

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Trip Butler Jim Lamb
Dan Schroder Dave Pringle
Mayor John Warner for Jennifer McAtamney, Town Council Liaison

Gretchen Dudney and Eric Mamula were absent

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the May 21, 2013 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (5-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the May 7, 2013 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (5-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Gold Creek Condominiums Exterior Remodel (MM) PC#2013034; 326 North Main Street
Mr. Schroder said that he loved what he sees. Mr. Mosher presented the color board for the Commission to review.

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

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mayor Warner: We did approve the McCain Master Plan. Tract 1 is 89 acres of governmental use and the rest is open space; 38% of the property was dedicated to open space. There was a headline a few days ago that was misleading; we are contemplating abandoning our relationship with the Corp of engineers who have made no progress in their plans with the river. They were going to do a \$5 million project, and without them it could be significantly less money. We shall see what happens with the restoration of the Blue River.

Mr. Pringle: Is it on a time table?

Mayor Warner: For me yes, I would like it to happen in the next few years. Kermit did ½ mile in 30 days so if you do the math maybe we could get it done in a year or two. So I'm excited about it; we are waiting to see what Mr. Daugherty (Town Engineering) says that Kermit indicates pricing will be. We would like to explore doing it on our own. Also, with the acceptance of the McCain Master Plan we did eliminate service and service commercial uses; like you, Mr. Pringle, I was the only one on Council who didn't like that. I still believe that we need service commercial in Town but that was the ruling of the Council. I know that people are upset about the gas station, but to me, we have some companies out there like Metzger's Concrete company and the landscaping company, etc, and they aren't going to have anywhere to go. I think that this is short sighted. The thinking is that they will find other service commercial but anyhow, it was a 6 to 1 vote and we will not see service commercial down the road there in 5 years. We appreciate that you guys took a look at it as well. We passed the final reading on the moving historic structures ordinance that you guys helped with; it seems to be going in the right direction. We also approved the Keller Residence Landmarking and that's it. Thinking globally, we are still dealing with Amendment 64; we are also contemplating some kind of revenue stream for the childcare scholarship program; it will be on the ballot sometime in July. We haven't decided whether or not it will be a property tax or sales tax revenue. Business community in Town favors a property tax

increase, not a sales tax increase; about a ¼% increase in sales tax would get us what we need. The commercial community really appreciates the prospect of the childcare scholarship program.

Mr. Lamb: Anything new on plastic bags?

Mayor Warner: They are being designed and it is coming down to bags from the US or bags from someplace else which is much more colorful and attractive. The US are not as attractive but are canvas and washable. They may end up with two bags, and it is going to happen. We are planning to stock the retail community and the lodging community with many thousands of bags. The retail community is up to this point fairly accepting of it. We've had a lot of kudos from people like High Country Conservation; there has been more positive than negative feedback and this is likely to go into place around October 1 so that it hits prior to tourist season. I personally have had several conversations with the City Market Communications Director and she has indicated that they are happy about this. I got her name from Randy Griffin, and she was very helpful. They are not going to oppose this action. I think that the bags are kind of iconic. People are going to take them back to Dallas and remember Breckenridge. It's been a great process and Mr. Truckey and Ms. Puester have done a great job and I really appreciate their help.

Mr. Schroder: Does Town anticipate a good taxable revenue stream from marijuana?

Mayor Warner: It's pretty remarkable, I've done the math and their average sale is \$65/sale and so a person walks in, they spend on average that much. So if you assume a 5% increase in participation and tourist base, say, 2 million people per year, that's \$6.5 million of revenue of sales with a 5% tax. That would bring \$350 to \$400 thousand to the Town in additional revenue. It can be a significant revenue stream so we shall see.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Welk Resorts at Breckenridge (MM) PC#2012044; 13541 Colorado Highway 9

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a 123-unit time-share/condo-hotel with a detached housekeeping / maintenance building and a detached meeting / facility building at Tracts W and D-3 of the Shores at the Highlands Subdivision.

The Planning Commission last reviewed this proposal on February 5, 2013. At this meeting, concerns were expressed about the:

- The design of the glazed guard panels
- Articulation of the roof form on the main entry of the Accommodations Building and the Meeting/Facilities building
- Location and buffering of the Meeting/Facilities building
- Vehicular circulation of the Trash removal area
- Detail on the landscaping plan
- Overall building height

The applicants have obtained a Town Council approved Development Agreement, which allows a mass increase for amenities from the Development Code standard of 200% to 700%. The approval of a Class C re-subdivision combining Tract D-3 with Tract W (drawings were included in the Commissioner's packets) has been added as a Condition of Approval. With the completion of this last subdivision, all of the development will be placed on one parcel. Additionally, a modification to the 2012 West Braddock Delaware Flats 4th Amended Master Plan to include the four multifamily SFEs from Tract D-3 into Tract W-1 has been added as a Condition of Approval.

Revisions since the last meeting included the following: change to aluminum and glass structural railing system; further refinement of massing, colors, materials and detailing; increase in distance from northern

property line; modification of building design; refined landscaping; building rotation to create a wedge at property line; enhancement of clear separation of traffic flows; reduction in building height; reduction in snowmelt areas; maximum of 25% non-natural materials on each elevation; building mass stepping from middle high point to lower shapes east and west; amenities building changes (removal of skylight, introduction of dormers, better integration into accommodations building); dormers added to 3 sides of roof drop-off canopy; cupola changes (reduction in scale, roof overhang unification and reduction, cupola roof slope to match main building roofs, 4 sided sheds at accommodation building): removal of curb cut and street entry at northeast; logical distribution of snow storage area.

The applicants and agents have been working with Town Staff and the neighbors to reach this point in the design of this application. The list of changes attached is a good example of the response to the many concerns. Staff had one question for the Commission: Did the Commission have any concerns with the proposed glazed guard panels? Staff welcomed any additional comments or questions.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the final Point Analysis for the Welk Riverfront Resort, Breckenridge Condo-Hotel, PC#2012044.

Staff also recommended the Planning Commission approve the Welk Riverfront Resort, Breckenridge Condo-Hotel, PC#2012044, along with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Mr. Jeffrey Edwards, VP of Development for Welk Resorts, introduced the development team: Mr. Richard Hulbert, Mr. Aleksandr Sheykhet, Mr. George Pierce and Mr. Tom Morrison are all present. Thank you for taking the time to listen to our presentation.

Mr. Richard Hulbert, Project Architect: I'm highlighting the major changes:

The site is L shaped; we have developed a narrative to give us some help for the design team. The notion is that we found the foundation of the chimney of the rancher. The horse barn has been refurbished; the corral is now used to park vehicles and the bunkhouse has been renovated to accommodate housekeeping and maintenance with work housing above.

- The roofs that were too 'plain' on the main entry element have been revised by adding functional gable dormers and eliminating the skylights. These still allow light into the space.
- The elevations have been revised and overall height has been lowered by reducing the floor plate of the principal floor much closer to grade; we looked at structural components with thinner floor and ceiling assemblies and reduced the ridge heights. All of the buildings step down at the edges.
- Even though the comment was made that the glazing was inappropriate, we've taken the glazed panels and framed them with dark finished aluminum surrounds.
 - In terms of durability and maintenance, these have been used by Welk in hurricane areas. They will be maintained 24-hours a day by Welk staff.
 - The glazing was raised up 4 inches so that we have the ability for drainage and snow removal. The benefit of the acoustical aspect of glass is that on the first floor the berms serve to bounce the sound back, and on the upper floors, the glass serves this purpose.
 - The idea is to see through it in terms of light; and for the resort guests are able to look out at their surroundings unencumbered.
- Also notice here the dormers are all around so the buildings are designed to be 'all fronts'. Remember that the skylight was eliminated.
- There are very few changes to the workhouse housing except to meet the requirement of the non-natural materials.
- The developer of the Shores and his architect met with us and we agreed to figure out how to change the Meetings Facility building to address some of their concerns.
 - We moved the building further away from the Shores property, re-angled it and moved the entrance to

- the East side.
- The roofline has been articulated far more so that the stepping forms have increased and now we have the front effectively as a one story element that is part lobby and part porch on grade.
- The back side of this building looks like another front side to our neighbors.
- Regarding the landscaping, Mr. Pierce is going to talk to you about that buffer.
- We met this afternoon with the Developer of the Shores and his two architects and while they appreciated our moving the building away from the Shores, and I learned that the principle issue is the value of the property that they are going to be putting on their side.
 - The southwest view is precious and very valuable to them and so we agreed to some points that I'm articulating out loud. We agreed to make some additional modifications that do not affect this application:
 1. We are pulling the meetings facility eastward as far as possible and to do that and respect the Code;
 2. We will cantilever the end of the deck and the roof on the west side and reduce the number of columns;
 3. We will assist in a joint effort to construct fencing between us and share the cost of the pathway in the Shores; and
 4. We will investigate the potential of someday use of the amenities by Shores homeowners, but we can't be 100% sure because it has to go to the Board of Directors.

In return, Mr. Lorin Gerch will support the project as submitted today.

Mr. George Pierce, Principal with Landscape Architecture:

The site is now totally devoid of any landscaping; we will revegetate the entire site with plants that are suitable to Breckenridge; in addition to that, there will also be a large number of site amenities on the grounds. The rear will have an indoor/outdoor pool, 3 Jacuzzis, one gas fire pit, seating areas and barbeques for guests to use. The landscape vision will have a predominately evergreen plant palate along Highway 9 and bring in spruce and white fir and pine to replace some of the pine beetle devastation. As we transition back to the activity area, we will bring more aspen and perennials and wildflower areas and lastly, as we approach the Blue River, we will bring some willows and dogwoods and plants more native to the river environment. We're going to be using 3-inch aspen interspersed with evergreens and spruce ranging from 10 foot to 14 foot heights and the occasional white fur 10 to 12 feet in height. Three inch aspen are usually in the 30 to 40-foot tall range and we are also going to have some cottonwoods in the same range.

Mr. Hulbert: In terms of the landscaping, it's a great opportunity to take this site and create a positive precedent. The setback from the eastern boundary is three times what the minimum required setback is. Working with staff, we learned that we needed a lot more detail on the drawing set to convey the details. Mr. Aleksandr Sheykhet is the president of the firm, and he is here to talk about the material boards.

Mr. Aleksandr Sheykhet, Colorado Architect with Studio Obermeier Sheykhet Architecture:

I have been here for about 20 years, and for the final application the team is required to produce large number of details. What I would like to say, is that we are proud of the Welk group and that the project once completed will be a richness that is beyond what you will see on a small scale. They were most helpful in colors and details. The color scheme is inspired by natural beauty and a story line that Mr. Hulbert put together. There are a number of colors and in material boards (presented to the Commission) we tried to give you color texture and scale. We've provided the structural glass panels, and the finish that will be applied and that we've done on many mountain projects here in Colorado.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: Are you happy with the new Accommodations Building without the glass skylight? (Mr. Hulbert: There is always more than one right answer to every problem; I value your opinion,

I'm not from Breckenridge and you guys make it better by making it fit in with your suggestions. If it helps, I'm comfortable. Those are real dormers, by the way, so we get natural light inside, and I think it's more appealing.) I appreciate your attempt to get light in, but I always thought that the skylight design was out of character and you now have a much better project today.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with that.

Mr. Schroder: Having read through it, with the presentation tonight, I am very pleased with where this is going.

Ms. Christopher: The color for the metal on the windows, is it nickel? Is it going to match the bronze for the railing? (Mr. Sheykhet: There will be no metallic color on the project. All surfaces are factory finished with the colors presented.)

Mr. Pringle: We can believe that any changes on the Meetings Building will be positive changes that will give relief to the Shores and that they won't require coming back in front of us? (Mr. Mosher: Yes that's true. Staff reviewed the concept of the proposed changes and these can all be handled with the Building Set submittal and the Statement of Compliance from the architect.)

Mr. Lamb: That's something that you're going to be monitoring? (If it is a substantial enough change then we tell them that they need to go back in front of Planning Commission.)

Mr. Butler: Mr. Sheykhet, how do you feel about that cantilever? (Mr. Hulbert: We are keeping the same materials; we are going to need a structural engineer because we don't want to change the look but it's facing the water which is arguably is unique on the site. The way that I can sell it to my client is that it will feel like we are perched out there. We agreed to maximize the overhang and their view by removing the end columns.)

Mr. Lamb: You are not going to be able to cantilever the whole thing though, right? (Mr. Hulbert: No, but that would be really cool.)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I'm in support of the point analysis tonight; I don't have an issue with the glazed balcony guards.

Mr. Pringle: I concur with the point analysis and applaud you for working on all of our concerns and your neighbors concerns. I'm hoping as this project builds out and starts to integrate into the community that it will be one of the town's end capstones. The landscaping; you really benefit from the setback from Highway 9; it's very well buffered there. I think that where you really enhance it is what you do to the site itself. I applaud your efforts.

Mr. Lamb: I agree. I think that you've really worked with the Staff on this and that your project will be better because of it; I did have an issue with the glass balcony guards but because there is a precedent I am okay with that. You clearly passed the point analysis and I hope that you enjoyed dealing with us and our Planning Department, because we are a little more complicated than other areas.

Ms Christopher: I support the point analysis, but I still do not fully support the glazed balcony guards because they don't seem to fit the character of Breckenridge; but I really appreciate the work that you've done and how you've worked with your neighbors and it's a strong project.

Mr. Butler: I think that it is a great project, and I had to go back to that site to view it because there aren't a lot of redeeming qualities about the site right now. I think that you've been a far better neighbor than you've needed to be; that's just my observation. It's the best thing on that end of town; that whole block down there. This is a good looking project. I like it. I am a big fan of the glazed balcony guards.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Welk Riverfront Resort, Breckenridge Condo-Hotel, PC#2012044, 13541 Colorado Highway 9. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Welk Riverfront Resort, Breckenridge Condo-Hotel, PC#2012044, 13541 Colorado Highway 9, with the presented findings and conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. McCain Solar Garden (JP) PC#2013036; 12920, 13250 Colorado Highway 9

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to install a 500kW photovoltaic (PV) solar garden on a 3 acre portion of the McCain property. The proposed solar panels would consist of approximately 2,106 panels in 16 rows, access by the existing dirt road utilized by Alpine Rock. The proposed solar panels would be managed by Clean Energy Collective (CEC). CEC would sell panels to residents and businesses within the entire Summit County area. The residents and businesses would pay the upfront cost of the panels purchased. In return, Xcel Energy would credit the purchaser's Xcel bill monthly for their share of the value of the energy produced.

With the Town's annexation of this parcel, the property was incorporated into Land Use District 43 in 2003. The Town is currently in the process of purchasing the Alpine Rock property (which the proposed solar garden is located on a portion of). The Town Council approved the McCain Master Plan on May 14, 2013, that allows for open space and governmental uses including solar gardens. The Planning Commission denied the McCain solar garden on October 18, 2011 due to a nonpassing point analysis.

Changes from Planning Commission meeting October 18, 2011:

Primary concerns from the Planning Commission were lack of buffering to the site as well as the lack of landscaping proposed. Primary changes made since the October 18 review include:

- Reduction in scope of project from a 2 megawatt system consisting of 8,333 panels over 27 rows to a 500 kW system with 2,106 panels over 16 rows;
- Site was relocated to the north onto the Alpine Rock property which the Town is in the process of purchasing (June closing date);
- Reduction in lease area size from 10 acres to 3 acres;
- Some landscape and natural screening provided by the existing berm and existing trees;
- Detail on inverter and switch gear equipment size and shed structure;
- Fence detail;
- New site visibility photos; and
- Grading information.

Staff has been working with the applicants to address issues raised by the Planning Commission previously. This has been significant with the relocation of the site north behind an existing berm and tree buffer. It is now on Alpine rock property, sits low on the site and is not readily visible from rights of way as you saw from the site visit today. As with other applications of this nature, there is limited ability to add screening from Silver Shekel to the site while providing solar exposure; however, staff believes that further efforts could be made with strategic landscape plantings to screen from the rights of way which would be best addressed after the installation and decision for any potential expansion of the project has been determined by Council. Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

- Did the Commission believe that the new site location achieves the intent of Policy 7/R, Site and Environmental Design?
- Did the Commission agree that additional landscaping is needed on the site to provide buffering? Would the Commission support no negative or positive points under this policy with the financial commitment from

CEC to provide additional plantings in strategic locations until the first phase has been installed and any potential expansion location determined?

- Did the Commission agree that positive two (+2) points are warranted under Policy 33/R-Energy Conservation?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: When we talk about the berms south and east of the site, isn't that just an area where people dump their excavations? When I look at the berm, it just looked like fill dirt. (Ms. Puester: I don't know the history of it, but it has been there quite awhile. Alpine Rock is a heavy type of land use there and guessing they have built that up to screen their own uses there. Applicant has stated that they would like to clean up the berm, make it more presentable.) Also, we stopped at what used to be the old north fire station site, is it possible for us to encourage some more landscaping to be put in there? Basically you won't be able to see that site except from maybe there. (Ms. Puester: We will encourage them to landscape in those locations.) Could we negotiate that maybe now? That looks like a good spot for some permanent landscaping. (Ms. Puester: We will have that planted.)

Mr. Butler: So they've reduced it to 500 kW, so 300 homes to 75 homes and is that enough? (Ms. Puester: This is the same size as the Stillson Solar Garden; we are recommending the positive 2 points which is consistent with past precedent.) Seems like reducing it to 25% of what was originally intended out there in 2011. (Ms. Puester: There are some reasons why that happened, but I'll let the Applicant address that.)

Mr. Pringle: Where is that second phase possibly? (Ms. Puester: We don't know if a second phase will happen or not and have not located it. We bubbled out some potential areas during the master plan process, but they haven't been determined.) What makes this work is that the berms and trees that are there so we can't go south unless we relocate the berms.

Mr. Lamb: When will we know about the Second Phase? (Mr. Brian Waldes, Financial Services Manager for the Town of Breckenridge: That isn't even a discussion with the Council right now and it is based on how quickly inventory sells out and the demand for more.)

Mr. Butler: Did you have a sense that energy for 300 homes was too large? (Mr. Waldes: It was initially slated to be 1mW, twice the size, but the process with Xcel precluded us from putting in two applications for the same parcel so, we just took what we were allotted.)

Mr. Richard Miller, Clean Energy Collective (Applicant): I appreciate your time tonight. I'm joined tonight by Mr. Chad Roach, Project Manager and we will answer your questions together. We have Ms. Michelle Zimmerman and Mr. Eric Westerhoff with Innovative Energy as well. Ms. Puester did a good job explaining our project. One thing, on the aerial that you just saw, Mr. Chad Roach of CEC and I met Xcel out on site and we won't have to take any trees out to put that line in. This is a partnership between the Town of Breckenridge for the citizens of Breckenridge and CEC; it is truly a 'community owned' facility. The Town will own panels as well as citizens. We do have a remote meter program so that we can see what the panels are actually producing in real time. Our firm builds these, manages them and maintains them. Our plan is for it to be here 50 years. We are taking about a 500 kW facility which will provide for 70-75 homes for one year. Over a 20 year period, this will reduce carbon emissions by 26 million pounds. We heard that the view was important to the Town so we think primarily from the Coyne Valley area and from Highway 9 you are going to only see a slight glimpse of the site. We are prepared to address the concerns of the Planning Staff, enhance the berms and help screen as much as possible. We will install landscaping and berms, listen to citizen comments, work with Staff and install visual buffering. We will finalize the landscape plan before we come back for final review. If you are open to having the final installation of landscaping after we put the panels in, we are willing to escrow the funds for that scenario.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: The panels are about 12 feet in the air? (Mr. Westerhoff: Range from 10 to 12 feet off existing grade.) How far will they be raised up into the air? (Mr. Westerhoff: About 3 feet above grade.)
- Mr. Lamb: Do we know really how long solar panels last? (Mr. Miller: We plan 20-25 years but as you know the panels are getting more efficient. We try and get a warranty for 30 years.) At altitude, these actually produce more because we are in thinner air, is that correct? (Mr. Roach: It's a combination of being closer to the sun, cooler temperatures and also reflection of snow. We've seen up to 15% of an increase over what the manufacturers say about the panels' production.)
- Mr. Pringle: \$3,000/panel? I think you are selling panels. (Mr. Miller: They are about \$850 per panel.) So if I wanted to buy into this am I buying a kW or am I buying a panel? (Mr. Miller: You're buying a panel.) (Mr. Roach: You want to contact us, and get a release of your utility bill and we would go ahead and design a system based on that.) (Ms. Puester: We need to get back to the code issues.)

Mr. Lamb opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. John Jumonville, 411 Long Ridge Drive, Highlands

I feel like I'm jumping in front of a train here but I am not either for or against solar panels. I'm pretty reasonable, coming from a reasonable place trying to understand how we got to solar panels in the Town of Breckenridge. I was glad that I was here tonight to hear the Welk. What was the largest focus on that structure-appearance? How did we get to black glass as fitting in community character and fitting with the historical nature? In terms of aesthetics standpoint, I have a problem with black glass fitting into our character. #2, the solar panel ordinance talks about the stand alone, certainly about putting panels next to existing structures, there is lots of language about panels not being visible. How are we going to hide a phase 2? What happens to the value of the properties around it? Does the cooperative own this land? No, so they don't pay taxes. Bottom line is aesthetic; how we got to a large set of black glass and fitting with the historical nature of Breckenridge. Also, when I looked at SustainableBreck, the ability to use and enjoy resources without comprising the beauty of our town. When I think about natural resources, I think of ridgelines, mountains, views. I spent money on a lot up on a ridge, on trees to block my view of the valley, but no matter what size berm nothing will protect our view from this. I can't imagine what Silver Shekel thinks, I imagine that they wouldn't want to look at 3 acres of black glass. Financial standpoint: purely speculative. \$3,700 out of pocket and 8-12 years to get back, speculative. Do these things pay for themselves? Could payback, could not. In the meantime, we have 20 years, potentially 50 years of black glass; with respect to technological improvements; are we not going to have more efficiency in the future? We have to wait 50 years until we can use it? Breck is here because of its natural beauty, and that's what been driving all of this. This is not a slam dunk great financial deal, it's speculative. Finally, reducing the carbon footprint; I understand that the Town is here. Actually having a town state that they want to reduce their carbon footprint is dubious however it is fantastic. But do we have to do it through structures that are out there that are contrary to exactly what a lot of our historic character? Is the website that tracks the production that's on there now, is it accurate? It's showing 600 tons. So for about 1 ½ years, it's been about 450kW. How do we get past the aesthetic part? The financial aspect is speculative and then CO₂; we say 500-600 tons in about a year and one half so on average we are saving 300-400 tons per year. I don't get 26 million pounds per 20 years. I guess in terms of CO₂, this is one coal plant in the US produces about 3.5 million tons of CO₂. Probably the same plant in China is multiplied of that, so we are going to go against that, how we want the character of Breck to be, putting somewhat speculative financial benefit in, and we are going to save 300 to 400 tons per year which compared to one coal plant in the time we've been here for about an hour, they've produced more CO₂ in one hour than we will by having 3 acres of black glass. Is it worth it? Why don't we go buy land out in Park County; you can expand as much as you want there, and then no one will care. How many ski resorts have 25 acres at their front door to do with what they want? Amazing opportunity. Are we really going to put black glass there? I

have trouble seeing black glass in the confines of a building then detached stand alone monolithic views and it's high. If it's anything like the one at the golf course, it's up. It makes a difference. I've said my peace. It's just trying to be reasonable. I want you guys to do it; can't we do it somewhere else?

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: This particular site in my opinion is really quite well buffered with no more additional landscaping; I even drove through Silver Shekel today so I think that what really kind of made me feel better was the site visit today. Something this size fits into that particular property. The 10 acre one that was turned down would have been more visible than this. Maybe another site visit and invite the community, John? I think if we did that, people would agree. (Mr. Jumonville: I don't think that it should be in Town. My issue is that it doesn't make sense to have it in Town. Can put it somewhere else.)

Ms. Christopher: I was pleasantly surprised during the site visit; the only place that it would be visible is from Silver Shekel; anyone driving by though would hardly see the site.

Mr. Pringle: I would concur that where it is sited right now, from anywhere ground level it will be highly screened. Up in Silver Shekel, I don't think that you can hide it at all; they have to balance what they are looking at now, which is a gravel pit. In direct response to your comment, yes I think you are jumping out in front of a train. I think that the Town Council is in the lead on this and they want to see a solar garden out there, whether we buy into the concept or not, it's been approved by the Master Plan and is going forward.

Ms. Christopher: The panels are facing directly south; so coming in on Highway 9 from Frisco you won't see anything. Silver Shekel will see them from the side view. Northbound they will only be visible for about 50 feet.

Mr. Lamb: It's impossible to make them invisible from above.

Mr. Pringle: I withhold any judgment about a second phase; any second phase would have to be as buffered as this one.

Mr. Lamb: Let's answer staff's questions. First one on Policy 7/R: is buffer appropriate?

Mr. Schroder: Yes, it is compatible with the site it does achieve an offset at that location. This is the right site.

Mr. Pringle: Only after taking the site visit would I agree with this one. It is pretty well invisible from grade level.

Ms. Christopher: I feel like that's the perfect site; any second phase would have to be looked at.

Mr. Butler: Yes.

Mr. Lamb: Yes, it is compatible. I thought today that it was hard for anyone to even see it from the highway. Let's move onto question 2 on landscaping.

Mr. Schroder: So the points are a neutral on landscaping. Holding money in escrow is a good idea so that we can screen at a later date. I don't think that trees on the berm are as necessary as out towards the highway.

Mr. Pringle: I don't think it needs any additional landscaping, I'm neutral on the points; as long as we have the money I would like to see some strategic landscaping between the bike path and the highway to provide more buffering, near the old firehouse site. Calling that a berm is being very kind to it; all it is is fill dirt. Would like to see that look better.

Mr. Lamb: I am neutral on the points as well; it makes sense to put this in and then see where we need a buffer. I think the highway is priority to landscape than the berm. It's hard for me to visualize where any additional buffer should go; if we put it in, then we'll have a better idea. It will be interesting to see what it actually looks like when it's in.

Mr. Butler: I would rather see them spend the money on cleaning that area up. I think the highway is priority.

Ms. Christopher: I would suggest doing landscaping near the right of way first and then maybe wait on the berm to the south of the solar array. A year or two years. But if there is no additional phase coming forward then put the trees in. Priority one is landscape between the highway and the project.

Mr. Lamb: Question 3, +2 points under 33/R for Energy Conservation?

Mr. Pringle: I would agree to the two points; but I also felt that applying the stand alone solar array that we use within the developed portion of the Town really doesn't match up well with a solar garden. The mass and scale requires a completely different thought process. I'd like to see a different interpretation of solar garden in our code. (Ms. Puester: Yes, we didn't consider something of this scale in the code. You can get more points as a house with a decent HERS index than a large solar garden.)

Mr. Schroder: I agree to the two points; we have an entire policy dedicated to energy conservation in Breckenridge; it's worth it.

Mr. Lamb: I believe two points are warranted. Agree, you power 75 homes and you get two points; it's interesting.

Mr. Butler: I agree with the two points.

Ms. Christopher: The Town Council wants the energy conservation to move forward and I believe the two points are warranted. The solar garden is a great way to keep it out of the historic district, put it somewhere on the outskirts but still in Town.

OTHER MATTERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Jim Lamb, Vice Chair