

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher	Jim Lamb	Trip Butler
Gretchen Dudney	Michael Rath	Dan Schroder
Dave Pringle		

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pringle: Commented on Page 4 of the packet (middle paragraph): I am unsure of the context of the section that refers to...“past, present, future...” not sure this is how it came up in conversation. I am worried that the minutes need to reflect what commissioners feel so it gets to the Town Council correctly.

Ms. Dudney: On Page 7 of the packet, under Stillson Solar Garden, Question 2 (Community Need) and question 3 (Policy 33/R Energy Conservation), please add my comment, “Yes, along with everyone else.”

With one change, the minutes from the November 1, 2011 Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (7-0).

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the November 15, 2011 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

### ***PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:***

1. Giller Residence (MM) PC#2011054; 306 South 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, and the demolition of a newer historic addition to the house along with a non-historic shed addition at the back of the site. The property would be used as a duplex, with a two-car garage (with a vehicle lift inside).

#### Changes since the last Preliminary Hearing on September 20, 2011

1. The commercial use has been eliminated from the proposal and the use of the property is proposed as duplex.
2. There is no accessory apartment proposed.
3. Natural stone has been added to the foundation base of the addition along the north and south elevations.
4. The three windows on the west elevation of the new addition have been reduced to two.
5. The above ground density has been reduced.
6. The proposed hot tub has been eliminated from the plans.
7. The site plan includes landscaping data.

This review primarily addresses the change of use from residential/commercial to all residential (duplex) and some design concerns expressed by Staff and the Commission. The overall architectural concept has remained the same. Staff anticipates the Applicant returning with additional detail on the energy conservation and landscaping.

At this time, Staff has no specific concerns with the application as presented. Staff will have further detail on the mitigation of the negative points at the next hearing. Staff welcomed any Commissioner comments.

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for Mr. Giller: Logistically, how parking was going to work became an issue. We just wanted to heat the courtyard area right near the interior plaza; it has nothing to do with the driveway. We will still have the snow stacking required for the driveway. It makes a lot of sense from a maintenance standpoint to heat the area. We would like to see what the Commission feels on that interpretation of Policy 33/Energy Conservation. On the landscaping, we are planning on a minimum of positive two points; that would give us negative seventeen (-17) points and positive sixteen (+16) points as the plans show right now. At this point, we are looking for direction from the Commission that we could gather for final review. I need to come up with a floor plan for the residential portion of the historical house; we have done everything that Staff and the Commission have recommended we do with regards to the exteriors of the historic house and the addition. We want to do a cut shingle roof on the historic house,

and a combination of corrugated metal and asphalt shingle roof on the rear addition; we will have more detail on colors in the final; along with the HERS energy analysis.

Mr. Mike Giller, Applicant: Appreciate the guidance you have given us during the first two sessions; energy is near and dear to my heart. I have been following a sustainable design guide since 1992, and the AIA 2030, the newest round of sustainability training. I have done LEED silver in all my projects. I am not familiar with HERS index, but I will be working to pick it up. It pains me to have to heat a driveway but I think it is the right thing to do in this case; the courtyard is in the shade from the neighboring house, so I think heating it is the right thing to do. I hope to balance the energy needs with our other energy conservation measures. We took a really good look at commercial but at the end of the day, the residential use is closer to the historic use; it is a better neighbor and I apologize to you for making you consider commercial.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Butler: They aren't heating the whole driveway? (Mr. Mosher: No, just the plaza area in front of the garage.)
- Ms. Christopher: Are there any plans with solar or geothermal in order to heat the driveway? (Mr. Mosher: No. Nothing is official yet, but the applicant is seeking positive points under Energy Conservation.)
- Ms. Dudney: What is your summary of the points? (Mr. Mosher: There is no formal point analysis at this time; however, as presented it would currently incur negative seventeen (-17) points.) And positive fourteen (+14) points right now without some things added in? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.)
- Mr. Pringle: Do you think the parking is going to be doable with the garage parking lift? (Mr. Giller: I don't think it is ideal. I have an Audi and it fits; I think there will be times when we will have to move cars to get one out, but it is viable and I am happy to do it to make it work.) I appreciate that but you will not own it forever. I just don't know if someone will be as dedicated to that as you are.
- Ms. Dudney: How many bedrooms are in the apartment/duplex? (Mr. Giller: Front historic house has two bedrooms downstairs and the back portion of the duplex has three bedrooms.) It is possible you will lease to someone who only has one car? From a functional point of view you might not need four spaces. As most people know I am new here, but I am surprised Breckenridge has a two car parking requirement; some places put a cap instead of a minimum requirement.
- Mr. Butler: Discussed where the parking lift was on the plan. So it doesn't go as high as ceiling in garage? (Ms. Sutterley: We are going to have to lower the garage a couple inches to obtain the required clearance inside the garage for the lift.) (Mr. Giller: You have to go with a garage door with the motors on the side, but it is viable.)
- Mr. Schroder: Is it truly accommodating the space? (Mr. Giller: Yes)
- Mr. Pringle: Are you anticipating the height of an Audi A4 or two Range Rovers with ski racks on top? The Grand Lodge in Steamboat didn't anticipate cars with ski racks and they ended up having a problem. I hope we are anticipating that your next car might have different requirements. This is not the most practical solution.
- Ms. Dudney: All the applicant has to do is require his tenant to have one car. So this is just addressing the development code for parking spaces. (Mr. Neubecker: It is proposed as a duplex, not an apartment, so there won't be a lease. Properties may be separately owned.) So then, there has to be some type of easement to allow access to the space? (Mr. Mosher, there will be two separate properties with easements for access.)
- Mr. Schroder: Have you thought of any perceived public benefit from the heated driveway? (Mr. Giller: I did hear a concern about the shading and the difficulty of getting the snow out there from the last work sessions so I took into consideration what I heard. Is it public or is it for my family? I'm not really sure of the difference.)
- Ms. Christopher: Clarification on the garage... the lift is on the south for you? (Mr. Giller: I am still thinking of that, I do not know yet which unit will use the lift.) Will there be an interior wall in the garage so they can't access the other car? (Mr. Giller: I haven't gotten that far; if you put a wall in it really constrains that area a bit.)
- Ms. Dudney: Asked Mr. Neubecker clarification on Policy 33, Energy conservation. (Mr. Mosher: As for the snow melting points, the courtyard is larger than a garage apron where the Code suggested no negative points as an example.)

- Mr. Rath: If you get 3-feet of snow on your solar panels then there isn't enough hot water to melt your driveway. (Mr. Giller: I'm prepared for one negative point for the heated driveway since I know I will be back soon with my energy plan.)
- Mr. Butler: Do you have any desire to heat the full driveway? (Mr. Giller: The courtyard is necessary and the driveway would be nice, but not necessary.)

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

*Commissioner Final Comments:*

- Mr. Pringle: The Staff report states on page 10, under Policy 5 Architectural Compatibility that the new connector will have natural cedar horizontal siding on the east elevation with some vertical. I'm not quite sure what you mean on that. (Mr. Mosher: Pointed out the different elevations and material changes to break up the massing of the addition.) (Ms. Sutterley: It might be a flush vertical application; we haven't decided which vertical material we will use yet.) (Mr. Neubecker: Is this used to delineate the new from the historic structure? It does help in the future for people to delineate the historic and the new with changing the material.)
- Mr. Rath: How many negative points for an ice melt system? It comes down to how much energy is going to be required for snowmelt. You want to keep as much snow out of there as possible, with a good cold-roof system, lots of insulation. It doesn't look like you have a lot of area on the roof for solar.
- Ms. Christopher: Without knowing the energy consumption, it is hard to assess the negative points. As far as I am concerned I think that the heated patio area (courtyard) could be combated with solar or geothermal energy even if it isn't used specifically used for that courtyard. Heated courtyard with no renewable energy replacement of any source would be negative points in my mind.
- Mr. Butler: I wish you had an alternative; a real viable alternative to a fourth car.
- Mr. Lamb: I like the project; every time we see it, it gets better. The discussion here is on landscaping. I agree with Staff's comments for two positive points. With so little space that meets code it's going to be difficult to obtain positive four (+4) points. The negative hit for me would be on heating the courtyard. With the HERS rating this might change and balance out. I don't think the courtyard is that big. Just because you have that system doesn't mean it has to be operational. I am looking forward to the point analysis.
- Ms. Dudney: I like the project; I am not inclined to agree to a large number of negative points for the courtyard because I don't see what your alternative is. It is south facing. (Mr. Mosher: But it is shaded by neighboring building.) I need to look at your energy analysis.
- Ms. Pringle: I think the development is coming along very well. As you hear, there are no problems with the architectural details or massing expressed by staff so that is nailed down. The questionable stuff is whether or not the plaza is heated. I think I would go with heating it with the least amount of negative points. In order for the plaza to work it has to be 100% clear of snow, and you have to have a slow melt system that works. It is going to be necessary for this to go forward. Four cars are necessary; make it work. I would go for the negative hit and snowmelt the entire driveway. The best way to guarantee it would be to have the snowmelt system. I am not afraid of the energy consumption, I feel like we can offset that somehow.
- Mr. Schroder: I agree with what Mr. Pringle, Ms. Dudney and Ms. Christopher said about melting the courtyard. Also, I don't think you need to apologize for taking away the commercial, the code allows it. That is what we are here for, to mull over your ideas. Ultimately, I like that you are moving towards residential because this block is residential.

2. Stroble Residence (MM) PC#2011060; 206 South Harris (Lot 3A)

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to move and restore the exterior of the historic house to an earlier period, remove the non-historic upper level addition, replace and add to the non-historic addition at the back, landmark the property and add a full basement beneath the historic house. An accessory unit is proposed in a portion of the new basement. Rebecca Waugh, Town Historian, has stated that this house was once identical to the houses at 208 South Harris Street (next door to the south) and the Wedding House at 106 North Harris Street. As it stands today with the current Code, the existing house on the subdivided lot is 620 feet over density, 735 feet over aboveground density and 368 feet over mass. It does not meet the setbacks on the sides and rear of the property. These conditions are legal non-

conforming. The applicant proposes improvements to the property which will restore much of the historic character while reducing the degree of non-conformity.

Staff believes that the restoration of this historic house is a good public benefit for the community. However, there are several concerns that would improve the benefits of this proposal.

The Code allows the moving of historic structures in some cases with negative points. It does not allow placing the parking requirements off-site and onto public streets. Since the addition to the historic house is less than 50% of the floor area, a connector is not required and none is proposed. Staff is asking the applicant to preserve the interior walls that are the original historic exterior walls of the house to maintain the rating and contributing qualities to the historic district.

Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

- Does the Commission support moving the historic building 3-feet to the west with negative points being assigned?
- Does the Commission support requiring the preservation of interior historic fabric if no connector link is used?
- Does the Commission believe proposed snow-melt portion of the driveway is warranted without negative points because of the existing site conditions and neighboring property impacts?

Staff welcomed any additional comments.

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for Applicants: This house has changed hands quite often. The Applicants wanted to come up with a restoration and renovation plan; the house is beyond “Band-Aids”. What we looked at was the possibility of restoring the home to what it was historically on the west, north, and south sides, plus Landmarking the property and getting a basement under the home. Two options are for the applicants to either to restore it themselves or to obtain plan approval and then sell it. The existing parking on the front allows for 3 cars and the owner is anxious to get rid of the employee deed restriction on the accessory unit in the house. He is willing to obtain something off-site for proper replacement. He would like a ‘trade-off’ from the Town for the kind of monumental project this is; there will be no above ground impact. As you can see this does not present any parking problem, we could fit another parking spot in the front yard. But, the biggest problem is having parking in the front yard and seeking landmarking. We would like the Commission to support an off-site parking pass for the applicants. If parked in the front yard, the car would nearly touch the house to fit. There are already cars parked all over the place on Harris Street anyway. We want to do a good job on the site work and the structure. We would like to have a decent window-well off the back yard so it’s not dark in the basement. Nobody ever considered what could happen on a half-lot when considering requiring connector links. I think it is an issue coming up on other projects; I want people to know how difficult it really is. There needs to be a little give and take on the backsides of the houses so things do work. I would like to see this addressed in the top-ten code changes soon.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Dudley: I do not have a problem with the snowmelt for the small portion of this driveway. Not in favor or parking offsite. Not in favor of Landmarking the building if you are parking in-front, which leaves you only two parking spaces for the single family home.

Mr. Lamb: Parking is one issue; the serious issue I have is the accessory unit. The big mistake was made in the 80’s dividing these lots and I would like to do whatever we can do to remedy them at this point. I question what this half-lot in this neighborhood can handle with the proposed parking and density. What is going to be two units on a half-lot; I don’t know where you are going to put the parking if you are trying to restore the front. Two parking spots shown on the plans works just barely, three absolutely doesn’t work. I am fine with Landmarking it and the underground density but how many cars are really going to be there? That is a huge concern of mine. Parking could work on the right side with snow melt but again, the accessory apartment really concerns me. I would be unwilling to allow an accessory unit to have those two parking spots.

Mr. Butler: Support the ice melt with no assignment of points.

Ms. Christopher: Yes, believe this situation warrants a hardship for that (snow melting). I do not support an accessory unit if there isn’t parking for it.

- Mr. Rath: The snow melt is warranted. Anything we can do to help the parking situation and remove the cars from the front of the house. I'd like to see us work with the homeowner to see this project become less unappealing.
- Mr. Schroder: Do I think it is for free? (Regarding negative points for snow melt). I don't think so. I would love to see a creative solution and then we can get back to you.
- Mr. Lamb: We have at least three units on that property and at least two exist, how does that work? (Mr. Mosher: The front lot and the back lot were counted as a duplex when the back house was built.) (Mr. Neubecker: The accessory unit is not counted as a separate "unit". It is one SFE.) They have limitations on sizes, etc. but they have a separate door? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.)
- Ms. Dudney: So, you can buy a different place to move that employee deed restriction? And does staff review to make sure that it is comparable? (Mr. Neubecker: Yes, we do. Sometimes we have them make upgrades with new appliances, carpet, etc.) (Mr. Mosher: The plan is to take the employee unit off the property; the owner works with Town Staff to ensure the replacement unit is comparable to the original.)
- Mr. Pringle: When you take a deed restriction of an existing unit and place it on another one, does it link it with a mortgage? What happens if someone loses the house? Do we lose the restriction? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Town policy, prior to the recession, was that the next lender would have to subordinate their interest to our covenant; we have had varying responses from FHA and Freddy Mac/Fanny Mae on whether they would accept those or not. I can't sit here and tell you clearly what the policy is anymore. Our first choice is to have them subordinate but there are specific circumstances that we can't control anymore. I don't have a black and white answer.) As a general policy, why would we accept a deed restriction that is not in first place on the loan? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Tim (Town Attorney) has devised some ways to address this. I can't explain in detail.) Are those window wells larger than what is necessary to adapt to the fire code? (Ms. Sutterley: I would like to allow at least four feet for that. I think it makes it not so much of a cramped window well.)
- Ms. Christopher: How large would the window well be if you didn't move the house? (Ms. Sutterley: We wouldn't meet code with that.)
- Mr. Schroder: How would parking meet conform to make it work? Since two cars push one space over the edge of the Town's snow stacking easement. (Ms. Sutterley: If we move the house back a little bit we could park in the front yard; right now they have an easement to have 3 cars parked perpendicular to the street. The problem is it would be parking in front of a historic structure; the two new spots are completely on the site.) Would positive points be allowed for historic renovation and have cars parked in front yard? Or does having cars parked in front negate that opportunity?
- Ms. Dudney: Are you saying that two cars could be parked in the driveway without permission from anybody? (Mr. Mosher: To park in the snow stacking easement an encroachment license agreement is needed from the Town.) Mr. Mosher, can you clarify your question for number two? Is there a legal connection between interior fabric and not providing a connector link? (Mr. Neubecker: Cited a couple of examples where the Town obtained a condition of approval to preserve the interior fabric.) (Mr. Mosher: Cited the Father Dyer Church, where historic exterior wall was removed. It now has less than 75% of the original fabric left due to the additions put on over time and the removal of the once exterior walls during remodels. Is no longer contributing as a building, just socially relevant.)
- Mr. Pringle: How are you going to be able to ensure that the interior fabric won't go away? (Mr. Mosher: A Covenant and Condition of Approval.)

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Bob Randall, owner of the house just to the North: I wanted to find out about how far the new addition will be away from the north property line. (Ms. Sutterley: It will be more in compliance than it is right now by about two feet.) The addition will go back and the historic house will remain? The shed area will be removed or remolded? (Ms. Sutterley: The non-historic shed will be removed.)

There were no more public comments and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Final Comments:*

- *Did the Commission support moving the historic building 3-feet to the west with negative points being assigned?*

Mr. Pringle: Is this necessary to have the accessory unit? I am wondering whether or not we can take a look at what his real outcome is. Three parking spots on the property drives the point that we should not be going forward with this proposal. Agree with moving the building forward, only the amount necessary for legal requirements.

Ms. Dudney: I support moving the building to the west.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Butler: Support moving the historic building, no problem to give the distance for a nice window well.

Ms. Christopher: Anything would be better than what it is; YES, but again, just as much as necessary.

Mr. Rath: If we can improve this property with the current owner, we can do the Town a favor. This limits us to two parking spots. I am not against finding ways to solve this. From an economic perspective I'm not sure how advantageous an accessory unit would be. In order to landmark it, you have to get the cars out of the front yard and restore the house and remove the dormers. No objection to moving the building.

Mr. Schroder: Question 1 and 3 kind of are related together. I don't support moving the house forward and losing the parking. The question that goes back is for no negative points; I don't support doing one and then giving the other. Parking needs to be worked out. I would support lining it up and making it more historic.

- *Did the Commission support requiring the preservation of interior historic fabric since no connector link is required?*

Mr. Pringle: No, I would rather see us work with not putting in a link rather than making some requirement that something exists in the future. I would rather go a more upfront way and see how that works.

Ms. Dudney: In terms on restoring the interior fabric, if this goes forward, there is going to be money spent and it will look neat. It will be a selling point of the house, so as long as it's approved by the staff upfront as to how the preservation is done. I will not be in favor of any Covenant or Condition for that. If it is done well then people won't look to change it in the future. I do support, in order to landmark the building.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Butler: Support preserving the interior fabric.

Ms. Christopher: A little on the fence for number two. I agree with Mr. Pringle that a connector link would be ideal; if there are additions as proposed, then something needed to protect that fabric from being lost.

Mr. Rath: We need to provide an opportunity to preserve interior fabric.

Mr. Schroder: Agree to what Staff suggested; there needs to be a Condition stating to preserve the interior fabric.

- *Did the Commission believe proposed snow-melt portion of the driveway is warranted without negative points because of the existing site conditions and neighboring property impacts?*

Mr. Pringle: Agree that it will be a good idea and support it with the fewest of negative points possible. I think the home has to be a home that is usable for today's needs and conditions. If we can make it as energy conservative as possible that would be great. We need to look at how we balance those issues out. In support of looking into rewriting Policy 80/A.

Ms. Sutterley: Gave a clarification of the exterior walls becoming interior. (Mr. Rath: I see no reason not to make some statement about how this house should be preserved in its perpetuity. This house is a mess now.) (Mr. Pringle: What we do is not cast in concrete.) The one other thing is, if the owner agrees to drop the accessory unit then it is a single family home with two parking spaces and no deed restrictions that will need to be moved somewhere. The deed restriction is being physically removed from the property. (Mr. Neubecker: I disagree. Staff will look into this.)

#### **COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. Dupey McGovern Dormers and Historic Preservation (MGT) PC#2011068; 413 East Washington Avenue  
Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to remove the existing 10" reveal metal siding and replace with historically accurate 4 1/2" reveal natural wood siding, remove the existing skylights and replace with dormers in the same location, and, finally, to remove the existing asphalt shingles and replace with standing seam metal roof.

While this residence is neither eligible for individual National Register nor Local Landmark status, it is a historic structure in our Historic District, and the preservation and rehabilitation of this residence is important.

#### Applicants' Preservation and Restoration Proposal:

1. Remove all current exterior siding and trim.
2. Install batt insulation at west wall along the deck area.
3. Install blown-in insulation where needed.
4. Relocate door three feet on west elevation to allow kitchen to function properly.
5. Remove existing casement window at east elevation and install new double hung unit.
6. Install 4 ½" natural wood siding on all exterior walls.
7. Replace all fascia, soffit, corner and window trim.
8. Remove existing skylights and install dormers in same location using existing openings.
9. Remove existing shingles and replace with standing seam metal roof.
10. Paint all exterior surfaces two colors to meet Development Code requirements.
11. Changing door on west elevation, non-historic portion of house.

The property owners propose to replace the non-historic bubble skylights with historically accurate dormers. The existing skylights leak water in the second floor and the applicants do not like the non-historic look of the bubble skylights. The use of dormers to provide a second floor in a one-and-a-half story building form is encouraged by the East Side Residential historic design standards. The applicants propose three options for the dormers, in this order:

1. Replace the bubble skylights with dormers using the existing skylight openings.
2. Replace the bubble skylights with flat glass skylights in the existing skylight openings.
3. Cover up the existing west skylight with the new metal roof and replace the eastern bubble skylight with a flat piece of glass. The eastern bubble skylight is above the bathroom and natural light is needed. Applicant would like to be able to open the glass to let steam escape.

The Planning Department recommends the Planning Commission approve PC#2011068, the Dupey/McGovern Siding and Skylight Replacement Proposal, located at 413 E. Washington Avenue, Lot 16A, Block 6, Yingling and Mickles Subdivision, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Butler: They have three options for dormers. Do any of those options impact the point analysis or your recommendation? (Mr. Thompson: No, I don't think it does. I think changing the siding would be worth the positive points and even if the bubble skylights could go away with flat glass skylights. I think it would be better than seeing the bubble skylights. The bubble skylights are leaking water into the house so something will have to be done.)

Mr. Pringle: I'm a big believer of not putting holes in a roof. (Mr. Thompson: The holes are already there, and he is a contractor so he has faith that he can get it done and it won't leak.) Would it be operable? (Mr. Thompson: Yes and it would be above the bathroom.) I think all the improvements you are making will be wonderful and will be a big improvement.

Mr. Jeff Dupey, Applicant: My wife is a flight attendant so she couldn't be present right now. We just put together a budget this year. I may employ people to help me with the roof, but the skylights are the biggest problem and I would really like to put in the dormers. Roof is just one level of asphalt. I am hoping that I can put in a microlam and put in those dormers. It will look better than a flat skylight and will look better than the ugly existing bubble skylights. The door on the west side is in the wrong spot; it would be nice to have the windows a little bit higher.)

Ms. Christopher: I like all the changes that you are proposing.

Mr. Schroder: What is your priority schedule? What would you like to see happen first? (Mr. Dupey: Initially I would wanted to shrink the dormers, but I was trying to stay within the existing openings, so the top part of the window will look into the top of the roof. I don't want to ruin the integrity of the roof any more.)

Mr. Lamb: Does the house sit on a foundation now? (Mr. Dupey: Yes, it is on a continuous foundation all the way around except the rear area.)

Mr. Schroder: Mr. Thompson, this has been presented to us as a Combined Hearing. We are being asked to approve it; can we approve the application if we don't know what the windows are going to be? (Mr. Neubecker: We feel there is a preferred pecking order for the roof, and what he has proposed will follow the above three steps mentioned.) (Mr. Dupey: I see your point; if it is

affordable and structurally possible then the dormers are my first choice.) (Mr. Thompson: It will still pass a point analysis with either option; it is a passing point analysis.) (Mr. Neubecker: Does any one of these dormer proposals give anyone heartburn where they wouldn't approve it?) (Mr. Pringle: I say doing the siding and getting rid of the non-historic door/windows on the west side would be worth the positive three (+3) points.) (Mr. Neubecker: We would be happy to report back to the Commission with the option Mr. Dupey chooses.)

Mr. Lamb: What is generating the positive three (+3) points is everything else, other than the dormers. I am confident that whatever we get will be better than what we have.

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

*Commissioner Final Comments:*

Mr. Pringle: Can we take the dormers/skylight issue out of this application and just look at the changing of the materials, with a condition that if they change anything with the skylight that they come back to staff so we know what we are approving? (Mr. Neubecker: One reason why I like leaving it in the application is because sometimes dormers are inappropriate, and need to be reviewed by the Commission. We don't want people to assume that they can just get dormers approved by staff.)

Ms. Dudney: Would it be appropriate to say that it is approved as shown and any changes to the roof would have to be approved by Staff? (Mr. Neubecker: Dormers or the flat skylights could be acceptable by the Commission.)

Mr. Lamb: I would prefer the dormers. Everything proposed is great. It is refreshing and rare for someone to generate positive three (+3) points and not use them.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Dupey McGovern Dormers and Historic Preservation, PC#2011068, 413 Washington Avenue. Mr. Rath seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Dupey McGovern Dormers and Historic Preservation, PC#2011068, 413 Washington Avenue, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Rath seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

***OTHER MATTERS:***

Mr. Truckey: Town Council Highlights:  
Final hearing on the 2012 budget is next week. From the Community Development perspective, one of the biggest issues was the potential reduction of a building inspector position (a planning position was already eliminated in the 2011 budget). At last week's Council budget retreat, the Council decided not to eliminate the building inspector position. This will allow us to continue to deliver the expected level of service to the builders. Other items discussed by Council at the retreat included the CIP budget, particularly related to the Arts District. The Barney Ford Lot will be paved and improved, with permanent pit firing provided. The historic Burro Barn, which has collapsed, will be taken apart and panelized to save the historic fabric and will eventually be reconstructed for use as public restrooms. Also, the Robert White house will get some remodeling done to it (roof, siding, etc.). Staff is looking into a State Historic Grant to help with that.

The old CMC/Harris Street Building: The Council is generally thinking it makes sense that Town Hall eventually moves over there. The question is whether to spend the money now or later on this project. Short-term they are going to lease it out to the new Peaks school for the 2012/2013 school year. The Council desires to hold a public design charette to come up with ideas for ultimate use of the facility. An RFP would then be released to solicit professional assistance with the design and remodel. The Council is looking at selling the existing Town Hall to finance the move to the old CMC. Moving Town Hall into the historic district seems an appropriate move. It is one of our historic gems, especially as far as institutional buildings in town, and the Town would probably be the best steward/tenant.

Explanation of the proposed change of the mill levy of taxes that is being considered by the Council to put on the April ballot: If put on the ballot, there would be less tax collected than from the existing mill levy. They are looking for a sustainable revenue stream for child care scholarships.

Amusement/Lift-Ticket Tax is also being considered for the April ballot. The general thought is that the proceeds that came out of that would go towards transportation. A combined bus system with the ski area has been discussed. There is also some desire to have an enhanced transit system with increased technology.

McCain property: The Council is interested in pursuing a solar garden there. First step is discussions with Alpine Rock regarding their existing lease with the Town. Master planning exercise for McCain may occur after these discussions.

Colorado Energy Collective: Moving forward with application with Xcel for the Stillson solar garden site. Council supports the project and the Town will be an anchor tenant.

The Council called up the Horse and Carriage application. A hearing will occur on December 13. Staff has issued a temporary permit that allows them to operate until the December decision by Council.

***ADJOURNMENT:***

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

---

Dan Schroder, Chair