

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Jim Lamb Dan Schroder Michael Bertaux
Dave Pringle (arrived at 7:11 P.M.) JB Katz
Mark Burke
Rodney Allen and Leigh Girvin were both absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the minutes of the June 1, 2010 Planning Commission meetings were approved unanimously (4-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda for the June 15, 2010 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (4-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Temporary Tent on the Barney Ford House Lawn (MGT) PC#2010031, 111 East Washington Avenue
2. Pete's Billiards Change of Use (MGT) PC#2010036, 500 South Main Street
3. Adams Residence (CK) PC#2010034, 135 Evans Court

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

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Transition Standards (Mr. Pringle arrived midway through the presentation)

Mr. Mosher presented the section of the proposed Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District - East Side Residential Transition Area. As initially drafted, the area map included properties on the west side of Gold Flake Terrace and on Highland Terrace. Similar to the Briar Rose Transition Area, the design criteria for the west side of South Gold Flake Terrace is geared towards addressing the west facing portions of development in this neighborhood. (Staff noted that the presented graphics will be 'cleaned up' for the final review.) Staff suggested some simple revisions to the existing text of this section:

- a) Staff removed the portion of the Design Standard 328 from this section of the un-adopted Transition Standards suggesting that the wood siding be painted. Staff believes that exterior finishes this particular Character Area, though in the Conservation District, are better suited to adhere to criteria suggested in Relative Policy 5, Architectural Compatibility.
- b) Design Standard, Priority 326, addresses Mass and Scale for this Character Area; *"As seen from the Historic District, buildings should appear similar in mass and scale to historic structures across the street."* Staff believes that the mass and scale of structures in this area could actually be larger and adhere to the 13.5 UPA massing as identified in the General Design Standards. Instead, Staff suggested titling this section *"Use building components similar to those seen traditionally in the Historic District"*.
- c) Design Standard 332 addresses garages. *"Minimize the view of parking facilities as seen from the street. Where feasible, locate the primary structure at the front of the lot and locate garages and other parking areas to the rear or side of the primary structure."* Since none of the properties can place a garage at the back of the lots, Staff believed this section was not applicable.

Staff is also exploring the current delineation of the boundary for this Transition Area. South of Washington Avenue, Highland Terrace separates the Historic District and Transition Area with homes on either side. There are also home sites above Highland Terrace (along Gold Flake Terrace) included in the boundary. The portion of this Transition Area north of Washington Avenue only has the homes in the Gold Flake subdivision as 'transition' to the Historic District. (Staff noted that the adopted boundary map for the Conservation District does not match the maps in the proposed Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Areas of the Conservation District. Specifically, Gold Flake Terrace is not included.)

All of the homes in Gold Flake Terrace lie well above the Historic District. Unlike the Briar Rose Transition Area, which has greater visibility from the Historic District, this subdivision has a substantial grade change (roughly 50 vertical feet) to the Historic District below and are also heavily buffered by mature Lodgepole Pine and Spruce trees. (Staff noted that there may be a time when the tree buffer may no longer exist and the visual impacts of the homes may be more important.) We welcome discussion regarding a possible change in the map boundary that would remove those lots along Gold Flake Terrace from the boundary.

- 1.) Did the Commission support the suggested change in wording for the Design Standard 328 from the Transition Standards regarding the Adams residence?
- 2.) Did the Commission concur with the change of wording regarding Design Standard, Priority 326?
- 3.) Did the Commission agree that the Design Standard 332, addressing garages, is not applicable?
- 4.) Were there possible changes in the map boundary that would remove those lots along Gold Flake Terrace from the boundary?

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Is there enough in the Development Code to control the architecture of the homes that will lie outside the Transition Area? (Mr. Mosher: Staff believes that due to the combination of building height restrictions, the Neighborhood Preservation Policy, relative Policy 5, Architectural Compatibility, and the sheer steepness of the sites, that we will see homes coming into general compliance with the Historic Character without the need to place these properties in the transition Area.)

Final Comments: I am in agreement with staff's recommendations on the three bullet items. And I support a boundary change removing the homes along Gold Flake Terrace. I'm in agreement with Ms. Katz; there are enough physical and natural buffers to the Historic District in this area.

Mr. Pringle: Isn't there a natural tree buffer there now? (Mr. Mosher: Yes. But it may not be there forever.) I would support removing the Transition Area along here, and elsewhere for that matter. The east side Highland Terrace functions as transition already. I believe that the tree buffer and change in elevation is enough for this area. Why would we be placing these kinds of restrictions on homes that are already built? This would make them legal non-conforming. The existing homes along Gold Flake terrace do not abide with any of these guidelines.

Final Comments:

1.) No. Siding should be allowed to be left natural in a natural state. It can always be painted later. If we paint it now, there is no option later for a natural finish. We should ask for the typical 4 ½ inch reveal though.

2.) Yes.

3.) Yes.

4.) Yes.

Mr. Bertaux: As far as garages on the side or back yards, there is that one building on the downhill side of Highland Terrace where this would be applicable. (Mr. Mosher: Those properties are in the Historic District, not the Transition Area. The hillside from the east side of Highland Terrace created narrow lots. To the north, Gold Flake Terrace's lots are twice as wide and may have a negative impact.) Are we *required* to have a Transition Area for the Historic District? (Mr. Mosher: Communities exist with and without Transition Areas. Our consultant and the Council believed that Transition Areas are important.) If there is a stronger reason to keep this area in transition, it would be solely to maintain the transition to the exiting historic buildings. But the slope is very steep and wooded; I don't think that the homes along Gold Flake Terrace would be placing density this far down the hill. (Ms Puester, the Neighborhood Preservation Policy would restrict above ground density anyway.)

Final Comments:

1.) No paint necessary.

2.) Yes.

3.) Yes.

4.) Yes.

Mr. Lamb: Would this be the only area that would not have a Transition Area if we remove it? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, it would be the only one without the boundary against the Historic District except for the Highland Terrace portion.)

Final Comments:

- 1.) No need for paint.
- 2.) Yes.
- 3.) Yes.
- 4.) Yes.

Ms. Katz: Do we not have consensus right now to remove the Transition boundary back and leave the Gold Flake Terrace portion out of the map? I don't believe making this one change will ultimately affect the entire picture of the Town's Transition Areas for Historic District. I believe we've still stayed true to the concept of transition with the grade change and landscaped buffer. So, as long as we clearly state that these existing home sites will not encroach into the buffer area it should not affect the Historic District. I believe it is okay to eliminate this portion of the boundary.

Final Comments:

- 1.) No. I think that if right across the street is painted, then it should be painted too... okay, I will go with the consensus. No.
- 2.) Yes.
- 3.) Yes.
- 4.) Yes.

Mr. Burke: So, if we remove this portion of the Transition boundary, we are still remaining true to the concept of transition? (Mr. Mosher: It appears that the Commission is comfortable with the separation of height and distance that the buffer is natural, not architectural.)

Final Comments:

- 1.) No.
- 2.) Yes.
- 3.) Yes.
- 4.) Yes.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Burke: Regarding the status of the Prospector Restaurant, Marty Lessow came in again last week to ask what the Town can do to get the construction going? Could we require a bond to ensure construction does not stop in such an important location? The only problem is that it has become a public eye sore. It's not directly affecting the neighboring businesses, we just want it started. (Mr. Mosher: The applicant has pulled a Building Permit and we should see work beginning this week. Staff will be keeping a close eye on the project as it moves forward to be sure the adjacent businesses are not adversely affected all goes according to the approved plans.)

The town passed on second reading an ordinance clarifying that marijuana cannot be smoked at a business, even in private. Regarding Club 420, marijuana smoked within the boundaries of the property of a business will be responsible by the owner of the business, not just the employee or customer. We're still waiting on application materials for the Silver Shekel future use as a pellet plant. So we'll talk more about that later. Amendment for the Summit County Communication Center has been approved. Okay, thanks guys!

PUBLIC PROJECT HEARINGS:

1. Locomotive #9 Site Plan (JP) PC#2009007, 107 Boreas Pass Road.

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to locate the historic Engine #9 and tender on the existing railroad tracks at the Rotary Park. The existing Rotary snowplow would remain in place and the attached box car would be relocated to the east of the driveway to make room for Engine #9 and tender behind the rotary (which is historically accurate). The engine and tender would be covered with an open air shelter.

This project is classified as a "Town Project" under the Development Code. As such, Section 9-1-27 does not contemplate the normal review and approval process. Instead, it requires the Town Council to "consult with and seek the advice and recommendation of the Planning Commission in order that the proposed public improvement project shall conform to the Town's master plan and ordinances insofar as practical." At the conclusion of the Commission's review of the proposed project, the Planning Commission is to submit its "recommendations and advice" to the Council.

Staff would like to hear any Planning Commissioner comments on the Locomotive #9 site plan and shelter. The Planning Department requested the Commission recommend approval of the Locomotive Park Site Plan (PC#2009007).

Any comments or suggestions the Commission may have concerning the proposed project will be forwarded to the Town Council along with the Commission's recommendation concerning whether the project should be approved as currently proposed.

Ms. Puester presented the Locomotive #9 Site Plan with landscape designs and architectural renderings. Since this is a town project, no variance is necessary for this project for the 1' setback. There will be parking bollards, boulders and snow fence on the roof to protect pedestrians. We're not proposing to add new landscaping, because we want to maintain the visual aspect of the locomotive. If we do add plants, it would be in the form of shrubs. Also, a future boardwalk similar to the one proposed previously at the Wellington lot may be added in the future which would run underneath one side of the structure.

Mr. Crispell, Breckenridge Heritage Alliance (BHA): We would like to propose an option that the base of these columns could be either the stone as proposed or corrugated metal siding wrapped around the column and that we would have the flexibility to decide this later on in the project due to budget. We would also like to have the ability to make a decision later on whether a standard frame timber truss or soffit system would be best, budget wise. You would not really be able to see a difference. We want to have Planning Commission consent to use either design method for the interior ceiling and either design materials for the columns.

Ms. Wolfe, BHA: Rock base is expensive and would like to have it a lower height on the column. It would look better lower. (Ms. Puester: This is the first that I have heard this. I am concerned that we have not seen columns wrapped at the base with corrugated metal historically. Also, if this was approved, we would want to make sure that it met Policy 5/R for architectural compatibility, the 25% non-natural material rule although, as a public project, no variance would be required. This appears that it would be well below the 25% rule anyway.)

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

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I would say that with your historic background that you have brought to the table today, I am supportive of what you decide on the column base material. Try to blend the bollards with the structure as best as possible.

Mr. Pringle: Sought clarification on the structure in relation to the right of way (ROW). (Ms. Puester: It should not encroach into the ROW but will be on the property line.) Whatever you decide on final minor changes, you need to bring those back to the Staff for approval to make sure that it meets the code. I recommend that you get staff to agree with your final decisions and then you have our consent to make in field changes. I also love the new location, it is more appropriate historically.

Mr. Bertaux: Breckenridge Heritage Alliance can make changes to the columns as it fits historically. I support the project.

Mr. Lamb: This is a much, much better location. I feel that the stone was used to make the structure seem more structurally sound and durable but would be alright with a modification to the column base material.

Ms. Katz: I know that there was an original proposal of putting this in the middle of town. I am so much happier to have it out here since it is historically accurate. I'm fine if the roof needs to be changed from soffit to timber, that's okay, and I love the corrugated metal look. If the column base needs to change to metal, I would be OK with that. Whatever is historically accurate, and does not like stone at this location even though it is outside of the district.

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Locomotive #9 Site Plan, PC#2009007, 107 Boreas Pass Road, as presented. Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Shock Hill Cottages Tract F Extended Vesting (CN) PC#2010033, 12 Regent Drive

Mr. Neubecker presented an application to extend the vesting for Development Permit #2006176 for an additional three (3) years. The original permit included construction of 14 clustered single-family homes, plus one deed-restricted employee-housing unit. Only three of the 14 homes have been constructed so far. Natural exterior materials include: 8" board on board siding with 6" reveal, 10" half log siding or 2x10 rough sawn timber with 1 1/2" chinking, cedar shake siding, 10" log brackets or 10x12 rough sawn cedar timbers, 3x8 rough sawn cedar window headers, 2x6 rough sawn

cedar window side trim, 2x10 rough sawn corner boards, wire mesh deck railing, Colorado moss rock or Telluride Gold stone base and chimney, aluminum clad windows, and architectural grade asphalt shingles and core-ten metal roofing.

The Town Council approved this project on June 12, 2007. Since then, the road has been installed and three of the 14 homes have been built. There are no changes proposed to the plans since originally approved by the Town Council in 2007. Staff recommended approval of the request to extend the vesting by three (3) years and had no concerns with this application.

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

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Yes.

Mr. Pringle: Yes. Is this a permit renewal, or an extended vesting? (Mr. Neubecker: It's a permit renewal.)

Mr. Bertaux: Yes.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Ms. Katz: Yes.

Ms. Katz made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Shock Hill Cottages Tract F Extended Vesting, PC#2010033, 12 Regent Drive. Mr. Bertaux seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to approve the Shock Hill Cottages Tract F Extended Vesting, PC#2010033, 12 Regent Drive, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Planning Commission Field Trip. Mr. Neubecker presented a memo outlining possible topics for the field trip, to be scheduled sometime in early fall.

Mr. Lamb: How about Manitou Springs? It's a quaint little town with similar historic districts, recreations, etc.

Mr. Neubecker: Any Ideas on walk-ability, sustainability, etc.?

Ms. Katz: I think we should focus on the redevelopment of older properties. That's always a good, educational field trip. I feel that we have already covered walk-ability and sustainability. Manitou Springs sounds good, but regardless of where we go, I would like to look at historic preservation. Does our Town Council still do joint meetings with Vail's Town Council? It wouldn't be so bad to go over there every-once-in-a-while.

Mr. Pringle: If we take a look at Vail, we see many things that are worse now than earlier, density problems, property development issues, parking structures and who pays for them, etc. We need to look at profitability for Breckenridge, and we should go take a look at what Vail has done so we know what not to do. (Mr. Truckey: We went there two years ago. A lot has happened since then.) I don't know that we need to take a full-blown field trip, but I think that all the resorts will come to press these growth questions and we need to know how to address it when it comes.

Mr. Bertaux: Broomfield has a successful parking garage system. We could look at that, too.

Mr. Neubecker: So, what I'm hearing is that we'd like to address redevelopment, parking structures and Vail, correct? (Planning Commission: Unanimous yes.)

2. Historic Preservation Commission Training is available in Broomfield on June 18. Mr. Neubecker reminded the Commission they could sign up themselves or through Joanie Brewster. Mr. Bertaux and Ms. Christopher will be attending.

3. Mr. Neubecker mentioned the Sustainable Breck public kickoff next Monday, June 21st as an addition to the Agenda. The Town Party is scheduled on Friday with free bike valet, and the Sustainable Breck meeting is scheduled on Monday evening.
4. Public Officials Liability Training in the Administration Conference Room, 3rd floor of Town Hall, on July 20 at 11am. Mr. Neubecker reminded the Commission if they are taking this session at the Colorado Municipal League conference in Breckenridge next week, they do not need to sign up for this training. Sign up for the July 20 session is through Mary Jean Loufek, Breckenridge Town Clerk.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Jim Lamb, Vice Chair