

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		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On the even pages of the minutes, the date in the header is incorrect.

Page 6 of the minutes, regarding the Matheson residence, it should read “High Street” not “Harris Street”.

With two changes, the minutes of the February 16, 2010, Planning Commission meetings were approved unanimously (7-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda for the March 2, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (7-0).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Inner Circle Exterior Remodel, PC#2010010, 820 Columbine Road  
Ms. Girvin requested that staff present images of the proposed remodel.  
Mr. Pringle noted that since these types of projects (Class C) are on the consent calendar, it would be beneficial for the Planning Commission to have better quality copies of the drawings for review.
2. Winterpoint II Exterior Remodel, PC#2010011, 250 Primrose Path  
Ms. Girvin requested that staff present images of the proposed remodel.

With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Transition Areas

Mr. Mosher presented. The Commission last reviewed modifications to the proposed “Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District” on February 2, 2010, which included review of the overall direction of the proposed revisions and specifics for the proposed Transition Area Standards for #9, the proposed “North Main Transition Area and #11”, the “North End Residential Transition Area” . The proposed “Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District” will be substantially revised prior to final adoption.

Staff heard the Commission’s concerns about respecting the Town’s historic grid, support for the 13.5 UPA above ground and increased building height within the Transition Areas. These have been added to the “Overview” portion of the proposed “Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District”.

Ultimately, the goal is to create two separate handbooks; one for the Historic District (including each individual Character Area) and one for the Transition Areas (including each individual Transition Area).

Staff presented a copy of:

1. The “Overview” portion of the proposed “Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District”.
2. Chapters 4.0 and 5.2 of the adopted “Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts”.\*

\* Staff noted that Chapters 4.0 and 5.2 of the adopted “Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts” are the only sections that include policies for the Historic District **and** the Conservation District. Staff believes that these chapters should be an attachment with the proposed “Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District” as a part of the booklet set.

Staff welcomed additional Commission comments.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Ms. Girvin: Did you look at the Sanborn maps to see if secondary structures are smaller or larger than the primary structure? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, there are instances where the secondary buildings were of primary use, like dipping, fabricating pipes for hydro mining, etc. The Sanborn Maps are not an official correlative document and is not binding in this case.) (Mr. Neubecker: We are addressing the Transition Standards. We don't need an exact replica of the historic Town; we just want to make sure the character is correct. We can write these standards to create the type of development that we want to encourage.)
- Mr. Schroder: Can we make sure that the language in these documents is clear about references to the Sanborn maps in relation to primary and secondary structures? (Mr. Neubecker: The Sanborn maps are not a regulating document.) I think a simple diagram defining districts would be really helpful and useful.
- Mr. Bertaux: Can we have a simplified definition of "The Conservation District is..." and "a Transition District is..."? (Mr. Mosher: Yes. We will add that. A simple "bubble" diagram may also be helpful.) Will Mr. Noré Winter be involved with this review? (Mr. Mosher: No, staff's experience with his standards is pretty detailed. We have nearly 20 years of using the standards in Town.) When you start with the standards, can you describe the difference between a policy and a standard? (Mr. Mosher: It is defined in the adopted handbook, and we can repeat this in the proposed Transition handbook too.) In the draft, on the "orientation to the grid", there is a large "P" but is all of that the policy, or is some of that the design standard? (Mr. Mosher: All of that is policy. Every design standard is either relative or absolute, with the "P" in a circle for the absolute policies.) On page 35 of the packet, what are the negative and positive points discussed? Do we want those multipliers stated here? (Mr. Mosher: All the non-priority standards fall back to Policy 5/R, Architectural Compatibility in the Development Code. We can define the name better, but not restate the policy in the handbook.) I would add the words "up to" 13.5 UPA on page 39. We do not want people to go above 13.5 UPA. On page 40, the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under 269, can you please explain the current wording? (Mr. Mosher: There is a graphic that goes along with this as well that will help explain it. Staff will add graphics at the next review.) I would prefer that the documents are bound together, to make it easier for applicants.
- Ms. Katz: Agree with Staff, we don't want to repeat Policy 5/R in the handbook. It invites errors if there are any code changes down the road.
- Mr. Pringle: There are several examples in Town of large barns as secondary structures. We need to acknowledge that there are some larger existing secondary structures in Town, but typically they were subordinate, which is the Town's preference. We want to encourage that secondary structures are smaller. There is an area labeled a "transition area" in Town (Briar Rose in the Weisshorn) that has nothing to do with the historic district, other than the fact it is adjacent to it. Are we going to separate this from this document? We need to explain this better, that there are areas where these standards may not apply, such as the Briar Rose. (Mr. Mosher: We will clarify where these standards will apply. There is a hierarchy to the guidelines. We will address the Briar Rose area at a future meeting.) (Mr. Bertaux: The River Park area may be another area that this doesn't apply.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Briar may be the only area where some standards don't apply. The River Park will apply. When we get to the Briar Rose transition Area we can discuss it more, but we need to keep the basic standards in all other areas so that there are standards that will apply if the properties are developed.) Have we taken the 13.5 UPA above ground and gone site specific to see if that was the correct established density? Will this be applied to all the transition areas? (Mr. Mosher: Yes. 9 UPA is for the existing the standards, 1.5 times larger is 13.5 UPA for the transition areas.) On page 34 of the packet, should the overview point out that the transition area has been expanded? (Mr. Mosher: Yes. Staff can add further detail of the history.) Priority Policy 272 or Priority 90 in the adopted handbook; would this be a good place to describe the "Breckenridge" 4-4.5" reveal horizontal siding? (Mr. Neubecker: This isn't included now. We could say that typically buildings had specific siding types, and that applicants should approximate those sizes. The adopted handbook, Design Standard 90, would be the best place to add this information.) This would apply to the historic standards, and in some transition areas based on the character area. (Mr. Bertaux: I agree with Mr. Pringle.) (Mr. Mosher: It could also be described in the individual character areas.)

- Mr. Lamb: There was also vertical siding that was used. You could word it “where siding is horizontal, it is encouraged to be...a certain size.”
- Mr. Allen: There are a few missing parts on the map. The area across from Wellington Square on the north end, the elementary school, and other places that aren’t included. (Mr. Mosher: This is the adopted map prior to any review of the Transition Areas and has only been shared with this discussion tonight for reference only. We will have a discussion just about map boundaries at a future meeting.) On page 36 of the packet under the “realtors” section, the Realtor should tell their clients to review the standards rather than know the standards. It should also say “real estate agent” instead since “Realtor”, which is a trademark name. The third bullet point on 268 regarding driveways, the word “asphalt” should come out. (Mr. Mosher: This will be done.) When you talk about flexibility in the document, should we be specific about what “flexibility” means or provide examples? (Mr. Neubecker: In the introduction to the transition areas we could describe it.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We have tried in the past to determine how to define this flexibility, but with historic preservation, each site presents a unique situation.) (Mr. Mosher: We can also use precedent, which is a legal part of our Development Code to add flexibility.) (Ms. Girvin: On page 42, the flexibility sentence is awkwardly written.)

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Rossi: There is nothing to report.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Miller Master Plan Modification, PC#2010008, 13541 Colorado State Highway 9
2. Miller Subdivision Modification, PC#2010009, 13541 Colorado State Highway 9

Mr. Mosher presented two proposals together as they are closely related and accepted comments and questions on both: one to modify the existing Miller Master Plan with a change in product type, and increase in density for Parcel F, and one to re-subdivide Tract F and D-2 of the existing Miller subdivision to reflect the changes proposed in the Master Plan revisions. The boundaries of the parcels remain the same. No other changes to the overall subdivision are proposed.

The Master Plan is proposed to be changed to adapt to the changing economy and sales market. This proposed amendment will have a net effect of increasing the number of deed restricted units on Parcel F from 17 to 22 and increasing the number of market units from 22 to 24, a net increase of 7 units. The 7 unit increase is proposed as adding 5 additional deed-restricted units and adding 2 additional market units (by purchasing 2 additional TDR’s). The uses are also amended as follows:

TRACT F	<u>Current</u>		<u>Proposed</u>
	22 Market Single Family	to	18 Market Duplex; 6 Market Single Family (+2)
	6 Deed Restricted Single Family	to	4 Deed Restricted Duplex; 2 Deed Restricted SF
	11 Deed Restricted Townhomes	to	11 Deed Restricted Duplex and adding 5 additional Duplex units

The Commission reviewed these proposed changes during a worksession on November 17, 2009 and Town Council approved the modification, via a resolution, to the Annexation Agreement reflecting these changes on January 12, 2010.

As an inducement to the Town to annex the property, the applicant will provide the following public benefits at no cost to the Town:

1. Applicant will restore the Blue River (in accordance with the Town’s Blue River Restoration Master Plan and the Stan Miller Master Plan as approved by the Town) by relocating the river along the westerly boundary of the property. The reclaimed river will be vegetated with natural landscaping and a soft surface public trail will be created for the length of the corridor. The river and trail will be located within a 6.14-acre corridor to be dedicated to the Town as public open space. Timing of the river reclamation and land dedication is scheduled for 2008 and 2009. This has been completed.
2. Applicant will dedicate to the Town a new 60’ wide right of way and will construct “Stan Miller Drive” within the new R.O.W. This road connects Tiger Road to Fairview Boulevard. Not completed yet.

3. Applicant will construct a public trail network throughout the project located on approximately 3 acres of private open space including four separate pocket parks. The trail easements will allow public access to the Blue River for residents of the project and the general public. A 10 space public parking lot and bus stops with shelters (pending approval by the Transportation Agencies) will be provided adjacent to Stan Miller Drive near the existing Red White and Blue North Station. Not completed yet.

Staff recommended approval of the Stan Miller Master Plan Modification, Class A, PC#2010008, by supporting the attached Point Analysis along with the presented Findings and Conditions.

The subdivision proposal is in general compliance with the Subdivision Standards with the exception of size and setbacks (discussed in the Master Plan). Staff recommended approval of The Miller Re-subdivision, PC# 2010009, with the attached Findings and Conditions.

Mr. Don Nilsson, applicant, presented the locations for the Habitat for Humanity homes. The applicant is giving Habitat two lots, and an option on additional lots.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Questions/Comments:**

Ms. Girvin: We looked at this in November as a work session. Has this changed since then? (Mr. Mosher: No.) Which areas will be landscaped? (Mr. Mosher pointed them out on the map.)

Ms. Katz: Looks fine.

Mr. Schroder: Does having Habitat for Humanity in Town provide any additional opportunities for grants? (Mr. Mosher: I think it is pretty positive image overall.) (Mr. Allen: We should market it.)

Mr. Lamb: I hope that this sets a good precedent for Habitat for Humanity.

Mr. Bertaux: How many units will Habitat for Humanity build? (Mr. Tom Begley, applicant: We are starting with one duplex.) (Mr. Nilsson: We have provided two lots for a total of four units.) I would like to repeat my comments from the previous meeting regarding allowing some possible commercial and/or daycare facilities in this area north of town.

Mr. Pringle: All good.

Mr. Allen: Where is the density coming from on the restricted homes? (Mr. Mosher: The town is providing those SFEs. It is a 1:1 ratio, but not unit per unit. The SFEs square footage may vary depending on the proposed use.) What are the restrictions on the Habitat Homes? Is it the same as the SCHA? (Mr. Begley: It is different, and there are specific rules.)

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Miller Master Plan Modification, PC#2010008, 13541 Colorado State Highway 9. Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to approve the Miller Master Plan Modification, PC#2010008, 13541 Colorado State Highway 9, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the Miller Subdivision Modification, PC#2010009, 13541 Colorado State Highway 9. Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

***OTHER MATTERS:***

Ms. Girvin asked if anyone toured the net-zero green home on Saturday. There were a lot of good things to learn regarding the green and sustainability code that we are currently discussing. They were able to show the structure of the home, the pipes, wires and insulation. Each outlet was on its own circuit; this was to reduce phantom load. It would be interesting to compare the energy bill of that home to another home of similar size in the area. The Town of Breckenridge building department did attend the event.

Mr. Kulick talked about the HERS rating system. The Council did not want to jump into mandatory HERS ratings for homes, but rather the potential for integrating into Policy 33/R for positive points on a quantifiable scale. They are looking at an overall goal of building the most sustainable house possible, and are looking at negative points that are received and off-setting those with positive points from the energy savings quantified with HERS ratings. The

paper also noted in the article that the Council is working on looking at providing up to \$1 million in a revolving loan fund, giving homeowners an opportunity to upgrade their homes while there are rebates available. (Mr. Bertaux: Does the county have to take action first on the revolving loan fund?) No, but we want to make sure that we have a similar set of rules. We are looking into who would do the energy audits as well.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

---

Rodney Allen, Chair