

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Trip Butler Gretchen Dudney
Jim Lamb Dan Schroder Eric Mamula
Dave Pringle
Jennifer McAtamney, Town Council Liaison, was absent

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Mosher noted that with the Town Council Liaison being absent, there would be no Town Council Report. With no other changes, the May 7, 2013 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the April 16, 2013 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (7-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Niernberg Residence (MGT) PC#2013031; 123 Windwood Circle
2. Schuman Garage (JP) PC#2013032; 11 Willow Green
3. Rallo Residence (JP) PC#2013033; 1030 Four O'Clock Road

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

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Maggie Point Homes (MM) PC#2013004; 9525 Highway 9

Mr. Butler: The company I am associated with, Creative Cabinetry, has an opportunity to bid this project; I do not have a problem with it, but is it a potential conflict of interest?

Mr. Mamula: I don't think it matters if it is a worksession or not. It may still be a concern.

Ms. Dudney: I would think that you might have an incentive to see it approved.

Mr. Butler: Removed himself from the worksession related to Maggie Point Homes.

Mr. Mosher presented a plan for the review of a fit test for this property. The Town Council is considering a modification to the existing annexation agreement for Maggie Point, but before they act on that request, they asked that Planning Commission to review the plan, and provide a preliminary assessment/point analysis against the Development Code. The input from the Planning Commission is an important consideration in the Council's decision prior to any modification of the agreement. The project was approved, after a lengthy process on August 19, 2009 with a new design of 21 townhomes in the form of nine duplexes and one triplex. Four of the units were market-rate and 17 were affordable housing. This represented the 80/20 ratio of affordable to market units the Town Council seeks with all raw land annexations. There were 16 three-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units. Each unit had at least a one-car garage (some had two-car garages).

The management of Maggie Placer LLC changed after the 2009 plan was approved, the development permit expired, and the project was never constructed. The new management of the LLC approached the Town in 2012 to modify the agreement again, and after some discussion the Council agreed to the following substantive changes/contingencies:

- 1) elimination of one unit for a maximum of 20 units total with 10 deed restricted and 10 market (50/50 ratio)
- 2) lowered AMI targets from 115-140% AMI to 80-95% AMI
- 3) use of local labor/suppliers
- 4) commencement of development by June 2013
- 5) approval of an amended development permit by June 2013 (to supersede the approved 2009 plan)

It was Staffs' understanding that the elimination of one unit (as requested by Town Council) would reduce the intensity of the development on the site plan that had been approved in 2009 and would mitigate some of the earlier concerns about site disturbance. However, the owner began a significant redesign of the project with a new architect and, as a result of new market information and construction feasibility analysis, a very different plan was ultimately presented to staff in early 2013. While the new plan is preferable in some ways (stick-built as opposed to modular), the modification to the size and configuration of the units did little to improve the impacts to the site plan. Staff expressed concerns about the fit and the livability of the units to the applicant and architect. The applicant has met with the Town's Housing Committee who also expressed concerns about the intensity of the development as it related to the Development Code and the site impacts.

In order to construct the plan as submitted the owner will need the Council to approve additional modifications to the agreement, specifically to:

- 1) eliminate one additional unit-down to 19 (9 market and 10 deed restricted)
- 2) increase AMI targets slightly to 80-100% AMI
- 3) eliminate 3 bedroom units (deed restricted units)
- 4) add more time for development review/entitlements, etc.

Before the Council considers these modifications to the annexation agreement, we are seeking input from the Planning Commission regarding the site plan and specifically whether the proposed plan is likely to pass a point analysis.

An initial point analysis shows the following:

Negative points:

- -4 points under Policy 7, Site and Environmental Design / Site Buffering
- -2 points under Policy 7, Site and Environmental Design / Site Privacy
- -4 points under Policy 9, Placement of Structures/ Snow Storage (still under review and need Commission input)

This brings the total to negative six (-6) or negative ten (-10) points.

Positive ten (+10) points are typically awarded under Policy 24 for the affordable housing, however the Council has already discussed that the maximum award in this case should be +7. This is due to the Council's concession on the standard 50/50 ratio for deed restricted to market units.

Staff is seeking input from the Commission on the suggested point assignments as outlined above. This information is important to the Council as they consider the applicant's current annexation agreement request.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Site buffering; would that portion of the code be intended to address its buffering within the property? Not just around it?

Ms. Christopher: What was it on the employee housing in Valley Brook?

Mr. Schroder: How many reiterations have been drawn?

Mr. Bobby Craig, Arapahoe Architects:

I'd like to introduce Ms. Diane Yost, the owner's rep, Mr. Jim Schlegal, Realtor, and Mr. Tim Crane of Compass Homes.

We have one similarity with the past application which is the loop road. We didn't feel like there were any other options. Additionally, Tim Crane and myself have done these loop roads before. Other than that, everything is totally different. The last one was a stack-a-shack; lower end units; we realized that we have to make this a seamless market rate project. We can't let the affordable units appear to look as if they are affordable or we will hurt the market rates. Firstly, the duplexes allow us to manipulate the site; we can break them up. Vertically we can step them with the site, less fill, saves us money and makes the site less of an over lot grade and running with the top. We can angle them, turn them towards views. We have 20-40 feet plus of separation. They are not all uniform. That allows landscape pockets along the sides. We think it's a much higher end unit. We wanted to stay at the exact same square footage as before, so we stacked everything. That results in 25% less building footprint with the same square footage. We also reduced asphalt which gives us snow stack and landscaping. The annexation amendment needs to change; the date that we start needs to change. As far as the rest of it, we can modify and come back. With experience from Mr. Mosher, Ms. Best and the Housing Committee, they advised a different mix. If we don't extend the start date, we have to up the price point of these units. Regarding architecture: natural materials, rock based, wood garage doors, lots of gables, shed roofs, covered porches. Which of these two are the affordable? The point that I'm trying to make is, when you look at the elevations, the more bland elevation is actually the market rate unit. The affordable units have better road presence. We didn't want the affordable units to be the cheap end of this thing. So we made quantitative changes to open up this site.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Mamula: Which ones are the market rates? (Mr. Craig: Pointed out market rate and affordable units.)
- Ms. Dudney: Was there not a middle ground between the long structure on the previous application and making a four-plex? Attach two buildings instead of three to increase open space on the site? (Mr. Craig: We could do that except it will fight other things that we are trying to do; grading, we would have to square up all of the buildings where as now we have everything angled. We feel that the duplex design is a better product and warrants a higher price point.) Could you go around the plan and give us the distance eave to eave please?
- Mr. Mamula: And please clarify distance to the surrounding off-site neighbors as well please. (Mr. Craig: Gave clarifications.)
- Ms. Christopher: What is the distance between Allaire Timbers and Building #5? (Mr. Craig: Measured distances for that and between buildings inside the project.) Do you think that is between 9 and 8 feet?
- Ms. Dudney: Probably more like 8-10 feet. You're not concerned about windows on the units looking directly into other windows or snow stack against the exterior walls of the buildings or landscaping growing in the narrow areas between buildings? (Mr. Craig: We will have grass, but no trees or shrubs will fit in the space. There aren't many windows looking directly into other windows. Our buildings are staggered.)
- Mr. Schroder: For instance, Building #9, would there be a window underneath that gable? (Mr. Craig: Yes. The worst ones are duplex units 7, 8 and 9 and those are market units.) Does it meet setbacks, meet code? These are still quite tight. If there was a way we could pull out another building it might loosen up with this unit design. As far as required percentage of snow storage on each property, there are little slivers that add up to a total and I wonder how functional this "adding of snow storage zones" is realistic. Do you think you meet the code for functional snow stacking? (Mr. Craig: Yes.) (Mr. Mosher: Noted to the Commission the previous approved project has expired; this is a new review with a new Commission, we aren't going to compare the past approval to today's request.) (Mr. Craig: Clarified the snow stacking strips. We are 25% over the required number for on-site snow storage. We have more

functional snow stack than the past approval.) Would the plow have to drag snow backwards? I'm looking at the access to the front door on some units having to get past a stack of snow. It looks awfully close; for example between 8 and 9.

Mr. Pringle: Ms. Best, if we had a property owner who wanted to accept the original density on this property, would we allow a 50/50 ratio for affordable housing versus market rate? (Ms. Best: I think that we could consider it based on different variables for Council to decide.) I thought that it was supposed to be 80/20; is the Council looking for our guidance on this also? (Mr. Mosher: We are only seeking how you interpret this proposal with the Development Code; we have half market and half deed restricted through an agreement the applicant has made with the Town Council.) The question that I asked is do we have an 80/20 standard? (Ms. Best: Yes that is the Council's general standard.) (Mr. Mosher: The Council is the only one that can make the change to a 50/50 ratio.)

Mr. Butler: Clarified that the deal was made with Council and that the project may lose positive three (+3) points for housing as a result.

Mr. Pringle: I understand that Council made the decision; I'm trying to figure out how we came up with that prorated point analysis. You're asking us if we would suggest more or less points for that? (Mr. Mosher: No, we have some flexibility on the negative points; eliminate snow stacking. As far as the positive points, you may not see a positive 10 points; you may see a positive 7 points, which is a business deal with the Council.) Would there be a better design solution offered? Maybe more of an apartment type thing? I don't want to point towards Ski and Racquet as a model, but as a multifamily building it has a lot less pressure on the lot. I think that the market conditions are going towards that type of unit, as opposed to the stand alone duplex or single family house. Isn't there a better model to look for here? This would solve a lot of our privacy, buffering, etc.

Ms. Dudney: Mr. Pringle, I think we need to address the Development Code related snow stacking, buffering and landscaping; they could come in with a plan for Multiplan, but that isn't up to us.

Ms. Dudney opened the work session to public comment. Staff noted that the Commission has received email comment from a citizen who could not attend. It was place before you before the meeting.

Mr. Chuck Seibold, 10-year owner in Woods Manor and on the Board of Directors for the HOA: I have a large concern over the setbacks. Our property line to a deck on the west facing building is almost underneath that deck; this is their living room for their people. The biggest concern is Building 5; the topographical lines are difficult for you to realize, but I'm about 10-feet back (illustrating by standing away from the table) from the property line. These topographical lines are, to give you a visual indication, the height of this room and slopes down to here (again illustrating by standing near the front row of seats). The first time we walked this with Mr. Mosher, we realized that this is a long way down from the site above; the submitted drawings in your packet have side views and literally they're sticking out straight down. The setbacks were intended originally to buffer. The timber that you are removing from the site, and the resulting "presentation of the entrance to Breckenridge", is poor. We are glad that the bright colors are gone, this is an improvement from that, but this whole subdivision slopes from left to right. If you understand this, how you're going to move snow uphill? This is a real challenge for any snow plower. This is not an easy one except if, in my opinion, Building 5 were pulled back, causing big changes. Also, the possible RV parking on this project is another thing, and if you look at Ski and Racquet's RV parking, we've gone to the tactic of not allowing RV parking because of the small amount of parking. Thank you for your time. (Ms. Dudney: I didn't understand what you meant about RV parking.) Recreational vehicles that the owners want to store onsite. How do you find the guy with the trailer when the plow is coming around? I agree that the loop is the only challenge, I don't know if the applicant has considered the turnaround be sufficient for fire trucks either.

There was no further public comment and the work session was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Mamula: Whenever you get a project with negative points that are all coming from snow stack, buffering or landscaping, there is simply too much product on the site. Unless you can work through these negative points, this will fail. I don't know that I'm necessarily buying your snow storage argument. It is not efficient. Your three points shy of passing, at a first blush. It's just too dense. I would like to know from Council if we have the ability to go less than 7 points for the housing. I don't know that we've ever had the Council put a point total for Planning before. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Housing Committee did not believe they should get the full 10 points because the project didn't meet the 80/20 rule.) I would feel more comfortable with a point range; if the Council wants to know what we think, it would be nice to have some flexibility. The architecture is all great; better than before, but it just doesn't fit on the site.
- Ms. Christopher: I'm going to echo what Mr. Mamula said; the architecture is a great improvement from 2009; this appears more neighborly. However, the buildings are way too close. A 20-foot separation should be a standard in this neighborhood as well.
- Ms. Dudney: I share the same concerns. I also concur with what Mr. Mosher recommended in the Staff report for negative points.
- Mr. Lamb: It's looking really tight and I agree with what everyone has said. It is at minus ten points, maybe minus seven; right now it flunks. It might be massaged into something workable, but it would be a better project with a small reduction in the massing. I have plowed a little bit of snow, you put all of your snow in one place and it will take forever with little pockets of snow. On paper the snow storage is there but in real life it won't work.
- Mr. Schroder: My first impression is that there is no way I would want to live there; the lack of building separation. Mr. Craig, if you could take a look at this development as a prospective resident, what would you do differently? It appears to meet the Code but it just doesn't seem applicable in the real world. So much focus on proximity, shadow between buildings, usability of space. I would like to see something different or maybe yank a building.
- Mr. Pringle: The only thing that I want to talk about is what we can't talk about, but that is that this is a crappy deal for the Town. (Please write this down verbatim.) They need to re-look at this, and then they get 75% of the allowable points. The Town really needs to take a look at this. There is no buffering between units, snow stack is a number you have to meet but as far as the actual ability to do it, it doesn't work, and the windows might have a 2-3 degree difference but a lot of the windows are looking right into each other. I agree with Mr. Schroder: it doesn't look like a place anyone would want to live in.

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1. McCain Master Plan (JP) PC#2013035; 13221, 13217 and 13215 Colorado Highway 9

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to Master Plan for the property known as the McCain property, identifying and distributing density and uses into two tracts. One tract is designated for open space. The second tract for open space and governmental uses which may include (but are not limited to) solar gardens, overflow parking, water treatment facility, water storage/reservoir, recycling center, snow storage and public works storage.

With the Town's annexation of this parcel, the property was incorporated into Land Use District 43 in 2003 which allows for existing residential and service commercial, recreational, open space, and governmental land uses, and mining.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 4th and recommended a continuance of the

master plan application. At its December 11th work session, the Town Council withdrew the McCain Master Plan application from the planning process to allow the Council to further discuss it without it being an active application. The Town Council held a public input session on the draft Plan at their February 26th meeting. On April 9th, the Town Council finalized the desired land uses to be incorporated in the McCain Master Plan.

Changes since the December 4, 2012 meeting

- Service commercial and commercial retail uses have been removed as permitted land uses.
- Density allowed has been reduced to a maximum density of 6.39 SFEs on the entire parcel.
- The Master Plan notes have been refined and are attached in this report.
- Overall goal moving forward with land use configuration resulting in the most contiguous open space possible.

This Master Plan has not presented any negative concerns to Staff. There will be further detailed review of any development on this property with each individual application for development. Any proposal will follow the density allocations and design standards per the Development Code. This is a Town Project pursuant to the recently adopted ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013), effective April 12, 2013. As a result, the Planning Commission is asked to identify any code issues they may have with this application and to make a recommendation to the Town Council. Staff provided an overview of land uses and density proposed in the Master Plan for the audience and Planning Commission.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission accept the point analysis as prepared by staff and recommend approval of the McCain Master Plan, PC#2013035, to the Town Council, with the presented Findings.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: What about trailhead parking? (Ms. Puester: We have contemplated some preliminary sketches how that may play out; there could be limited parking spaces near the park, bike path or utilize overflow parking. We are really just looking at the general land uses with this application.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Council will be getting answers to questions like that in the next 12 to 18 months when more specific detail about the plan is developed.)
- Ms. Dudney: What about the existing commercial uses? (Ms. Puester: Council has voiced that the existing service and commercial businesses will stay on their leases with the town; one day those leases will go away when the Town is ready to move forward with other uses in the Master Plan. Council can grandfather them and when the town is ready to go forward with the Master Plan, those uses will be discontinued and replaced with open space and/or governmental uses. The land uses including the Bear commercial retail store, the Alpine Rock and Alpine Rock storage, and three outdoor contractor storage yards there are what we are referring to.) What about the rodeo? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Some Council members are very interested in moving the rodeo to this site after this upcoming season.) This Master Plan doesn't preclude that? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It falls under governmental uses.) So under governmental uses, the Town can just lease to someone else? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes, they will deal with this more specifically in the next year.) I just didn't know how what we are doing would affect what they are going to do in the future. (Mr. Grosshuesch: These are general land uses.)
- Mr. Mamula: Why is the 150 foot stretch down Highway 9 not in District 4? We don't have it listed anywhere as District 4. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Master Plan supersedes the underlining Land use District; it's called a setback in the Master Plan and carries over; it will accomplish the same thing.)
- Mr. Pringle: We keep talking about the reservoir down there and I ask myself, when we talk about it is like it's a benign part of this property but it will be a big aspect requiring a huge dam and

what would that do to downstream properties? Any risk there because now they are below a reservoir? When we say reservoir, we picture a lake, but it's more like a dam there. (Ms. Puester: A reservoir is not a definite; it could be lesser storage ponds, more aesthetic in nature. That is being worked on.)

Mr. Mamula: The chance of it ever being there is probably less than a chance of you still being here in 30 years. It's a placeholder, and I pushed for it every meeting at Council and it got enough traction for it to be a bookmark at least. If we actually have to install it, it will be the most expensive reservoir in the State of Colorado. There are other solutions to our water problems right now be worked on. Maybe one day we will need it as the western water rights wars get worse. To preclude it because of potential danger to downstream occupants would be a mistake; it's just a bookmark.

Ms. Dudney: And you know whenever anything comes up that is specific it will be its own development plan.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Kermit Miller, President of Stan Miller Inc. and adjacent land owner: I'm here representing the future of my 12 year old. My big concern tonight is that we did a lot of river restoration on the Stan Miller property that we donated; it's been getting flooded out since because of McCain. The McCain placer stuff is a bit out of control and I'm taking the brunt of it. I ask that you push forward with those efforts and as you begin to develop, take our subdivision into consideration on the buffer zone.

Mr. Forest Rowser, Resident 281 Fairview: One of the things, I've watched this for years, since 2002, it caught my attention that the Mayor at that time said what a great opportunity to put a reservoir in. That was just about the time we were in a drought. I'm reflecting on what he was saying. Being a homeowner above here, I have a vested interest. We had all this snow a couple of years ago, but when you live out there, I was looking at the reflection of the trees in the water, and I was thinking, what would you want to see there? I like the feeling of the wood at the Bear store. You look across that and think this is what kind of town we have. I think it also reflects on the people that we have here. I just want to say, I've spoken with a lot of homeowners, it's just my comment.

Mrs. Allison Palmer, Owner Breck Bears: Just wanted to say thanks. It's been a long six months but on December 4, you made a big decision and I'm really proud of our elected officials. Not many people are here because they are comfortable with the direction. I left my family at home to do homework to come here and say thank you. I really appreciate Ms. Puester's patience and all of the parties involved; everywhere I turn people say to us, "we are so glad that you're back". I'm really glad that we get to stay; for those of you that you don't know, John was trying to purchase the property from McCain before the Town purchased it to control his destiny, but we appreciate all of the time that you've put into this. We are happy and this makes us feel safe and secure, as the Council indicated that they wanted us to feel. Thank you, and come on down. We have new staff and new product and using aspen and the pine.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I think that this is fine but we haven't seen the last of it so stay tuned. I would like to say that I like the idea of the open space on the 89 acres but the Town has some urgent needs in the future and I don't want to see those precluded. One of those is parking; one of these days we are going to have to provide real parking for real events and real amenities not just a mud flap. People parked there will also need restroom facilities and a place to put their trash, and real parking and the town needs to think about the long term needs out there. I wonder if we

are not by default starting to put in some access and egress in right now that will need to be addressed later. I am a little disappointed that we haven't looked at service commercial that the Town will need, and that we sort of just give that service commercial product away to the north of the county. Good place for it. We already have the Building Center that will have two more buildings; Kermit has a new subdivision out there with commercial uses and others (Tatro and Snowbridge) that are immediately adjacent that we don't have any control over. I'm not sure what their future plans will be, and I think that we don't want to cut off what the Town has going on in the future. I don't think that people should get the idea that it is all open space. It is in a holding pattern for needs and we've not yet seen the end result.

Mr. Schroder: I would support the point analysis recommended by Staff and the Plan.

Mr. Lamb: Like that there is money allocated to study needs and we will get clarity soon. We should focus on getting the river under control first and foremost. Remember that the Blue blew out Coyne Valley Road. We have some obligations to make sure that river can stay in its banks.

Ms. Dudney: This has evolved, and I am pleased that this plan really represents what the people want.

Mr. Butler: I agree; it has evolved. I'm surprised that people aren't more concerned about what the properties in the County are doing. It is ratty looking there.

Ms. Christopher: In support, I have no code issues. I would echo Jim in that the number one priority is to restore the river corridor area.

Mr. Mamula: I agree; this has gone in the right direction. I disagree with Mr. Pringle and on his service commercial comments. Glad that water storage is bookmarked here. Water wars in the west will be the defining event in the future. I would much rather come back in the future and change some of this language than call it blanket governmental use. There is a danger using that term to throw everything under. I would rather we just spell out those uses.

Ms. Christopher made a motion to approve the point analysis for the McCain Master Plan, PC#2013035, 13221, 13217, 13215 Colorado Highway 9. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Christopher made a motion to approve the McCain Master Plan, PC#2013035, 13221, 13217, 13215 Colorado Highway 9. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. McCain Master Plan (JP) (Withdrawn – Presented as a Town Project Hearing)

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Wakefield Land Use District Recommendation

Ms. Best presented a memo regarding the upcoming annexation of the Town-owned Wakefield property (approximately 17 acres located off Boreas Pass Road) and the recommended Land Use District. In establishing the initial zoning for a recently annexed property the Town has a couple of options, either place the property in the anticipated Land Use District as shown on the Town's Land Use Guidelines map or modify the Town's Land Use Guidelines to establish a new Land Use District designation for the property. The current Land Use Guidelines show the Wakefield property in Land Use Districts 1, 41, and 42. Land Use District (LUD) 1 allows one unit per 10 acres, LUD 41 allows one unit per acre, and LUD 42 allows two units per acre. While it might be preferable to place the entire property in Land Use District 1 to best preserve open space and historic values, it is Staff's recommendation that, since the property is owned and controlled by the Town, it be placed in the Districts that are currently recommended in the Land Use Guidelines.

In summary, it is Staff's recommendation that the property be placed in the land use districts as shown on the Town's Master Plan (LUD 1, 41, 42) and that the Ordinances clarify that there is no density assigned to the property. Staff is seeking support from the Planning Commission so that the Ordinances can be referred to the

Town Council for consideration.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Mamula: The property just east of this, is that part of this annexation/zoning? There is a large old boiler at the top of that trail. (Mr. Grosshuesch: That is off the Wakefield property.)
- Mr. Pringle: Is there no density on this property? (Ms. Best: This property is designated not to receive any density. Adding density to this site would be inconsistent with the JUBMP and the Sending/Receiving Map.) But is it prohibited? (Ms. Best: We could probably add verbiage to the zoning ordinance to clarify that it is not a receiving site and no density is intended.) Anyway to cement that. All I know is sometimes things change. (Ms. Best: We can make that change in the second reading of the ordinance.)

Mr. Mamula made a motion that the Town Council approve placing the Wakefield property in the land use districts as shown on the Town's Master Plan (LUD 1, 41, 42) and that the Ordinances clarify that there is no density assigned to the property (with an edit to the ordinance to prevent density from being added). Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2. Other:

- Mr. Mamula: I noticed a lot of store front signs starting to pop up that we didn't used to allow; like Subway with their specials; I know that things are in flux, but it is slowly creeping up and now there's a bunch of stuff we don't allow. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Point taken; we are working with community service and as we hear about things we go out and find them.) There are some neon open signs.
- Ms. Dudney: What about the joint Town Council meeting? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We don't currently have one scheduled; we need to come up with a good solid list of things that we want to talk to the Council about and at the end of the next meeting schedule a work session and figure out if we have an agenda.)
- Mr. Mamula: Why are the street lights turned off on French Street? (Mr. Grosshuesch: There was a selective reduction of street lights and that was one of the areas. We can check into it. It was part of the reset.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 pm.

Gretchen Dudney, Chair