

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Trip Butler                      Kate Christopher                      Gretchen Dudney  
Rodney Allen                      Dan Schroder                      Jack Wolfe  
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:03 pm  
Mark Burke (Town Council)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Burke:                      On page 3 of the packet, please change “Clerk and Recorder” to “Court Reporter”.  
Ms. Christopher:                      On page 11 of the packet, I need to clarify, please change the panels I mentioned to freestanding panels instead of roof panels.  
With two changes, the March 15, 2011, Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (7-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the April 5, 2011 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Longbranch Solar Thermal Panels (MGT) PC#2011009; 107 North Harris Street  
Mr. Pringle:                      Do we need to call up Longbranch to explain to Commissioners? (Mr. Thompson: The original permit is expired, and these panels are a little different than the original permit. Pretty straight forward, code suggests trying to put on an outbuilding, but the only outbuilding is on north side of the building. There is also not room on the ground on this property, so the south facing roofs are the only place they can do solar. The panels will not be very visible. You can see them from some locations south of the building. This project is inside the historic district, so it is a Class C. Outside would have been Class D.) Thanks, you just gave the presentation I needed.
2. Lot 3, Timber Trail (MGT) PC#2011010; 220 Timber Trail Road  
Mr. Wolfe:                      Was it subjective to come up with positive four points (+4) on landscaping? (Mr. Thompson: No, not subjective due to the new landscape ordinance. The plan calls for 11 total spruce trees, 9 of which are over 10’ in height and 24 aspen trees, with 12 of the 24 exceeding 2.5 caliper inches. The Applicant could get 0, 2, 4, or 6 positive points. If there were no trees less than 2.5 caliper and no trees less than 10’ in height, then we would have suggested positive six (+6) points. There are some trees less than 2.5 caliper and some less than 10’, so that is why they got positive four (+4).)
3. Mainridge Condos Exterior Remodel (MGT) PC#2011011; 540 South Main Street
4. Sprung Structures Permit Extension (MGT) PC#2011012; 1599 Ski Hill Road  
Mr. Pringle:                      This is an extension of permit with the variance included, correct? (Mr. Thompson: Yes, we included the variance from the first approval. This application is for another three year extension. The structures will go away when the Applicant builds Building 804 at base of Peak 8 or the new Skier Services building at the gondola base.)

With no requests for call up, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

**WORKSESSIONS:**

1. Joint Upper Blue Master Plan (JUBMP) Update (MT, JP)  
Mr. Truckey presented. The Joint Upper Blue Master Plan (JUBMP) Update Committee has now met six times and has reached consensus on the key JUBMP issues. A first draft of the Plan Update has been prepared. A copy of the Plan draft was presented to the Commission. Each jurisdiction (Town of Breckenridge, Town of Blue River, Summit County) was updated on the overall Plan in early March. A public open house is scheduled for Thursday evening, April 21, at the Summit County Courthouse. (Note the date change from April 28.)

**Key Goals/Policies of JUBMP Update:** Summary of the principle goals and policy direction contained in the Plan:

- Maintain a cap on overall density in the Upper Blue Basin (i.e. no upzonings in the Basin without utilizing Transferable Development Rights/TDRs).

- Recognize a new realistic build-out, which is higher than the one contained in the 1997 edition of the Plan, and incorporate the envisioned demand for affordable workforce housing.
- Target a recognized realistic build-out of 14,200 residential units in consideration of pursuing realistic density reduction strategies.
- The targeted build-out in the Basin is based on maintaining community character, not necessarily infrastructure capacity.
- Continue to preserve the undeveloped character of the Upper Blue Basin's backcountry areas and limit development in the backcountry to the maximum extent possible. Continue to promote the TDR program as a means of protecting backcountry areas.
- Work to increase the supply of affordable housing units in the basin.
- The Town of Breckenridge and Summit County should attempt to reduce density that they hold when building new affordable workforce housing units to offset impacts of the housing.
- Increase capacities and efficiencies in the basin's transportation and transit systems, including an emphasis on "complete streets" and providing for the full range of alternative transportation modes (e.g., biking, walking).
- Promotion of "sustainable" development and support for the Town and County sustainability planning efforts.
- Support for forest management projects that improve forest health and for long-term planning efforts to avoid impacts of wildfire and protect our watershed.
- Commitment of the County and Town to continue to jointly acquire open space and improve the basin's trail network.
- Continue to develop active recreational and park spaces.
- Policies that support provision of adequate infrastructure while recognizing that growth should be driven by character issues as opposed to ability to service areas.
- Policies suggesting that the County adopt development standards similar to the Town's in an area of mutual interest.
- Policies suggesting amending the current intergovernmental agreement on TDRs and in re-evaluating the methodology used to determine the price of TDRs.
- Support for retaining lands that are zoned for commercial service/light industrial uses.
- Policies addressing redevelopment.
- Policies in the draft Plan would preclude the Town of Breckenridge or the County from allowing deed restricted units in the Town of Blue River to meet Breckenridge or County housing requirements/obligations. The Town of Blue River is also exempt from the overall Plan recommendations to reduce density.

The previous TC agreed to not allow new affordable housing carte blanche as free density as there are impacts associated with adding affordable housing. The previous Council agreed to extinguish 1 unit for every 2 units created. That was the policy the Council agreed to at that time. It was a compromise between those such as Mr. Mamula and Mr. Bergeron, being our two reps on the JUBMP Advisory Committee, wanting a 1:1 ratio and other Council members wanting less of a ratio as density may be needed for some other use in the future. The BOCC agreed to go along with the 1:2 ratio. Since then, we had a change of guard with the Town Council. The current Council questioned whether we really wanted to extinguish that density. They saw it as eliminating a valuable taxpayer asset whereas others saw it as additional density which would impact the community character. Conclusion at the February Council meeting was the majority of Town Council members voting to not maintain that 1:2 ratio policy. The new proposal was not to extinguish the density, but to put the density into a lockbox. The affordable housing density we need (potentially up to 389 SFEs off of property we own based on the 1:2 ratio and current housing needs assessment) would be put into that lockbox, and that density could not be used unless Council goes through public process, full disclosure, to release it. Might need super majority vote of the Council as well. Right now, we can do anything we want with the density the Town owns. This process has not been ironed out yet. (Mr. Pringle: How much density does the Town have?) Town owns a little under 600 SFEs currently. (Mr. Pringle: In my simple mind, if we are retiring the density, it is going away. That is not the case?) Based on direction at the last Council meeting, we are not going to do any extinguishment up front, but put it into the lockbox for future use. (Mr. Wolfe: What is the logic to making it harder to retrieve that density for other than affordable housing?) We are trying to show some commitment to the overall concept of the JUBMP as far as extinguishing density for affordable housing. (Mr. Grosshuesch: This is a compromise for the new Council.) (Mr. Pringle: Maybe we should not be pulling this density out of thin air, there needs to be a formula.) There will probably be more permutations on this in the future; the Council will discuss more details on the 26<sup>th</sup>. We did not have a lot of discussion on affordable housing in the original version of the JUBMP other than it would be allowed as free density. By giving free density, we got an increase in affordable housing, more than we expected, so we needed to

adjust. I went to the County Commissioners at one of their recent work sessions and explained the lockbox concept to them. Their thought was they don't love the lock box idea and suggested having language more general in the plan. Leave the details up to the individual jurisdictions to determine the final way to implement density for affordable housing. So we have a diversity of philosophies between County and Town. BOCC said let's keep it more general. (Mr. Allen: Would that go into the Development Code?) It would probably be a Resolution by the Council. (Mr. Wolfe: How is this any different than what is there now?) There would have to be another deliberate step with the Council to decide if we make density available in other ways. (Mr. Pringle: This gets a future council to agree to a new process.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: It probably comes down to which pool of density is used last. Density in lockbox is untouched until other pool of 260 some units gets drawn down to 0.) (Mr. Wolfe: It seems logical to offer positive points in our development code to get property owners to reduce density.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: A lot of these policies will be converted into Ordinances and Resolutions.) (Mr. Burke: Were we going to agree to extinguish some density? What have they been told?) The lock box scenario. Mr. Mamula is trying to get some portion of density extinguished. It is a moving target, but wanted to update you on where it is at. On the opposite side, the Upper Blue Planning Commission would like to see a 1:1 ratio. (Mr. Burke: The concern is the lost revenue for the Town. Not just density you are extinguishing, also construction jobs, there was uneasiness that we were extinguishing that plus subsidizing affordable housing, potentially to the tune of a \$50 million reduction overall. That is why council was uneasy.) (Mr. Wolfe: I would go further, if you built a hotel with the density, include lodging tax, sales tax, from use of that density, then the value is probably in excess of \$50 million; is there a concern we are putting handcuffs on future Town Council?) (Mr. Burke: Yes, I think that was a way to find the middle of the road for the people who did not want to extinguish anything. We felt we were giving a lot a way to Blue River for example.) At the JUBMP, it might be helpful to ask "do you think it is appropriate to extinguish density as affordable housing is built?" (Mr. Pringle: One example of implementing this is we take density from property in town, parking lot for example, and transfer to Block 11 where there is no density. I don't understand how we can tie future Council members' hands to use the density in the lock box.) This doesn't bind their hands; they would just have to go through a public process to do that. (Mr. Burke: Current Council we can create density if we want to and can also ignore the JUBMP.) (Mr. Pringle: Yes but that is not the spirit of the IGA.) (Mr. Wolfe: Why not have points in the development code for density reductions?) (Mr. Grosshuesch: It has never been a priority (on the Top 5 list) and would not be in that kind of detail in this plan. Policies will be updated as necessary after the plan is approved.)

Ms. Puester discussed the housing numbers in more detail. We took the 2007 housing needs assessment and we have about 914 units left to be built. That counted 2007 projects that were approved on the books but not built yet. The 389 number you see in the plan represents the amount of density identified in the needs assessment minus existing zoning that is on some of those potential housing parcels, at a 1:2 ratio. (Mr. Wolfe: What does 914 get us?) It represents essentially what is projected as the need for workforce housing, workers that do not have housing that would like to live in the area.

Mr. Truckey continued the presentation. The number includes getting the deficit of the people who would like to live here that can't right now. In addition to that, for any new jobs that are created until buildout ten years or so, the 914 units includes those numbers as well.) (Mr. Wolfe: I get that, what does 900 units garner us? What is the overarching goal?) (Mr. Grosshuesch: 47%. 47% of Breckenridge workers live here. Goal is to keep that going forward. Healthy goal. Problem with 914 number is that is same as what we are going to lose from move out-sellout so 914 is conservative. That is, free market housing currently occupied by employees, won't be in the future. We will lose that number, so we won't gain any ground at all, but that is how aggressive the Council wanted to be. With economy, Valley Brook will take 3-4 years total to buildout. By the time we see several more projects built, building them one at a time, we will go through several more economic cycles. We are still not overshooting this number.) 914 is associated with buildout, but does that happen in 6 years or 20? (Mr. Pringle: What about taking the 389 and applying to Block 11 now, take land we already own, then we have bricks and mortar document saying courthouse lot has no density, it is all out on Block 11.) (Mr. Burke: 389 is what original document would extinguish at 1:2. This Council says we are not comfortable extinguishing it.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: When we talk about it being in a pool, it is on those parking lots, it will stay there until we do something with it. It is not in a density bank like we do with the backcountry TDR's. It is associated with one parcel or another; it will stay there until we use it.) (Mr. Burke: Are we willing to give up the density from F lot?) (Mr. Grosshuesch: It has to be associated with some space. We have not worked out the exact logistics.) (Mr. Pringle: Clean record we can follow as to what is going on. 389 in lockbox will take some calculation to figure out where it is, how much we have. Let's make it clean and just move it, done, so we don't have to calculate-a transfer. Agreeing to JUBMP

would honor the idea that we can't create density out of thin air.) (Mr. Burke: Times change, Councils change. Ten years from now Council could create density out of thin air.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: I think it would be difficult for the Town Council to create density out of thin air in the future.) (Mr. Pringle: Town should use good faith intention of how much density the Town has. Keeping the density is a smart business thing, the other side of that is the aesthetic thing.) (Mr. Wolfe: The day we started counting 1:2, we were more worried about building housing than about traffic and impacts.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: There is a lot of the opposite going on, Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Mamula do not want to disregard the impacts.) They wanted 1:1. Differing views. That is why we are discussing this. This is going to be an ongoing process for resolution. We need to keep it more generalized in order to get all the entities on board. (Ms. Dudney: I am pretty confused. In the past, the goal was to create affordable housing with free density with not as much emphasis on traffic and impacts. The, Town affected policy to take 1 SFE of Town density to allow 2 SFEs of affordable housing to be built. JUBMP is concerned with the impact of affordable housing. As for the Council, some want affordable housing but not at 1:2 but put it in a lock box and some would rather do 1:1 ratio. Still want housing built but not as much. Another Council may not want to use that density for something else or sell it.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: You are on track with your summary.) (Mr. Wolfe: 1997 JUBMP had it right. Was based on community character, Can always buy more capacity. Disturbing thing is there was a 2,000 unit bust. 7,500 unit built, 10,800 built, infrastructure busts at 10,000. I would hate to lose sight of that.) A lot of text from the old plan stayed. Besides these little complicated issues we run into, the plan itself has been largely successful and has created great policy. We don't want to just see density sprout out of thin air and onto hillsides around town. (Mr. Burke: Mr. Joyce and I just want to discuss it more. Not just approve at 1:2, discuss it. Mr. Dudick is absolutely against extinguishing any for future development. Need to understand what are we accepting and what are we giving up.) Mr. Dudick gets it, he understands the impacts created by new affordable housing, his point was is that 389 really the tipping point for the community? Could be for Mr. Mamula and Mr. Bergeron. Mr. Dudick might be more comfortable. (Mr. Pringle: I agree with Mr. Dudick, we are making a judgement about density on this property is already established, why would we want to give it up?) (Ms. Dudney: They were wrong, it hasn't been devastating to have 10,800 units, do you challenge your assumptions when the last one was so wrong?) That analysis also kept the road at two lanes, certainly four laning helped. (Mr. Allen: Most of units created as affordable housing (700 some), have they all been created with free density?) (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes.)

Blue River did not like option to allow someone to deed restrict a unit in Blue River to meet their housing requirement elsewhere. Concern of Blue River as to reduction in property tax. Council and BOCC have agreed to keep Blue River as a partner in the plan. Right now, they'll go along with no deed restricted units in Blue River. (Mr. Wolfe: It is a non binding agreement?) Yes, they do want to become part of the plan and the IGA on TDRs. Would have to go against the IGA if they don't honor it. We exempted them from density reduction strategies. They mostly have single family lots out there, non issue for us. (Ms. Puester: Council also considered that with Blue River having deed restriction exemption to buy down units, they did not have too much heartburn because we want employee housing by employment centers as well as accessible to bus routes, etc. to decrease impacts on infrastructure.)

Please note the open house date is incorrect, it will be April 21<sup>st</sup> at the Recreation Center Multi Purpose Room at 6:30. We encourage you to be there. In addition, there will be a Sustainable Breck open house on May 11 for the final Action Plan. That will also be at the Recreation Center Multi Purpose Room at 6:30pm.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Allen: Talking about the 1:2 ratio, I did not see much in the plan for when private development wants to come in and develop affordable housing. (Mr. Truckey: We are going to be the ones to pony up for those SFE's.) Why not just require a 1:4 from a private developer? He has ten units, 6 market, 4 affordable housing. I am suggesting maybe Council doesn't pony up. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Project wouldn't get built then or Town subsidies would be more elsewhere.) (Mr. Wolfe: Council wants to partner with private parties to get affordable housing built.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: JUBMP is not where our housing policy exists, it is more general. This plan is not going to address that level of detail.) There should be something in here that private sector could be developing affordable housing. On the buy down, Blue River didn't want it; one unit does not have any effect. 90% does. Can there be strategy of only a certain percentage of any building can be bought down instead? (Mr. Truckey: We initially thought Blue River's issue was that affordable housing somehow degrades character and property values, but really it is there is a

difference between deed restricted and market rate for tax purposes. They live off of property tax. Also, no deed restricted units in Blue River at this time.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: No one on Council is happy with Blue River's approach, but up to now, they are still willing to compromise.)

Mr. Wolfe: The Town of Frisco put into effect the cabin zoning ordinance. Some day Blue River may want to do that. It is upzoning. Put 8 units there, sized to meet price point that would meet affordable housing. It is Frisco's way of creating affordable housing from the private sector. (Mr. Truckey: It depends on how we calculate it for density. You are allowed to build ADUs now without additional SFEs in most cases.)

Mr. Allen: Sustainability is broad, why was economic sustainability not part of this plan? (Mr. Truckey: We used template of old plan. Added community sustainability, can add economic sustainability.) Want people to have a job. Last one, we have never looked at JUBMP in any of our development permits. Should we do that? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The nature of our master plans is different, master plans drive ordinances in the future and the Development Code contains the policies that we review development against, not the Town Master Plan documents.)

Mr. Pringle: JUBMP has guided all our other plans. (Mr. Grosshuesch: JUBMP has been remarkably successful.) (Mr. Truckey: We changed our codes after JUBMP.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We originally wanted to review density number issues and lawsuit against county and not a whole lot more.)

Ms. Dudley: Community character was talked about, but not infrastructure capacity. Is there a tipping point as far as schools etc.? (Mr. Truckey: We did a capacity analysis 2 years ago looking at everything in relation to Town and basin, roads sewer etc.) Is it the County that takes on schools, the landfill? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The County did the 2030 analysis to look at those topics.) How did we do on the issues? How about schools? (Mr. Burke: In 2007 they were full, now they are not, which is odd.) (Mr. Truckey: Still capacity at the High School, Breckenridge still has capacity left.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: They have bigger fish to fry than capacity right now.) (Mr. Allen: Capacity analysis showed at total buildout that the Town had enough water but just enough.) (Mr. Truckey: We have more water rights but right now not the ability to hold it. If we do the pump back and another reservoir, then water capacity increases.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: This plan avoids basing the buildout number on infrastructure capacity. It's based on community character values. You can buy your way out of infrastructure issues.)

Mr. Truckey: Come to open house! Come to both open houses, those comments will be related to the Committee and the Council.

Mr. Allen: Question on Page 25 of the report regarding density. (Mr. Truckey: Acquired density and put into TDR bank. Mining claims sitting out there, stand alone development right. When we take that density and put it into the bank, 20 acres becomes 1 unit. Stays that way under the new Plan, which predicts there will be more of that happening. Not a change.) If I have a 5 acres claim that I sell, there is just 1 unit out of that, 1/4 TDR? (Mr. Truckey: Correct.)

***OTHER MATTERS (Not an agenda item):***

Ms. Dudley: I got a note about an open house on Peak 6. What is that about? (Mr. Allen: The Forest Service is putting that on.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: Someone on staff may go.)

Mr. Pringle: Regarding Peak 6, if you have a large employer that generates a large amount of employees, can we incorporate an employee parking requirement into an agreement on that? (Mr. Grosshuesch: When we discussed the Peak 6 expansion plan, those types of social issues were brought up. That process gets a commitment out of the Ski Area on those issues.) Why does the Ski Area give free employee parking away? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We have a parking agreement with the Ski Area, they have to provide 3,200 spaces, which includes for employees. Ski Area would gladly be relieved of their parking agreement.) (Mr. Burke: Why does parking garage have to be right here, downtown? Maybe it belongs on Airport Road.) Why are we satisfying their employee parking lot on town lots? Do we want them parking their employees all day long?

***TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:***

Mr. Burke: Presentation on coyotes. No worse than it has ever been. Fiber-cement siding passed on second reading. I was not at first hearing on wood grain, but I did raise the issue about wood grain. Mr.

Joyce shared his experience as a builder; some of the non-wood grain samples actually look better than the wood grain ones. The second reading for density exemption for basements was continued because of comments from the audience. For example at the Gold Pan, to raise that basement, he would have to pay water and parking fees as a restaurant. A few of those issues were raised. Mr. Berry felt we should continue it. If Mr. Gray uses it for storage, it relieves some of his space in the restaurant. There is value there. (Mr. Wolfe: The goal is to get the building restored.) Exactly. There were a few on the Council that raised that issue. (Mr. Grosshuesch: It is going to come back as a separate issue to address the PIFs and parking. Staff does not support the request to change the building elevation provision. Variance is available in a hardship situation.) (Mr. Mosher: We have used this in several situations where there was water damage or other major problems. We have precedent.) Read a Council Bill to issue optional premise liquor license for events on the Riverwalk lawn. Council made a motion to cancel our April 12 Council meeting. I just want to remind you that you can do that if needed.

***OTHER MATTERS:***

1. Riverwalk Center and Golf Course Point Analysis Update (PG)

Mr. Grosshuesch presented. The nature of the question raised was, how can staff be so different from Planning Commission on the points? Basically, we had approved the policy on solar panels a couple of years ago. In that policy, it identifies solar panels on poles as second priority. There are other policies, but that one is probably the most important. We had the week before been directed by the Town Council to pursue the project. What staff heard at Sustainable Task Force, reduce energy consumption and reduce carbon footprint. Accomplishing a lot for Town and facilities. Pretty good reasons for testing public acceptance of the project. One of the applications came in at 0 and one at a couple of positive points, both of which are as close as you can get to not passing. Planning Commission showed that you understand the code, that you can bring in additional policies and emphasize them more than others for a different point conclusion. Throw all that into the mix and where you got to.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Burke: Curious, as a new council member, members of the community felt like there was undue pressure on the planning staff that because it was a Town project that your analysis would have been different if it was a private builder project for example. (Mr. Grosshuesch: I don't know that that is true, the policy is new and we don't have precedent to go on with this policy in this case.) If it had been anybody other than the Town, the analysis would have been different. What should I look at moving forward?

Mr. Allen: As hard as it was, the process was fantastic. Council went through it, Planning Commission applied the code. It was a fantastic process.

Mr. Pringle: When we developed that policy, I don't know that we had solar arrays in mind. (Mr. Grosshuesch: When we sent that through initially, I was thinking 3 4 5 panels on the roof, but when you get covering 100% of actual buildings, you are looking at a lot more. You have to have a lot more panels to make a big difference for a larger building like the RWC. If you are talking about an 8,000 square foot house in the Highlands, you are going to need a lot of panels to get to 100% offset.)

Mr. Burke: For this PPA, the standard was much more than the policy addressed.

Mr. Pringle: We are going to have to take this into consideration in the future on the policy.

Mr. Wolfe: I agree the project worked, but I don't think staff considered all the policies. Was this laid out by finance people and engineers, or by solar people? I think the golf course could have been done differently. (Mr. Grosshuesch: They maxed out the sites.) Do we need to go back and reconsider the policy? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Possibly. When we said pole mounted are second, how do you hide those? It is difficult to do.)

Mr. Pringle: We were thinking of one small one behind a house. Not so many of them overwhelming the site. (Mr. Grosshuesch: One small one behind a house still can be seen by the neighbors, they would still be affected. There would be incompatibilities with pole mounted arrays. So my back yard, I have a pole mounted array sitting back there. It might be offensive to some people, but it would not be my whole back yard filled with these. The ordinance does not address that.

Ms. Dudney: Is there any way to get Xcel to be proactive to work on this concept, can we put political pressure to get them to do more? (Mr. Grosshuesch: They (Xcel) are going to roll out the solar garden

- concept.) Then we need to get them to get going on that. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Solar gardens will work well for the private sector, but not so good financially speaking, for the public sector.)
- Mr. Allen: We need to get ahead of this so that when a developer comes and says I am going to put a solar array out on French Gulch Road, we don't look like a deer in the headlights.
- Ms. Dudley: If they can reduce the panels by half, it still is not financially viable. That is another thing to explore. Rather than making a 16 x 16 panel work, let's find something that works. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The efficiencies aren't there. Solar people are convinced they are near the end of the efficiency spectrum. If you wait, how long do you wait? When do you pull the trigger?)
- Mr. Burke: We pulled the trigger on 9 of 11 sites. The two we turned down were clearly not right to me from the beginning. It was a big billboard. To me it was not what we are about. It is in the eye of the beholder, but I think we know. Council is looking at how to make that work at the Riverwalk Center. 9 of 11 is a great accomplishment for this Town. We need to focus on positive.
- Mr. Pringle: You showed us the other 9; I thought we were going to see the others again. I thought they were coming back. Now I am assuming everything has been approved. What is approved and what is not approved? I like the idea of seeing the point analysis on the Riverwalk and the Golf Course. (Mr. Grosshuesch: There are some changes. They are going to be higher on the buildings so snow has a place to shed. The pump house got dropped. Right now it is off the table.) All of the ones at police, golf, etc. are not flush mounted anymore? (Mr. Grosshuesch: They came through as administrative reviews. We elevated them to a courtesy review so you could see them.) Some of those are issues we discussed. It was no problem when we saw them the first time. Now if they are going to be sitting up like picnic tables, you start bringing in issues again.
- Mr. Wolfe: I agree, there are some visual impacts. But as Mr. Grosshuesch explained, these did not have to come to Planning initially.
- Mr. Burke: I don't remember the 3 foot change being raised in front of Council. Did the modifications go to the Town Council? (Mr. Grosshuesch: I thought they had, but I am not sure what Mr. Waldes presented to Town Council. I wasn't there for all his presentations.)
- Mr. Pringle: I am perplexed that this change was not brought to our attention, but we do not get to make that decision.
- Mr. Wolfe: We see a lot of PV being installed flush, is that not appropriate anymore? (Mr. Grosshuesch: If it can't fall off the edge of the roof, you would have to clean off the panels, it made fiscal sense to raise them up to get the shedding to happen. Where they were visible before they are going to be more visible. Not at the Ice Arena, the golf course, or the Public Works Maintenance building, they are not very visible. Most visible at the Rec Center. Always highly visible at the Police Department. There will be an array across street from the Police Department on a berm facing the tennis courts. I think it fits with the staff review policies.)
- Mr. Pringle: We never are worried about slowing down the private process. (Mr. Grosshuesch: This is time sensitive.)
- Mr. Burke: Information might be good if there is a change, simple memo to let PC know of a simple change. Let's focus on the 9 and I have been telling people flush mounted. Just information would be good. This is a hot button topic, so information helps.
- Mr. Allen: Good suggestion. Administration needs to communicate on hot topics.
- Mr. Burke: What about on condo complex, Longbranch? What percentage of electricity? (Mr. Mosher: It is hot water, which is more efficient than the electric. The stats should be in the staff report.)
- Mr. Pringle: Can I get a list of what solar project will be on which building? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Sure.)

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 pm.

---

Rodney Allen, Chair