

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Dan Schroder Jim Lamb
Trip Butler Gretchen Dudney Michael Rath
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:33 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Dudney: On Page 4 of minutes, 5 lines down, wording should be “constrictive” instead of “constructive”.
With one change, the September 6, 2011 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (5-0). Mr. Rath and Mr. Lamb abstained as they were not present at the September 6 meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the September 20, 2011 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Hansenstab Duplex (JP) PC#2011053, 568 White Cloud Drive
2. Sloppy Dog Change of Use (CN) PC#2011055, 500 South Main Street

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

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Breckenridge Nordic Center (MGT) PC#2011050, 954 Ski Hill Road

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to construct a new 5,886 square foot Nordic Center to replace the existing Nordic Center building, which will be removed. The plan also includes a 47 space parking lot, including two ADA compliant parking spaces. The building has been designed with a covered drop off area at the entrance to the lodge for guests. There is a large 25' x 36' west facing deck with an attached gazebo. The inside of the building has been designed to include: a lounge, coffee and snack bar, retail area, guest rental area, employee rental area, an EPA Phase II wood burning device, restrooms, snow cat enclosed parking, and an unfinished storage area in the lower level.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: In the staff report there was a comment about the gazebo. (Mr. Thompson: I don't see that it is necessary. We have not seen many gazebos in the past in Breckenridge.) Is enforcement of parking an issue? (Mr. Thompson: It sounds like the lot has been poached by downhill skiers in the past. A neighbor suggested an on-site person that would check-in Nordic guests when they get in there; however, this lot is intended to be a free lot for Nordic skiers. I suggest a sign that says “This is parking for the Breckenridge Nordic Center, all others will be towed”; start a hang-tag system or dashboard ticket system where someone from the Nordic center could patrol the lot and double check on parking.)
- Ms. Dudney: Have you discussed the long unbroken ridge line and the applicant's response? (Mr. Thompson: I did discuss it with them, no response back from them yet. It is negative one (-1) point for that. It may be a decision where they decide to keep this design).
- Mr. Schroder: Is it the plan to push the snow right up against the foliage? (Mr. Thompson: It is not a good idea for new plantings, but pushing some snow around existing established trees usually does not kill them). So it is acceptable and it fits? (Mr. Thompson: The snow removal and storage is functional and it is legitimate.)
- Mr. Schroder: Wondering how many parking spots are at the Breckenridge Gold Run just to compare? (Mr. Neubecker: It is probably three times the size.) (Mr. Thompson: Summer usage (golf) needs more parking spaces than Nordic skiing).
- Mr. Schroder: Are people starting to accept that they might take mass transit/come in by other means? Gondola? Bus? (Mr. Neubecker: People traditionally know that for alpine skiing, lots fill up; but traditionally they have availability for Nordic skiing, and it doesn't fill up as much. Nordic is a much more affordable sport.)
- Mr. Lamb: As an observation, Nordic skiers go up for an hour or for lunch, where alpine skiers go up for 4 or 5 hours.

Mr. Schroder then opened the floor to Applicant, Gene Dayton:

Looking forward to this opportunity; we signed a 30 year agreement with the town, my two sons are interested in carrying this forward; we turned trees removed from Cucumber Gulch for the gondola alignment into usable logs. It is a green concept to harvest and use them on the same site; we hopefully would begin building in the spring. This could be a showcase for green technology. We are looking into doing geothermal heat and solar panels for the building.

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Gary Fitzgerald: Is the street that is on the backside that accesses Tim Casey's site going in at the same time? And how does this affect that Nordic trails behind our lot? (Mr. Casey: That road currently exists; we have no plans to develop our property in the immediate future, so it will exist as it is today). You will not put a road in there now? (Mr. Casey: No, we will not put it in until we are ready to develop the subdivision). (Mr. Dayton: We anticipate that we will groom those trails; with the exception of the trails that will be affected by Tim's development. The Gold Digger trail circumvents that; the teaching area will remain. There is very little that is affected).

Mr. Brian Wray: Proponent of this proposal; is here to help us understand the efficiency of log production. Here to pass along my knowledge. (Mr. Neubecker: The building commissioner/official will review request to use logs and how it meets standards).

Mr. Jim Chastin: All homeowners on The Settlement are very excited for this; we think the new building is a great idea and our only issue is the parking lot. We are pleased that the initial parking lot has been decreased from 87 to 47, but we have a couple of issues we want to bring up: 1. The number of trees that are in the proposed parking lot; primary issue is to ensure there is a significant buffer on the Grandview side so we don't have to look at a paved parking lot. We really want to bring this to your attention. Also, we feel like currently not a lot of trees are accurately represented on this site plan. We want there to be an accurate representation; we suggest a berm with as many trees as possible. The other issue was the possibility of downhill skiers using the parking lot, which is an issue from a traffic point of view. A lot of cars coming around this corner could be a safety issue; we are concerned that there will be poaching of parking spaces and it could affect us from a traffic and safety view. We think the proposal of the hang-tag system that identifies people as Nordic users is a good idea; we want to manage that as much as possible. (Ms. Dudney: The seven or so trees that the staff has proposed on the west side and 7 or so on the east side; How do you feel about that amount of trees going in?) I think a berm would be helpful; I am concerned there is not enough coverage. (Ms. Dudney: What is the width of a 10' tall spruce tree? Roughly 5', which if seven new spruce trees were planted that would be 35' of coverage.)

Mr. Matt Dayton: From experience of what we have in the past with parking, we have had some poaching of the parking. Our visibility has been kind of an issue because we can't see it with our current building. It hasn't been a huge issue; we do monitor the lot frequently to see who is out there. We do help people outside so we do see who is out there. I usually confront a couple of people a week. It appears sometimes more that it is because of people who are skinning up the mountain in the morning. Also, a lot of our skiers have alpine counterparts that hop on the bus from here while the other uses our facility. I'd be open to suggestions on how we could use a tag system or how that could work. We are open to different suggestions but enforceable signage would be helpful. (Ms. Dudney: Do you expect more customers with the bigger building?) Yes, growth is more revolved around the building, it a more strenuous sport where people take more frequent breaks.

Mr. John Quigley (representing Shock Hill HOA): Regarding the public access point around Shock Hill, we have encouraged the Nordic Center to use a sign in sheet up there (for season pass holders); this would help alleviate the parking situation. We also have experienced the same parking issues in Shock Hill and worked with the Police Department to make a sign that could be enforced. The sign was approved by them; viable solution for season pass holders at the Shock Hill station so you could track them.

Mr. Syd Steele: Not opposed to Nordic Center but our concern is adequate screening and enforcement of parking. We are concerned about the overnight parking, skiers parking and one of the things we would ask you to do would be to ensure there is screening and enforcement for no overnight parking and no other parking allowed besides Nordic purpose. I ask that there is a gate put up there. Something that is enforceable by us if we see it. We need to have something that we can enforce. (Ms. Dudney: I understand if there isn't an enforcement of the parking it would hurt the operator, but if it is full of people taking the bus to skiing, how does this damage the neighbors?) They park along Grandview Drive. (Ms. Dudney: The police could take care of this.) They would all be going to the bus. Equipment and other things have been parked back

there. I am concerned that there will be overnight parking there. We are concerned about the future and what happens and the value of our property and our neighbors.

Mr. Shedd Webster: Gene and Matt Dayton have done a great job running the Nordic Center. I live the closest to the Nordic area and everything going on is great. I found that trees that I have planted are now 20'; it is great for the community; size, location, everything.

Mr. Tim Casey: Our partnership owns the property to the north and the parking lot to the south; we think that this project has come a real long way. We have supported Nordic skiing and this existing project for many years. We welcome the new building. I look forward to having the site cleaned up, want to make sure all the equipment is out of sight (stored or underground). I look forward to having that industrial looking use going away. We have extended vesting for our subdivision behind the proposed Nordic Center. We embrace the fact that there is a new building, the design is attractive and we are very pleased with this project.

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

Ms. Dudney: Would the solar be enough to offset the negative ten (-10) points for employee housing? (Mr. Thompson: I don't think at this point the Dayton's would be willing to do that.) (Ms. Puester: It wouldn't be under the HERS rating, it would be under the ICC). (Mr. Thompson: I calculated and it would need to be approximately 300 square feet of employee housing to make up the negative ten (-10) points).

Mr. Pringle: Is there any reason why it would be prohibited? (Mr. Neubecker: Plat Note says that it is strictly Nordic uses on this property.) (Mr. Schroder: It all needs to be submitted together.) Is there a possibility for additional landscaping points?

Ms. Dudney: Did you consider additional landscape screening from the gazebo and Mr. Steele's home? (Mr. Thompson: There is some screening drawn in here. As it is shown now it is two spruce trees and five aspen trees and four shrubs. Perhaps more landscaping is needed in this area. Your point is well taken; more landscaping in this area maybe needed).

Mr. Rath: Want to hear from applicant why a gazebo is necessary. (Mr. Neubecker: There is nothing in the code that says gazebos aren't allowed. But it is relevant in terms of setbacks and buffering).

Commissioner's answers to staff's questions:

Mr. Schroder: I think that is acceptable, I like the way it was presented. I would support the negative one (-1) point. I am in support of what I am seeing. I do agree with the landscaping. I support the more than one tree per fifteen feet; being strategic about them. It would be a good community asset and alternative to downhill. Regarding parking, I hear all of your feedback and I appreciate it; I support the way that it was presented.

Ms. Dudney: I agree with the negative one (-1) point for the ridgeline; I agree with Mr. Thompson on the landscaping. I would like to see more landscaping between the gazebo and where the neighbors will be affected. Also, I see no reason not to accommodate the neighbor's wishes with no overnight parking. I would also like to see some type of tag system but I wouldn't make it a condition for approval. I think you have the incentive to make it work yourself.

Mr. Lamb: It is a huge asset to our community; we are a ski town. You either need to get rid of 800 square feet or add employee housing. I am impressed with the setbacks. It gives us a lot of opportunity for the buffer; I do trust the staff with their buffering skills. I like the parking lot going from 87 to 47; the permit system-parking thing is going to be enforcement thing; hang-tags would be one way to approach that. I don't like the gate idea. On overnight parking, the need to plow a lot will cause people to get towed. Good luck, I think it's a good project.

Mr. Pringle: I agree with the negative one (-1) point. The additional landscaping should be applicable for positive points; cleaning up the site will be good for everybody up there. When we go to this development up there, is there going to be potential for summer use? Banquets? Summer weddings? This project has been 30 years in the making for the Dayton family and Tim Casey; everybody owes them for seeing this thing through.

Mr. Butler: I agree on the ridgeline; I agree additional landscaping is needed. I think a good byproduct of this is that the parking won't be so obvious, parking will still be an issue but not horrible.

Ms. Christopher: I want to thank the applicants for presenting such a nice application on a key community feature; negative one (-1) point for the long ridge; additional landscaping would be very desirable. Also, thank you to the applicant for reusing the old growth trees. I commend you on doing that and also the thoughts

on geothermal/green use for the building; personally, would not like to see the gazebo and to put that money back to more landscaping but there is no code base behind that, just a thought.

Mr. Rath: I agree with Ms. Christopher about the gazebo; would like to know applicants purpose for it. Parking is a moot point; everything they are doing is going to be an improvement for the neighborhood. It is going to be a cornerstone that anchors the neighborhood in the positive way. Do need to assess the one negative (-1) point for the long ridge; I'm always in favor of more landscaping.

2. Giller Residence (MM) PC#2011054, 306 S Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to restore the exterior of the historic house to an earlier period, landmark the historic house, add a full basement beneath the historic house with a 2-bedroom accessory apartment, demolition of non-historic shed addition at the back of the site, rehabilitate the interior, add a two-car garage with attached 2-bedroom 2.5-bath living space to the back of the house.

The Owner of the house that added the first addition was Arthur C. Howard. It was Howard who built the initial addition later in 1907 to the south side of the house. A newspaper article describes lumber being delivered to the site for this addition. A miner, Howard's business interests included the O'Riley Mining Company, and the Bay State property. Howard proceeded to purchase lots 23 and 24 of this block in 1910, and he occupied this house with his family until his death in 1925.

Staff's assessment of the additions to the property are:

1. Original House – 1881
2. 18-foot South Addition – 1907
3. 12-foot Southmost Addition – 1930+/-
4. Southeast Kitchen Addition (Shed Roof) – 1930+/-
5. Northeast Storage Shed – 1970's+/-

Changes since the last Worksession on August 2, 2011:

1. Additional detail on the renovation and proposed new addition has been provided.
2. Based on the Planning Commission's assessment of the newer historic addition, the plans reflect the removal of this portion and the replacement of all the original historic fabric that belonged on the 1881 and 1907 historic portions of the house. It was agreed, according to the Development Code, that negative points would be incurred.
3. Further exploration of the house has revealed a distinctive change in construction materials in the 12-foot "South Addition – 1930+/-". The abutting framing is distinctly newer and the abutting clapboard siding has a vertical joint running in the same location between the older and newer framing.

The applicant and agent have been working closely with Staff to present this preliminary review. Staff believes the proposal is off to a good start. Though the restoration and rehabilitation details seem rather complex, the resulting project should clean up the site, restore a neglected historic house and benefit the overall character of the Town's historic district.

Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission believe the solid to void ratio on the west elevation of the new addition should be adjusted to reduce the window sizes and increase wall area?
 - a. Ms. Christopher: If staff and applicant could work to create less window-to-wall ratio, to maintain town character, then I am in favor with what you decide.
 - b. Mr. Rath: Reducing them by a third would look more consistent with the rest of the structure.
 - c. Mr. Pringle: Already agreed to that with my comments during the discussion.
 - d. Mr. Lamb: Needs to get taken care of. I have no concerns.
 - e. Ms. Dudney: Yes, to everything Mr. Mosher asked in the report with two exceptions: prefer stone at base, but hope you work it out, and (addressing the Applicant) have you considered a heated courtyard?
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Yes.
 - g. Mr. Butler: In favor of reducing it by a third.
2. Did the Commission believe that fiberboard siding would better meet the intent of the Historic Design Standards than form-lined concrete for lower face of the new addition at the side yards?

- a. Ms. Christopher: I don't think fiberboard would be good since there is so much snow there. Stone and natural wood would be my ideal materials. If nothing else maybe stamped concrete.
 - b. Mr. Pringle: I think you will come up with a design solution for this.
 - c. Mr. Lamb: Assume you will come up with something that will work.
 - d. Ms. Dudney: Fiberboard wouldn't work with the snow.
 - e. Mr. Rath: It wouldn't be my choice; I think it is a steep slope. My first suggestion would be stone and stepped siding above.
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Leave it up to the Staff and applicant to come back with a solution.
 - g. Mr. Butler: Resolve at next meeting.
3. Did the Commission support the two 18-inch encroachments into the rear and side yard setbacks?
- a. Ms. Christopher: Yes.
 - b. Mr. Rath: Yes.
 - c. Mr. Pringle: Yes.
 - d. Mr. Lamb: Yes.
 - e. Ms. Dudney: Yes.
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Yes.
 - g. Mr. Butler: Support.
4. Did the Commission support awarding positive two (+2) points for screening the on-site parking?
- a. Ms. Christopher: Yes.
 - b. Mr. Rath: Yes.
 - c. Mr. Pringle: Yes, I'm just not sure being that close/immediately adjacent you'll be in the shadow in the winter so we need to be careful how we address this situation. This would be a good location for a heated driveway, sometimes this is more process over purpose, especially when you are in the back out of public view it could be a solution for this.
 - d. Mr. Lamb: Sure, this could work well.
 - e. Ms. Dudney: Suggest looking into the heated driveway.
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Yes.
 - g. Mr. Butler: Support.
5. Did the Commission believe the stone pavers with grass meet the intent of reducing the visual impact of cars for this Character Area?
- a. Ms. Christopher: Yes.
 - b. Mr. Rath: Yes.
 - c. Mr. Pringle: Yes.
 - d. Mr. Lamb: Yes.
 - e. Ms. Dudney: Yes.
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Yes.
 - g. Mr. Butler: In favor.
6. Did the Commission support awarding positive twelve (+12) points for the restoration/renovation efforts?
- a. Ms. Christopher: Yes.
 - b. Mr. Rath: Absolutely, we appreciate the amount of thought and detail you are putting into this.
 - c. Mr. Pringle: Not going to argue the positive twelve (+12) points because I think you will deserve them, a little fuzzy on this as there are other site impacts from the large addition to the rear. This affects the overall site.
 - d. Ms. Dudney: Yes.
 - e. Mr. Lamb: Effort put into this deserves positive twelve (+12) points.
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Yes, support this.
 - g. Mr. Butler: In support.
7. Did the Commission believe that, after the restoration/rehabilitation of the historic house, the property could be locally landmarked?
- a. Ms. Christopher: Yes.
 - b. Mr. Rath: Yes.
 - c. Mr. Pringle: I would endorse it.
 - d. Ms. Dudney: Yes.
 - e. Mr. Lamb: Yes.
 - f. Mr. Schroder: Yes, support this.
 - g. Mr. Butler: In support.

- Ms. Christopher: In response to the concerns addressed by Ms. Nichols, I did not know it was going to be commercial until I got my packet. It is a highly used area so I think commercial use could have good potential in this area. I am excited to see the community evolve and clean up.
- Mr. Rath: (To the Nichols'), since they are using the rear part of residence, I would be attentive to who the tenants are in front, someone nice a quiet use that is consistent with the neighborhood.
- Mr. Lamb: Understand the commercial came late but I wouldn't worry about it.

Staff welcomed any additional comments from the Commission regarding this application. Staff recommended the application return for another review.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: How much is the connector offset back from the corner house? (Mr. Mosher: Six inches.)
- Mr. Schroder: How would we screen on-site parking? (Mr. Mosher: Parking is screened from the backyard; it is not visible from front.)
- Mr. Giller, Applicant: I really want to work with the Commission and Staff to accurately take this building back to 1907, so we have a house that complements the district. I have done a lot more investigation on the house since the Worksession; I bought the property three days after the worksession. The biggest fact I further verified is the southernmost addition is 12 feet in width and did not occur in 1907. There are strong physical indicators of this inside and outside the house. We based our design on that accordingly. Working on details of the project, for example, the permeable pavers; this front yard will fit with the 1907 restoration. We shined two giant spotlights in the attic, took digital photos and tweaked the contrast and shadows to expose more detail in the photo. The last six or so rafters (the newer addition) were not smoke damaged while the closer ones are. This must have happened at different times. Also, the fireplace location would remain in the original location. People don't move masonry fireplaces. These are typically at the corner of the house, as seen in the 1907 addition, not in the center wall, a result of the newer addition.
- Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect: Wants to thank Mr. Mosher for a very thorough staff report; none of the massing changed from the worksession other than we added a lot of detail on these drawings. The only issue I need to address is the solid to void ratio concerns on the west elevation. The best thing to do would be to minimize the amount of glass on the shed portion. That would be two windows instead of three. I would like to know how the commission feels about that as a solution to question number one, above. We want to give it a little of its own character too, a new look that is complimentary to the old house but with its own character. I also wanted to clarify the following: if we put commercial in the building with professional offices on the main floor, it would be a very appropriate place for professional offices with the parking along the right of way and the post office use. With the commercial use added, we no longer qualify for "single family residence" and associated accessory apartment. The property will all be under one ownership. Also, we are keeping the same floor elevation of the historic house. And, the roof would be wood cut shingles, not shakes. The shake is a heavier look and that is not what you would see on a historic house. I would like to have a little discussion about pavers to see what everyone's feelings are about that. Brick pavers are set on concrete; the point about the snowplow is well taken; we are still tossing ideas around on this. We have the option to look into brick with concrete under it; we are still exploring that if anyone has comments about that.
- Ms. Dudney: Is the historic portion entirely commercial use on the ground floor? (Ms. Sutterley: Yes. The historic building is the office space, the connector is mostly stairwells and the back addition is the main part of the residence which has the garage and the master bedroom. For the new addition the window wells are on the north side. There is a lot of light in the stairwell also.) (Mr. Mosher: Clarified that the original historic windows are coming from the southernmost addition.) (Ms. Sutterley: There should be quite a bit of light in the lower level. There will be more windows drawn in on the next plan.) (Mr. Mosher: The proposal is that the concrete, since it is more than 6" exposed, will be painted or something.) (Ms. Sutterley: They are having problems with the Hardy Plank.) (Mr. Rath: It is basically particle board.) We would like some discussion on that. (Ms. Sutterley: We could do formed concrete or mortar wash.) Why not stone? (Mr. Neubecker: Why wouldn't you use wood on that element?) (Ms. Sutterley: I don't like having to cut an angled slope on the wood; to keep it away from the ice and moisture.) (Mr. Neubecker: The question comes down to if the elements comply with the code of the historic district. Is the Planning Commission setting precedent if they allow using form-lined concrete?) (Mr. Rath: Could build a barrier around the house to avoid molding. Is stone not appropriate?) (Mr. Mosher: Typically stone has to be around 6-inches

tall on historic structure and has been allowed taller on newer structure.) (Ms. Sutterley: Might have to look into stepping the stone along the wall.) Thoughts on historic standards, we don't want to encourage any historic precedents, we want to get some comments on it.

Mr. Rath: Discontinuity of how many windows there are on the shed portion. Reduction of windows would look better.

Mr. Pringle: Suggesting paved area back by the rear courtyard, using the other pavers for the driveway. It might make it easier to maintain and less potential damage.

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment. The following comments were made:

Ms. Maureen Nichols, neighbors to the north: Did not hear much of the presentation since I was in little bit in jaw-dropping shock understanding that this historic house is not going to be their retirement residence but will include a commercial use. Are there no requirements for commercial buildings regarding parking? Does the Town just let this happen? I already have problems with people thinking the driveway curb cut for my empty lot is for public parking. I just wondered what the Town's feelings are about this. I didn't even know I could come and pick up a staff report. I could have? I am very involved and am sensitive with the historic district, if anyone ever cared to look at the paperwork during that time. I wanted to get some feedback on this. (Mr. Neubecker: Commercial use in this district is allowed. Since the property lies within the Parking Service Area, parking needs may be included on site or they may pay a fee in-lieu to the Town's parking program for any commercial uses.) (Mr. Giller: Want to be a good neighbor. We actually met in July and spoke for an hour and a half about my plans. I mentioned then that there was a possibility of commercial uses. You stated as long as there was not a restaurant or other similar intense use, you were OK. Offices were a viable use.)

Mr. Jim Nichols: Wondering about snow being stacked in the back for neighbors. (Mr. Neubecker - Required to be 25% of the area removed of snow, for snow storage space.) That will last about a day and a half. I am wondering if you were taking about putting pavers on concrete, why not just pave the whole thing with concrete and heat it and provide drainage near in the courtyard? (Mr. Giller: I haven't ruled it out, but I want to be environmentally sensitive about energy use and the impacts to the site. I do want to be a good neighbor, want to address Ms. Nichol's question about the commercial use. I do want to get along and I do want to follow the development code.) Both the south and the north properties are going to be damaged with the excavation. You will be accessing via the neighbors property. (Mr. Schroder: You are right there won't be a lot of space/room to wiggle.) (Mr. Mosher: If necessary, caissons can be driven into the ground to contain all disturbances on the applicant's property. A construction staging plan is required with the Building Permit Application.)

Mr. Brett Gray, Neighbor to the South: Extremely excited to hear that the property has been purchased and is going under restoration per the historic guidelines. Excited that Ms. Sutterley is working with the applicant on this project. A concern I do have is that there are near zero lot lines; if our properties are damaged in any way things will be addressed right away; things will be replaced, etc. There are some natural and landscape areas that will need to be reestablished as a part of the property line. I am in favor of this and excited see how it is going to be fixed up.

PUBLIC PROJECT HEARINGS:

1. Variable Message Sign (CN & MGT) PC#2011056, 12965 CO Highway 9

Mr. Neubecker and Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to construct a two-sided electronic variable message sign on the west side of Highway 9, north of Coyne Valley Road, to provide information on traffic and parking to visitors entering and exiting the Town of Breckenridge at the north end of town. Information on the sign could include open or closed parking lots (including skier parking), road closures, and general traffic information. In addition, the sign may be used to provide public alerts and general information on current and upcoming special events. The proposed sign is designed to be compatible with the existing way-finding signage recently installed by the Town of Breckenridge.

The Planning Department recommended approval of the Variable Message Sign. Staff believes that the sign will serve a worthy public goal. The sign is also attractive and compatible with other wayfinding signs installed by the Town.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: As far as landscaping, there has to be a commitment to landscape that area as soon as we know it's a permanent location. I hope they don't defer it forever.
- Mr. Pringle: What is the control on the usage of the sign? What events get promoted? Does this become a new banner on Main Street? What can be advertised? (Mr. Neubecker: There is not a policy written yet, the Town is going to own the sign.) (Mr. Tom Daugherty, Town Engineer: We are going to try to help the parking issue, quick variability issue. The tradeoff is they do one in town and we do one out there.) It is important to distinguish control. (Mr. Daugherty: The police will control it. From the conversations we've had in the Council meetings, it would be town used for events/parking.) It opens the door for a lot of abuse if we don't control it.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Variable Message Sign, PC#2011056, 12965 CO Highway 9. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Transition Design Standards (MM)

Mr. Mosher presented. On the September 6, 2011 Planning Commission worksession, we reviewed the public open house that was held on August 22, 2011 in the Council Chambers here at Town Hall. As Staff approaches the final draft of the "Handbook of Design Standards for the Transition Character Areas of the Conservation District", we have noticed all property owners within the Transition Areas for this meeting. Staff will be adding additional graphics and photographs to the handbook (similar to those in the 1991 un-adopted copy) along with having all the text proof-read prior to taking the handbook before the Council to begin the adoption process. Staff noted that the adoption process with Council will also involve notification of the public. Staff welcomed any additional comment on the presented draft copy of the Handbook.

Staff noted that there are four properties in the Gold Flake Subdivision that have the lower portions of their property in the East Side Residential Transition Character Area. We have spoken with the Town Attorney about any potential problems that would affect the overall property and if any changes needed to be added to the Handbook as a result. The Attorney and staff agreed that if and when any property owner were to develop their property that lies within this Character Area, then the guidelines would be followed, but they would have no affect on the rest of the property.

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

OTHER MATTERS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

Dan Schroder, Chair