revise the Exterior Lighting Policy (Chapter 12 of the Development Code) to allow for overhead bistro style lighting along walkways internal to a site. Bistro lighting along internal commercial walkways would enhance the pedestrian and shopping experience as people meander through the site to storefronts in the rear of the property. Staff presented proposed language in strike and bold, modifying the policy, for feedback and posed a question to the Planning Commission.

1. Should the existing time frame (May 1 through October 31) for outdoor restaurant/bar areas be permitted year round to mirror the proposed internal walkway provision? Should timing for walkways be year round, winter months or summer months?
2. Other issues?

### Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Girvin: What is considered "interior to a commercial site"? (Ms. Puester: Outdoor restaurant and bar areas have specific requirements and dates in the existing code. This would allow for lights over the walkways to storefronts which do not have frontage near the street.) Bistro lights could be allowed year round in store walkways, but it is different for restaurant and bar areas? (Ms. Puester: We would like feedback from the Commission on timing. Restaurant bistro lights are allowed by current code for summer months only due to the outdoor dining season.) I don't understand why this is needed. (Mr. Neubecker: The town got a call asking about the use of lighting strung over walkways between buildings, rather than on buildings which is already allowed in the code via holiday lighting. We thought that this was a good idea and should be considered.) That isn't what this says. (Mr. Neubecker: We can clarify the language and are very open to comments at this point.) What are the dates for holiday lighting? (Ms. Puester: November 1 to the end of the ski season.) (Mr. Neubecker: Maybe we should just be clarifying the holiday lights section, and only allow this in the winter time.) I agree. My preference would be to include in the holiday lighting and allow canopy lights in the winter season, which is over six months long. I don't think it is compliant with dark skies. Agree it should also need a permit, as Ms. Katz mentioned.

Ms. Katz: Stay within Lighting Zone 1 with a permit. There needs to be a way that we can modify the boundary for certain exceptions - for restaurants - that are right outside of the boundary as Ms. Puester mentioned. I think possibly a permit on a case-by-case basis would be okay, similar to a sign permit process. I don't want to put it into holiday lighting. It needs to be fair. I am fine with it

being all year round, and having a nightly cut-off time at the close of business. Security lighting is different and they can keep that on later. Walkways are okay for winter only. White lights only, don't lump in with holiday lighting.

Mr. Schroder: I think it is an interesting concept for certain locations in town, but not sure I would want to support a lot of additional lighting in Town. (Mr. Mosher: Perhaps it should be defined as only between buildings, rather than just over walkways.) I think we need stronger language. I understand the need. I agree with Mr. Pringle that we should leave this alone and wait and see.

Mr. Lamb: I like bistro lights and think they are compliant with dark skies because they are very low wattage. They should be turned off at the close of business.

Mr. Bertaux: My concern is that the Christmas lights are left on 24-hours a day. They need to be turned off at the end of the business day. This is an energy issue. I think bistro lights should only be used in the summertime and that the zone should be extended to people on opposite sides of the street from one another. I like Mr. Rossi's point about a length restriction, and would suggest 100' and no more. I agree that a Class D permit should be issued. At the end of the business day these lights should be turned off.

Mr. Pringle: If we add walkways are we opening up too much area that can be lit? Should we look at the exterior lighting plans for these buildings? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Could it be a permit for approval as proposed and we write certain criteria for approval?) Are the lights that we are talking about currently illegal? (Mr. Neubecker: Maybe. If you look at the exact definition of holiday lights, it is arguable of whether or not this is allowed.) Why can't we just leave it alone? This seems like micro-management. (Mr. Neubecker: We could interpret this as holiday lighting for the time being.) I think the current lighting zones should be followed. I think we should leave the bistro lighting definition as-is but allow for all restaurants in Town.

Mr. Allen: The first sentence of the bistro lighting definition says "small white or clear bulbs", and I saw many colored lights in town this evening for holiday lighting. My point is that as we consider this as a year-round proposal are we going to change this? I encourage everyone to walk down Main Street and see the lighting we are discussing. There are several "canopy" lights on Main Street already such as La Cima. I'd like to see some uniformity with what goes on; one way would be to require white or clear on canopy lights and stay consistent with bistro definition not all different colors like holiday lighting. These need to be specific and clear about what it needs to get through Class D. I think they should be turned off at night. I think modifying holiday lights would be appropriate. I think a maximum of 60 watts is too high. We should look at a length restriction.

Mr. Rossi: Can the need be met by something other than additional lighting such as signage? (Mr. Neubecker: We think the lighting can encourage lighted access to different commercial locations further back on the site.) Is there any way to address the length of the canopy so as to prevent a walkway from being interpreted? (Ms. Girvin: How does this align with the dark skies?) It doesn't; its seasonal lighting. If there is a desire to draw people to a business there could be other mechanisms other than lighting, like signage. Do you think this lighting actually encourages people to walk to these other businesses? (Mr. Neubecker: I think it creates activity.) (Ms. Katz: I think lights show that the business is open and encourage people to explore.) I think we need to be consistent with people that are across the street from one another to allow for restaurants. It should otherwise not be allowed in Lighting Zone 2. Not many businesses that this policy would apply to.

### 3. Historic District Transition Zone Standards (MM)

Mr. Mosher presented. At the February 2, 2010 Planning Commission meeting, Staff introduced the pending review of the un-adopted Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District. Within the adopted *Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts*, Chapter 4.0 (Design Standards for the Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings in the Historic District) and Chapter 5.2 (General standards for all new construction projects) describe standards for development within the Historic District *and* Conservation Districts. Therefore, the Town already regulates certain aspects of development within the Transition Areas. The proposed review is to adopt specific standards for each Transition Area and to "fine tune" their boundaries. Staff called attention to three policies potentially needing review or revision:

80. *Respect the perceived building scale established by historic structures within the relevant character area.*

- *An abrupt change in scale within the historic district is inappropriate, especially where a new, larger structure would directly abut smaller historic buildings.*

- *Locating some space below grade is encouraged to minimize the scale of new buildings.*

81. *Build to heights that are similar to those found historically.*

- *This is an important standard which should be met in all projects.*
- *Primary facades should be one or two stories high, no more.*
- *The purpose of this standard is to help preserve the historic scale of the block and of the character area.*
- *Note that the typical historic building height will vary for each character area.*

82. *The back side of a building may be taller than the established norm if the change in scale will not be perceived from major public view points.*

- *This may be appropriate only where the taller portions will not be seen from a public way.*
- *The new building should not noticeably change the character of the area as seen from a distance. Because of the mountain terrain, some areas of the district are prominent in views from the surrounding areas of higher elevation. Therefore, how buildings are perceived at greater distances will be considered.*
- *As pedestrian use of alleys increases, also consider how views from these public ways will be affected. When studying the impact of taller building portions on alleys, also consider how the development may be seen from other nearby lots that abut the alley. This may be especially important where the ground slopes steeply to the rear.*

From the un-adopted *Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District: Design Standard 258. Where new buildings in the Conservation District are to be built near the edge of the Historic District, they should step down in scale to more closely match the scale of historic buildings found within the Historic District.*

- *In general, building heights should appear to be similar to historic heights when near the edge of the Historic District.*
- *Building widths also should appear similar to historic widths in such a context.*
- *If nearby historic buildings are one story in height, then new structures should step down to a similar dimension; if nearby historic buildings are two stories in height, then matching that dimension is appropriate.*

Two key issues arise as the existing Handbook of Design Standards relate to the issue of building scale within the Transition areas:

- 1) The Town has established precedent on development applications allowing increased above-ground density and greater overall building height in the Transition Areas. Specifically, the above ground density has been allowed at 1.5 times the standard 9 UPA, to 13.5 UPA.
- 2) Building height has been allowed at a maximum of 35 feet overall.

The un-adopted Transition Standards suggest larger building height and mass, but the Priority Policies (80, 81 and 82) restrict the height and mass as they relate to historic properties. Staff suggested adding language to Policy 82 indicating that this policy does not apply to properties that lie within the Transition Areas but adjacent to the Historic District, and referring building height issues to Policy 258 in the Transition Area standards.

Staff welcomed Commissioner comment.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Girvin: Can you provide some examples of the 13.5 UPA? (Mr. Mosher: There is an approved property, the Matheson residence, on South High Street that follows this mass and scale.) (Ms. Katz: On that particular house, I am okay with the mass and scale, but am not okay with the materials and colors.) I agree with Ms. Katz. (Mr. Neubecker: This evening, we are trying to focus on the general massing and scale in the Transition Areas overall. Most requirements may need to relax in the Transition Area. We can extend any specific requirements to include materials in particular character areas.) Can you please give an example in the North Main Transition area? (Mr. Mosher: The buildings there appear more historic but with more relaxed massing and scale. This is one of the “Gateways” to Town and stricter interpretations of historic forms, more in keeping with the Conservation District Standards. There is a slightly different character in that area and the buildings were designed to

meet that.) If someone wanted to develop in this area, they would need to follow these proposed standards. I think this looks fine. Under Character Area #11, would it be a priority policy to follow the historic the grid layout? (Mr. Neubecker: The grid is not addressed in that specific priority policy, but it is in the Handbook of Design Standards transition area handbook.) It should be more of a general policy. The projects identified as those that do not follow the grid are not “recent” (i.e. Wellington Square) and it needs to be updated in the text.

Ms. Katz: I think that materials should be addressed in the Transition Area Standards. I am fine with the density and height transitions. I agree with Ms. Girvin about the grid being important in the transition areas. (Mr. Mosher: We will look into that as a summary of the whole district.)

Mr. Schroder: So most people in the transition area would gain rights with these standards? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, some properties would.)

Mr. Lamb: Agree with the density and height increases.

Mr. Bertaux: Why do we want to allow bigger buildings in the transition area? (Mr. Mosher: The Town doesn't want a hard abrupt edge around the historic district; the idea is for a gradual transition and step down in height as one approaches the historic district.) Are you only talking about the properties that are adjacent to the district, or the outside edge of the boundary? It would help to have a better map that shows the 7 character areas. (Ms. Katz: Can we also get overall district maps for our Planning Commission packets?) (Mr. Mosher: We can provide a better map for the next meeting.)

Mr. Pringle: The Conservation District should be inside the yellow line, which was the original old Town core. Once contemporary building started to fall within the historic district boundaries, we tightened up those boundaries to create the “conservation” area - the old Town grid. There were then transition areas that were adjacent to that. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The transition zone is supposed to mimic the scale and block orientation of the historic district, without the exact details. We are proposing that we call the area that surrounds the historic zone the “transition zones” instead of the Conservation District. We would then get rid of the references to the “conservation” zone that are misleading in the Handbook of Design Standards.) Are all of the transition zones within the conservation boundary? (Mr. Mosher: Most of them are in, some smaller portions are outside.)

Mr. Allen: I think we have consensus on the 13.5 UPA and height, and Commissioners are in support.

Mr. Rossi: How do we inform property owners that will be affected by this? Do we notice them or do they get more involved in the process as we go along? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We'll have public hearings on this at Planning Commission and Town Council as the process progresses. We haven't determined how much outreach we will be doing, since it could affect property rights. Generally, people are getting more permissiveness with their zoning with these standards. We just wanted to determine how extensive a change the Planning Commission is supportive of.) On number 9, how does that affect a BBC Redevelopment at a staff level? (Mr. Mosher: Currently, we ask people to consider the standards and development pattern. There is no requirement as these are not formally adopted, and BBC is outside the Transition Area.)

#### TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Rossi: There is nothing to report.

#### COMBINED HEARING:

1. Resubdivision of Lot 1B, Block 9, Breckenridge Airport Subdivision (CN for CK) PC#2010004, 1925 Airport Road.

Mr. Neubecker, on behalf of Mr. Kulick, presented a proposal to subdivide the existing Lot 1B, Block 9, of the Breckenridge Airport Subdivision into two lots for commercial use. In general, the history and density tracking of this property was confusing since several recorded documents over time indicated different amounts of remaining density for the property. The Applicant would like to subdivide Lot 1B to form two lots. Lot 1B1 would consist of 0.882 acres with 10,790 square feet of density (including the existing 800 SF greenhouse), and Lot 1C would consist of 0.623 acres with the remaining 3,900 square feet of density (including the existing 3,900 SF structure). This works out to 1:3.560 FAR for lot 1B1 and 1:6.955 FAR for lot 1C. LUD 31 allows 1:4 FAR and a 1990 amendment to the Breckenridge Airport PUD states that density shall not exceed 1:2.75. Both Lots 1B1 and 1C would conform to current density requirements.

Staff felt comfortable recommending approval of the subdivision of Lot 1B, Block 9, Breckenridge Airport Subdivision as a combined preliminary and final hearing with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Girvin: The existing building is on which lot? (Mr. Neubecker: 1C.) What is the box on the other lot? (Mr. Neubecker: It is an easement.) Will there be setbacks? (Mr. Neubecker: Setbacks will be followed and addressed at site plan.)  
Final Comments: I am okay with this.
- Ms. Katz: Final Comments: I am okay with this.
- Mr. Schroder: Is a greenhouse considered a permanent structure? (Mr. Neubecker: Yes, it is considered density.)  
Final Comments: I am okay with this.
- Mr. Lamb: Final Comments: I am okay with this.
- Mr. Bertaux: Final Comments: I am okay with this.
- Mr. Pringle: When and why did we change the Airport PUD density to 1:2.75 from 1:4? (Mr. Grossheusch: It happened in 1990.) (Mr. Neubecker: The PUD allows density transfers within the subdivision between different lots, but didn't want one lot to exceed a specific density. The cap for each lot is 1:2.75, even with a density transfer.)  
Final Comments: I am okay with this.
- Mr. Allen: Does the greenhouse have setbacks? (Mr. Child: The greenhouse can be moved and it will follow setbacks.) The density of the greenhouse will go to the new lot? (Mr. Child: Yes. There is plenty of density for both the business and the greenhouse.)  
Final Comments: I am okay with this.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

- Lee Edwards: Will the access point align the road with the one at CMC? (Mr. Neubecker: We are not sure yet. That will be addressed at site plan.)

There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to approve the Resubdivision of Lot 1B, Block 9, Breckenridge Airport Subdivision, PC#2010004, 1925 Airport Road, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

***OTHER MATTERS:***

Mr. Neubecker asked if anyone had an issue with a joint meeting with Council on June 22. There were none except for Ms. Girvin.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

---

Rodney Allen, Chair