

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Jim Lamb Trip Butler
Gretchen Dudney Michael Rath Dan Schroder
Jennifer McAtamney, Town Council
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:05

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 3, 2012 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (7-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Neubecker suggested discussing Joint Planning Commission and Town Council meeting dates and topics after the Town Council update. With no further changes, the January 17, 2012 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Landscaping Ordinance (JC)

Mr. Neubecker presented on behalf of Ms. Cram. The purpose of the Landscaping Guide is to provide more detail with regard to species selection, location, spacing between plants, planting details and maintenance of plants than what is outlined in the Landscaping Policy within the Development Code.

The Planning Commission reviewed Section 1 of the Landscape Guide on August 16th 2011. Section 1 specifically discussed species selection. Since that time, Staff has included the mature size for all trees and shrubs under Section 1 and completed Sections 2, 3 and 4.

Section 2 covers location and spacing. Section 3 includes details for planting and Section 4 discusses maintenance. Section 5 will cover common pests and diseases and is currently in progress. Graphics have been included to aid in descriptions. Some portions of this draft need additional work. This is to act as a guide for property owners.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Some plants are encouraged others are not. How will the Town handle this? (Mr. Neubecker: Staff will review plans and likely not assign any positive points if selected plants won't survive in this environment.) How about after any review; not subject to points? Is anything discouraged? (Mr. Neubecker: Not subject to review by Staff. Does the Commission want to include direction on discouraging specific species of plants?) Maybe allow or encourage fescue vs. bluegrasses when planting grasses. In Section 1, you mention a microclimate requires shelter from the wind, etc. What others do you mean by "etc."?
- Ms. Dudney: The Town does not really need to identify the plantings that are discouraged, unless it is part of an application that is seeking points. I am surprised irrigation systems are encouraged. Irrigation systems can use a lot of water. Sod uses a lot of water. Would we regulate how often people can use their irrigation? Don't prohibit any species if people want to take a chance.
- Mr. Rath: Lawns use a lot of water as they cover large areas and there is more evaporation. Drip irrigation is locally placed at each plant, delivered below grade. Drip irrigation is encouraged by the Town. (Mr. Neubecker: Encouraged to allow plantings to establish, for at least two years.) The suggestions in this book are going to affect a development application given to the Town? (Mr. Grosshuesch: That is what the Development Code is for, these are guidelines.)
- Mr. Schroder: Noted that the changes note "No known vines in this area". Maybe add cautionary note that if plants are not listed here, don't bother planting them since they won't survive. Like the way this is being presented.
- Ms. Christopher: The document acts as a good guideline for anyone wanting to plant in this environment.
- Mr. Lamb: Don't prohibit sod, but give people access to the information.
- Ms. McAtamney: Good to point out plants that don't grow here since people buy plants in other places and bring them back to Breckenridge. Often the local stores sell plants that do poorly here. With the grasses, pumping

verses broadcasting seed could be defined in more detail. If you cut grasses and not allow them going to seed, may not spread as well. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Landscaping Policies in the Development Code identify the general guidelines and refers to this guide.) (Mr. Truckey: We are trying to not get too specific as the existing code covers much of this already.)

2) Town Council Update

Ms. McAtamney: End of the year was only one meeting. Ski Area Lift Tax was big issues. Looked at Council's Top Ten List, which was reviewed and some items were crossed off and modified. MMD, Summit Stage was modified, plastic bags was incorporated into a sustainable business program (i.e. not propping door open in winter.) (Mr. Neubecker: Maybe an airlock entry could allow outer door to stay open.) Amusement tax was another idea; some thought lift ticket tax was punitive to ski area, some thought it was rational. Consolidating the transportation system throughout the Town and the ski area is another goal; we are not at the point of solidifying this idea, but looking for opportunities for other partnerships with the ski area. Council has started talking about the round-about at Four O'clock Road and Park Avenue; CDOT does not have the money, so Town Council may fund more of improvements; then we looked at Town wide road and traffic issues. Water planning, the Riverwalk study, and F-Lot redevelopment are other goals.

Council passed an emergency ordinance to allow open containers at the Ullr Parade. We will be bringing back a regular ordinance allowing open containers at other events. Manure ordinance was adopted. Landscape Architect signature requirement was not supported by Town Council and did not pass. Carriage rides was resolved at Welcome Center location.

The Town Attorney is looking at sign code changes and limits of signs on private property and vehicles.

Mr. Pringle: Don't see a lot of presence of Staff helping patrons around town, on the bus systems or getting around or out of Town, etc. Hard to find an officer to ask directions. As a charter home rule community (not statutory) we can allow open containers. What about signs on vehicles? It used to be a small magnetic sign on the side of a truck. Now the whole vehicle is a sign. (Mr. Neubecker: We can look at this when sign code revisions come up.)

Mr. Rath: Regarding traffic, has anyone thought of a smart-phone application to aid guests? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Variable Message Sign does some of this.) (Mr. Neubecker: The Ski Area is adding some signs too.) Lift ticket tax would be only for tickets sold in Town? Could tickets be sold out of town, or in remote lots, without the tax? (Ms. McAtamney: Most are season pass holders and we want them to not park in the remote lots, as the remote guest usually spend less in Town.)

Mr. Neubecker: Joint PC and TC topics and dates?

Mr. Schroder: April 7-14 is Spring Break.

Ms. McAtamney: Sign Code revisions could be a topic.

Mr. Lamb: Improved transit; smart phone apps.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Giller Residence (MM) PC#2011054; 306 South Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented an application 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 demolish 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 residential duplex, with a three-car garage (with a vehicle lift over one space). A color material board was also presented.

Changes since the last Preliminary Hearing on November 15, 2011

1. The landscaping plan has been modified to meet the suggested criteria under the Landscaping Policy of the Development Code to be awarded positive two (+2) points.
2. Overall square footage has increased by four square feet.
3. A draft HERS index rating has been included.

This is the fourth review of this proposal. The applicant and agent have responded to all concerns and direction provided over the last meetings. At this time, Staff had only one question: Did the Commission support assigning negative two (-2) points for heating the internal courtyard for the project?

Negative points proposed for snow removal/heated driveway (-2 points); All parking in rear of house away from street (positive points); Landscaping plan improved, planting sizes increased, more in line with code suggestions for positive points (positive two (+2) points recommended); Positive twelve (+12) points suggested for historic preservation; Local Landmarking recommended since it exceeds minimum requirements; Draft HERS rating proposed; Index of 60 needed for positive three (+3) points. Staff noted that this needs to be certified before the building permit issued. A total of negative nineteen (-19) points, and positive nineteen (+19) points were suggested. Total score is zero (0) points. Staff requested the Commission confirm negative two (-2) points for heated driveway.

Staff welcomed any other comments.

Staff recommended approval of the Giller Residence Restoration, Rehabilitation, Addition and Landmarking, PC#2011054, by supporting the presented Point Analysis. Staff recommended approval of the same with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Staff also suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark the historic structure based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Lamb: Is it sprayed-in foam for high R-value? I think there is space to park two reasonable cars. This meets the parking requirement.
- Mr. Pringle: Please explain how lift will work in garage. (Mr. Giller, Applicant: Lift is high enough to allow one vehicle to park above another. Attraction of Breckenridge is that it is walk-able. Lift does work. However, it won't accommodate height of two Range Rovers, but will hold two normal sedans. Garage is about 9'10" overall height. We slightly lowered the garage floor to accommodate the lift.) Is this required parking? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.) I know the Code has a two dimensional requirement for parking spaces. What about three dimensions, for height? This is an absolute parking requirement, but it only works for small vehicles. A Jeep Grand Cherokee is not a tall vehicle, but very popular here. If three parking spots are required, the presumption is that parking will accommodate a reasonable vehicle. Not sure this is what was intended. Don't want to design parking for only one type of vehicle that will fit. Don't think there is precedent for this. Storm Residence is not good precedent, since the lift was not for required parking. Anything bigger than a sedan or compact car may not fit. Question if it complies with absolute policy. We are not getting parking in garage. I question positive points. Bad precedent to set. What does the Fire Department and Building Department say about this?
- Mr. Butler: I think a Subaru and an Audi will fit.
- Ms. Christopher: Average garage door height is 7 feet. Toyota Corollas, which I own, are 57" high. I am concerned about all the other issues related to garage doors. Other than that, we love it. Maybe the floor can be lowered some more.
- Mr. Rath: Lots of people have ski racks too. Most garages now have 8 foot doors. What about BMW X5; an SUV won't ever be parked in garage? We need to be reasonable about the cars people drive up here, with ski racks on them.
- Mr. Schroder: What we are saying is that reasonable vehicles need to fit. We need to see what the code says about this. Code does not address height.
- Ms. Dudley: What happens if they can't fit 2 cars? How big is the garage? (Ms. Sutterley, Architect: 22' x 22'.) What car could you park? Parking spot does not need to fit every conceivable car, but it should accommodate reasonable vehicles. If it was a relative policy, we could assign negative points. I need to know a car that will fit for sure. I don't have any problem with the lift idea. It does not have to fit the tallest car, but an average car.
- Ms. Sutterley: (To Mr. Mosher): During your narrative you mentioned negative six (-6) points, not negative nine (-9) points for above ground density. On parking, there is one spot behind the building. We have room to have 5 more cars in driveway. We can't do that since we would have to ask someone to move their

- car. Technically it blocks a parking spot. (Mr. Giller: I acknowledge that garage is tight. It is not ideal but I think it works.)
- Mr. Pringle: It may work for you. I have seen so many projects go to sale after approved. But what do we do with the next guy? (Mr. Giller: I did calculate that my car and my wife's car will fit. She drives an Audi A3 and I have an A4. Both are 56" tall. That is 9'5".)
- Ms. Dudney: According to the calculations described by Ms. Christopher, you can't even fit those cars. (Mr. Giller: We will go back and make sure it fits.)

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

Mr. Mosher suggested that we continue this discussion to a future meeting, to allow for more research and to provide exhibits and details on the parking lift.

Mr. Pringle moved to continue the Giller Residence (PC#2011054), 306 South Ridge Street, to a future meeting date. Ms. Christopher seconded. The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Dan Schroder, Chair