

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Trip Butler Gretchen Dudney
Jim Lamb Michael Rath David Pringle arrived at 7:05 pm
Dan Schroder was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the July 17, 2012 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (6-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the July 3, 2012 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (6-0).

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Gary Gallagher:

1. Harris Street Building (old CMC building): Town Council agreed to take it to the next step which is fine tuning the cost numbers for both the library space as well as the Town of Breckenridge space and sitting down with the County to determine the appropriate contribution from each of the parties. Architectural plans and floor layouts were deemed generally favorable by both of the parties.
2. Breckenridge is looking to entice the Ice Castles to town this coming winter. Probable location is downtown, most likely either the RWC lawn or Tiger Dredge parking lot. Event would fit nicely with Towns' desire to have family oriented activities for our guests.
3. Snowball Express is a bit more controversial. Three day event at which 10,000 people would attend each day. Ice skating rink is most likely location at the moment. Mixed reviews from town of Avon which held the event in the past. Council is divided regarding the event at the moment. 4 in favor and 3 against. Town has asked promoter if event can be scheduled in early April rather than in January, as the town is busier in January than in April.
4. Council has agreed to certain business items with Breckenridge Grand Vacations and the Breckenridge Ski Resort to enable the building of an 80 unit time share project on Peak 8, where the Bergenhof restaurant is currently located. Project will move forward in the normal course of business including, of course, Planning Commission review.
5. Solar Gardens: Xcel Energy is close to accepting solar proposals from potential users in the state. Town of Breckenridge has identified 2 properties (Stillson and McCain) that could accommodate the solar program and is prepared to make a significant investment in this regard. More info should be forthcoming in the next month or so. Project will undergo customary Planning Commission review.
6. Plastic Bags: Council has determined something needs to be done regarding non re-usable plastic bags and would like to have an acceptable road map in place prior to the end of the year to begin addressing this issue. Council wants to involve interested parties in the community to help shape the ultimate program to ensure "buy in" by all.
7. Fire Bans: County dropped their fire ban this morning, and Frisco, Dillon and Silverthorne are expected to follow suit shortly. Forest Service will be making a decision with respect to the White River National Forest this week. Breckenridge may drop their fire ban shortly as well, and we would return to our normal practices.
8. Council would like to ask Planning Commission to go back and think about the issue of sheds/secondary structures. Seems many projects in the historic district recently have had these elements arise. Council would like input as to whether code changes are advisable and if so, what might they be. Chris Neubecker indicated Planning would be looking at this subject in an upcoming work session.
9. Rodeo: Mr. Pringle asked about the rodeo and expressed a desire that it is a fun event with little conflict

and suggested that Council attend to ward off any unhappy attendees.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Shock Hill Master Plan, Tract C (MGT) PC#2012050, 200 Shock Hill Drive

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to Master Plan for 15 units totaling 38,400 sq. ft. per the approved Shock Hill Master Plan. The proposal is for 15 market-rate units in duplex and single family form. Master Plan development standards in the form of Master Plan Notes are proposed for the entire development. After Council approval, each building will be submitted separately for review under individual Class C applications. The Shock Hill Master Plan allocated 24 SFE's for Tract C Shock Hill. In December 2010 an amendment to the Shock Hill Master Plan was approved for the Shock Hill Lodge and Spa with 66.70 SFE's, which would have required density to be transferred to the site. The current proposal is to go back to the original Shock Hill Master Plan and only use the 24 SFE's allowed in the Master Plan.

Staff had the following questions with this evening's presentation:

- Did the Commission have any comments on the Master Plan notes?
- Did the Commission support the depicted building separation for the units?
- Did the Commission believe the level of intensity is appropriate and allows for the site to function efficiently, and is still buffered well from the neighbors?
- Did the proposed Penn Lode Drive access and circulation work well as a 14' wide one-way private road?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I can't read the notes. I would think that you could gain a little bit more of the urban look. Tweak the setbacks between structures to gain a little bit of space. Level of intensity is appropriate; buffer the site from neighbor to neighbor; the 14 foot roadway is fine.

Mr. Lamb: Well written Staff Report Matt; building separation is fine; narrow road is a good idea, less asphalt is a good thing.

Ms. Dudney: Ditto, agree with Mr. Lamb's comments.

Mr. Butler: No comments. I do support the building separation; level of intensity is appropriate; like the 14 foot private road.

Ms. Christopher: Ditto.

Mr. Rath: Ditto. The access makes a lot of sense; integrates well with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Staff welcomed any additional comment and suggested this application return for a Final Hearing.

Mr. Marc Hogan, Architect for the Applicant: Very pleased to be here; Tim and Patty Casey are also present. Appreciate the one way drive saving more trees; got rid of all of the pine beetle trees. We will incorporate energy conservation; all units planned for both solar thermal and PV. Some of the buildings are shaded and they will be challenged, but they will all be roughed in for those elements.

(No questions from Planning Commission.)

Mr. Casey: We assembled a team with Marc and Steve considering what would fit well on the site. We approached the owners and indicated that we would like to purchase Tract C and do something and more like the Shock Hill Cottages; met with Mr. John Quigley and feel that we have landed on something fitting. We appreciate the Staff and their review.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Christopher: Master plan notes on our pdf; can't read the notes. Question: Does this private one way drive line up with Columbia drive? (Mr. Thompson: Yes it does line up with Columbia Drive.) Looks good so far. Likes the idea of less paving for the private road.

Mr. Lamb: No negative points? (Mr. Thompson: No.)

Final Comments:

Mr. Rath: Interested in final design. (Mr. Neubecker: Staff will compare the proposed architecture to the concept Master Plan notes to make sure that they are consistent.) I think variety is important. (Mr. Hogan: Have developed rough concepts and have some to provide at the final hearing. Variety is important to this Master Plan.)

Ms. Christopher: Appreciate the lower amount of paving; are you going to continue the sidewalk from the road? (Mr. Casey: Yes; it will be tied into the existing sidewalk.) (Mr. Thompson: Wetlands report; the original plat for Tract C showed a small wetland.) (The applicants did not believe it was a wetland; however, there is a recorded wetland on the plat. The applicants hired a consultant (Mike Claffey) to determine as to whether or not it was a wetland and ultimately decided that it was not a wetland. A Condition of Approval will be added prior to the final hearing requiring a new Plat to be recorded with no wetland shown.)

Mr. Pringle: Hoping that we get a better idea of what architecture the project will look like. Suggested the applicant consider not use up all of the allowable density and mass, as property owners in the future will want to do additions.

Ms. Dudney: Relied on Matt's Staff Report, which listed many of the Master Plan Notes. Comfortable with the Master Plan as proposed.

2. Welk Resorts Condo-Hotel (MM) PC #2012044; 87 Shores Lane

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a 72-unit condo-hotel at Parcels C-1, C-2 and a Portion of Tract A of the Shores at the Highlands Subdivision. With this submittal, the Applicants have refined the design of the buildings and site and are in the process of adjusting the areas and counts with staff to be sure the calculations work and that there will be a passing point analysis. Hence, this submittal is still lacking these numerical details. Staff has recently met with the applicants with the goal of offering a more comprehensive review at the next hearing.

At the June 5, 2012, Worksession, Staff heard general support for the overall concept for the building forms, finishes and general architecture. There were concerns expressed about the parking layout and site buffering. Changes since that meeting include: modification of the parking layout and creation of landscaping with berms. Staff anticipates having greater numerical detail (densities, parking, snow stacking etc.) with the next submittal.

As indicated, the Applicant is seeking comments regarding the general concept as presented. There will be additional detail when the application returns again for a second preliminary review. Staff welcomed any additional comments or concerns.

Ms. Dudney: There seems like there are so many negative points. (Mr. Mosher: Lots of options available to add positive points for example, for shuttle, employee housing, refuse within building, etc. The initial draft review of the points came up with a passing score of positive eight (+8) points. That is what the developer is working towards.)

The Applicants were present and made a presentation. Jon Fredericks, President of Welk Resorts; Brett Park,

Valley Landscape Design Group (Landscape Architect); Jeff Edwards, Development Crew; Rick Hulbert, Architect.

Mr. Fredericks: Welk is a family owned company - a grandson of Lawrence Welk; we have been in this business since 1964 with 43,000 vacation owners. Average owner is 47 years old; \$90,000 a year income. We generate \$130 million per year in annual revenue. We want to focus on the revision on the plans based on your input. We are known for high product and service levels; top 5% of our industry.

Mr. Hulbert: The great thing about working with the Welk Company is that each development should have a sense of place in its own context. I toured the town with Mr. Tom Begley, met Mr. Mosher, and came up with our objectives:

- Respect the town history; use as inspiration;
- Celebrate the present setting and emerging development (the challenge is that it has been dredge mined);
- Anticipate the future of sustainable master planned resort design.
- Guests that come to the resort, neighbors who come to the resort and visitors.

Narrative in conjunction with conceptual drawings and plat for Level 3:

The great thing about this team is that we have members in all venues of the development: landscape, design, production. We want to encourage a design that is more timeless and less trendy and sets a precedent. (Mr. Hulbert presented an aerial view.) Some portions of the buildings will be three-stories stepping down at the edges to two-stories. We are going to make a case for it. We would like to pretend that there is a miner who made some money; didn't want to be a miner anymore, wanted to be a rancher, so he built a big stone based home with a big chimney. What was left when we "found it" was a chimney; also he had a bunkhouse for the ranch hands and a horse barn. We are going to take these three elements to design our community. Lobby building is for amenities; barn is now a meetings facility with a little commercial. The lobby building interfaces with the new time share units that are a mix of 2 and 3 stories. Employee housing, housekeeping and maintenance building is also provided. No backs or sides; all fronts. Amenities: indoor and outdoor pool, lobby, check in, ski storage, owners lounge, fitness facility, games room for family use. We put a skylight over the fireplace for light, but all of the lighting is downcast lighting per planning. From the lobby building you can walk down to time share suites lighted by side lights for mobility. Lots of elegant berms; internal gardens in-between the lobby and pool area and time share building. (Mr. Hulbert provided elevations of the buildings, plats with grade noted from top of project to bottom. Showed floor plans for 2 bedrooms and 3 bedrooms; 1,200-1,300 square feet.)

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: What is happening around the project? I am concerned about project looking into the units south. (Mr. Park and Mr. Hulbert: They would be buffered with landscape and berm. Berms wrap around the project that buffer and repeat throughout the project.) How close are you to the McCain property? (Mr. Park: Determined to be almost a mile away.) My only concern is to protect the project from what can happen around you.

Mr. Pringle: What is your relationship with the river? You are going to set the tone; this will be a positive impact on the surrounding projects. (Mr. Park: We are working backwards from the river; trying to let nature take its natural course up the slope; this is a working landscape with the fish, birds and river. We are going to work with staff to restore the landscape.) When I talked about telling a story last time, in my mind, when you come into Breckenridge people wonder why buildings are there. The project has context. I am a leery

of the design of the big barn, and maintenance facility. Don't know if that is the design concept; maybe go to a mining type concept. Height will be an issue although I am not opposed to it as long as it is done well and can be mitigated.

Mr. Rath: You have a lot of 'guts' for launching this without knowing what else will go out there; looks like you are creating an 'oasis'. You're going to bring all of this greenery and I hope that it starts a trend out of it; it was once, before the dredge boats, a river running through trees. I wish you luck and hope the neighbors support you. You really listened to us from last time; creating something that belonged here. I like that you have a story. Sooner rather than later, involve some people who are intimate with Breckenridge to inject some local design passion.

Ms. Christopher: Thank you for listening from the last meeting. Good design here. I hope that you have neighbor support. Thoughts: 50 foot line on the barn; looks like glass for balusters; not safe for mountain living.

Mr. Lamb: Story is interesting; I understand that it isn't a modern building. I like the idea of recreating the ecosystem, and the berming around the parking lot.

Mr. Butler: In the future, this will be coveted for seeing this vision today.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Jerky Wagon (CN) PC#2012049, 100 South Main Street

Mr. Neubecker presented a proposal for a small vendor cart to sell jerky (dried meats) at the southeast corner of Lincoln and Main Streets. Climax Jerky, Inc. is a retail business that sells a variety of dried meats, known as "jerky". The company operates in several locations throughout the state, and has operated in Breckenridge since 2008. Sales are made from a covered wagon. The wagon is 8'4" long, 4'4" wide and about 8' tall. The wagon is constructed primarily of wood and steel, with a canvas cover.

The Jerky Wagon has been in this location since 2008. Prior to 2008, other vendors have used this location for vending food and beverages, since at least 1992. In March 2012 the Town Council adopted a revised Vendor Cart policy in the Development Code to address the new and existing vendor carts in town. The new Vendor Cart Policy 49 (Absolute) sets design standards for both large and small vendor carts. This proposal is for a small vendor cart, since it is less than 40 square feet and the cart will be removed from the site each day after operations end.

Mr. Neubecker went through the design standards for small vendor carts. Staff found the application to be in compliance with all policies required.

The Planning Department has approved Climax Jerky Wagon vendor cart, PC#2012049, located at 100 S. Main Street, Lincoln West Mall, with the attached findings and conditions.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

The owner, Brooke Comi started in Climax 13 years ago and thanked the Commission for taking the time to review.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Christopher: Do you have other jerky carts? (Ms. Comi: Silverthorne, all farmers markets, 16th Street mall and 2 locations at DIA.)

Mr. Pringle: This is exactly what we had in mind when we discussed vendor carts. I support it.

Mr. Lamb: This is what a proper vendor application should look like.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Jerky Wagon, PC#2012049, 100 South Main

Street. Ms. Christopher seconded and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Jerky Wagon, PC#2012049, 100 South Main Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion carried unanimously (6-0)

2) Lot 1, Block 10A, Airport Resubdivision (MM) PC#2012045, Continental Court (CR 923)

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to resubdivide Lot 1, Block 10A, Breckenridge Airport Subdivision Amended into two lots. The proposed lots are to be used with the adjacent western lots in the County's Continental Subdivision. No density is associated with this land. The lots may only be used in the future for landscaping, parking, and storage in accordance with the provisions of the Town's Development Code.

The Planning Department has advertised this resubdivision as a Combined Preliminary and Final Hearing, as Staff believes all relevant issues to be resolved. This resubdivision complies with the Subdivision Ordinance and the terms of the Breckenridge Airport Planned Unit Development.

Staff recommended that the Commission approve the Re-subdivision of Lot 1, Block 10A, Breckenridge Airport Subdivision Amended Class B Subdivision, PC#2012045, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: Could you ever transfer density back on? (Mr. Mosher: No, property is stripped of all density.) What does splitting this accomplish? (Mr. Mosher: This property abuts parcels that are in the County. The conditions within the PUD are that if any of these were to subdivide, we would say it needed to be subdivided as well. Intended for parking; ownership should line up and work together.)

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Lot 1, Block 10A, Airport Resubdivision, PC#2012045, Continental Court (CR 923), with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

3) Silverthorne House Extended Vesting (JP) PC#2012035, 300 North Main Street

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to extend the property rights vesting for a site plan development permit to construct one duplex building (Building B), one single family building (Building C), relocate, restore and convert the existing barn (Building D) to a deed restricted residential unit, add a parking area in the rear of the lot, install remaining landscaping, and install a new trash enclosure. Mr. Dave Hartman, Applicant, was also present at the meeting.

The Silverthorne house site plan addition, restoration, and landmarking development permit was approved June 9, 2009 and was valid for a 3 year period (expiring on June 8, 2012). The Applicant has partially completed the development. Last summer the Silverthorne house underwent a historic restoration including installation of foundation, restoration and repair of the building exterior and 20 foot relocation on site. The Silverthorne house and carriage barn was also historically landmarked in 2009. The front yard was restored to its historic condition by removing the driveway off of Main Street, allowing the Town to construct Main Street improvements and landscaping and drainage was installed. The completed work primarily received all positive points with the exception of relocating the historic house 20 feet on the lot.

The Applicant has not completed the site plan primarily due to economic conditions. Mr. Hartman has expressed

his intent of moving forward with the carriage barn this summer and buildings B and C in the next two years.

No changes to the application are proposed from the development permit approved in 2009. Staff has kept the original point analysis, approved by the Planning Commission at the June 9, 2009 meeting; however, should the Planning Commission find that the Applicant shall meet the modifications to the Handbook of Design Standards, the applicant would not meet Policy 5 (Absolute) *Architectural Compatibility*, resulting in a failing point analysis and failing project.

Subsequent to the approval of this application in 2009, the Town approved a number of code changes that would no longer allow several features of their design or future subdivision of footprint lots. As such, code section 9-1-17 (I) allows the Planning Commission several options in its consideration of the request to extend the vesting. The Commission has the ability to 1) review and approve this application under the Codes in effect at the time of the original permit application in 2009 which would essentially be extending the vested property rights, 2) deny the extended property right application or 3) require the recently adopted Design Standards to be followed or a combination of the two as conditions. The Planning Commission may approve, deny or approve the extension with conditions (per code section 9-1-17-11 (I)).

Mr. Dave Hartman, the owner and Applicant: The property was in a state of disrepair; we started this project in 2006 and it took 3 years to take it through the Planning Commission. It is a landmark property on Main; the key was to get the Silverthorne house relocated to a foundation; we completed a good restoration and restored the front yard historic context. We slowed the development because of the economy in 2009. In 2010, I set up a temporary office and moved the Silverthorne house to its current location. We are ready to start Phase 2 of this project; had structural's come through today for the Carriage House restoration and conversion into a two story employee unit. Please extend these vested rights as I received them and support a future waiver to the new subdivision footprint code requirements. If we resubmit under the the current code, I will not be able to put the density allowed and planned for the site plan to recoup restoration costs incurred. I would like to recoup some of the capital I invested in the restoration of the property. Additionally, Staff's request to change the exterior can be done, but seems like a lot of barn wood. (Mr. Rath: What percentage of your total budget has been spent?) We are just shy of a half million dollars for the Silverthorne house. We need about \$150,000 for the carriage barn and \$1 million for the two new buildings, so we spent about 1/3 of what the total costs will be thus far.

Staff has specific questions on the following:

1. Would the Commission apply the 2010 code modification regarding building scale to the project resulting in a non-passing point analysis or uphold the decision made in 2009?
2. Staff has recommended that Building B have an exterior material modification to rough sawn siding or similar to appear more like that found historically on outbuildings. Did the Commission concur?
3. Did the Commission find that the application should be modified to meet Priority Policy 89 regarding setbacks resulting in a non-passing point analysis?
4. Did the Commission want to require the application to meet the Priority Policy 81 modification and have the buildings lowered in height to be below the building height of the Silverthorne house resulting in a failed point analysis or find that as the original barn in 1890 was 2 stories results in this policy being not applicable?
5. Would the Commission support a waiver at this time per Code section 9-2-1-15 to the 2010 subdivision code modifications on footprint lots? (Note that as a subdivision application is not before the Commission at this time, this is not a formal decision for a waiver.)

If the Commission finds that the Silverthorne House Site Plan meets all absolute polices and supports the final point analysis which was previously approved, Staff recommended approval of PC#2012035 with the following additional condition (to the 2009 development permit):

1. The applicant shall modify Building B exterior materials to be a rough sawn siding or similar material to be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Michael Cavanaugh: Congrats to Dave for his tenacity and restoration work; there is a precedent that you might be setting. I think that it is a good one to set. His project is a good project.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Does this set a precedent for future Planning Commissions? (Ms. Puester: This is a unique circumstance; it is extending a project which has already begun in which the Applicant has developed what received positive points initially.) In the 1890 Sanborn map, the original barn in the back was higher. So why would we write the code so that secondary properties should be shorter than primary? (Mr. Neubecker: That was the desired character, generally. We had seen a lot of taller buildings in the back being proposed at the time and it was determined that was not the desired character. Not necessarily will it always be that way. There are always special circumstances such as this one where the barn was taller than the Silverthorne house historically.)

Mr. Rath: Is it relevant that these will be footprint lots? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Spoke to the national standards with respect to the footprint lots-they are acceptable in mixed use areas which this is in, our Downtown Overlay District; also said that the recommendation is to extend the vested property rights which means keep the footprint, keep the structure sizes and change the material on the Building B. In the downtown area there is more of a mixed product, and having units subdivided off is more in character with the rest of the area.)

Mr. Lamb: I am in agreement with Staff. To change the rules for the Applicant in the middle of the project construction is not fair. If we hold him up we would end up with a worse project. These are special circumstances. He was in before the code changes. We want people to restore historic houses and we need to treat him fairly. I support a waiver to allow for the subdivision and am ambivalent about the material change.

Mr. Butler: It is incongruous that the 2010 Commission helped modify the code to current state and now in 2012 would not apply it. I like the project. I would not apply the 2010 code modifications in this case. I don't have a problem with exterior material on the duplex. No, they should not have to modify setbacks, no on building height modification and I support a future waiver at this time.

Ms. Christopher: The location of this project is in an area with mixed uses, there are other examples of footprint subdividing in this block. We should allow the Applicant to continue project as approved. This is a unique circumstance where the code was changed after his project was approved and he went forward in good faith. Alright with the 3 year vesting, uphold the 2009 codes, the setbacks no change, Applicant should work with the Staff on exterior of building B, no to the lower building heights, the waiver, yes supports one.

Mr. Rath: Thinks there is a lot of density-the whole alley is like that; the argument that there have been changes in the economy is common although code has changed. I don't want to pull the 'rug' out from someone's feet. He started this with good intentions. Stick with 2009, exterior modification seems like such a small issue but I support Staff's opinion on that. Applicant should change exterior of building B to be more barn like. In support of a passing analysis, I don't believe that we should support a failing analysis, I support a waiver.

Mr. Pringle: Asked for clarification on the building elements change. Is there any inappropriate

ornamentation? (Ms. Puester: No, that was removed prior to the 2009 approval). Do we accomplish what we want with the barn siding? (Ms. Puester: We would work with the Applicant to find something appropriate that fits. C is 1/8 rough sawn; B is 4” cementations horizontal lap reveal.) (Mr. Neubecker and Mr. Grosshuesch: Discussed a simple design for the barn wood design.) I agree with what Mr. Lamb said; the Applicant has been working on completing this property. He has done a beautiful job. It would be easy to give him a permit renewal with no changes. I don’t want to answer any of the questions except will we grant the waiver, and the answer is yes.

Ms. Dudney: This is the first time that the Planning Commission has had this ‘power’. It is not common that the code changes so significantly and not fair to change the rules on the applicant half way through. A Master Plan is different than a single property. He has encountered all of the expensive outlay upfront. I think we should waive the code change. I also agree with the Applicant about not changing the exterior on Bldg B. It was approved in 2009.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Silverthorne House Extended Vesting, PC#2012035, 300 North Main Street. Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the Silverthorne House Extended Vesting, PC#2012035, 300 North Main Street, leaving the presented findings and conditions that were approved in 2009. Mr. Rath seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Dudney: Can we talk about having a work session per City (Town) Council. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We would like to give you some recommendations and analysis; we don’t have it yet but it is coming.)

Mr. Grosshuesch: Regarding the Silverthorne House; the principle is important to the integrity of the historic district. We are happy with the outcome. Don’t minimize the importance of the principle.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:14 p.m.

Gretchen Dudney, Vice Chair