

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Rodney Allen	Dan Schroder	Leigh Girvin
Jim Lamb	Dave Pringle	JB Katz

Michael Bertaux was absent.
Eric Mamula, Town Council Liaison, arrived at 7:50pm for the worksession.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Page 8 of 38 of the minutes, Ms Girvin's comments on Park City, should state: "Park City is way ahead of us" rather than "ahead of use." With no other changes, the minutes of the October 21, 2008 Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (5-0). Ms Katz abstained.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda for the November 4, 2008 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (6-0).

ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR FOR 2008-2009:

Mr. Pringle made a motion to elect Mr. Allen as Chair and Mr. Lamb as Vice-Chair for November, 2008 to October, 2009. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Lot 2, Timber Trail (MGT) PC#2008112; 198 Timber Trail Road
2. Village at Breckenridge Exterior Remodel (CN) PC#2008114; 505-655 South Park Avenue
Several Commissioners had questions, and suggested a call-up of the Village at Breckenridge Remodel.
3. Oakley Rolling Lab Fuel TV Shoot (MGT) PC#2008113; 201 South Main Street / Blue River Plaza

Ms. Girvin asked what the daily hours would be for the Oakley Rolling Lab Fuel TV Shoot. (Mr. Thompson pointed out that all activities would occur during daylight hours with no activity occurring at night.) Ms. Girvin sought clarification regarding the term "bread truck". (Staff explained the applicant didn't provide input on what they meant by this term. But its about the size of a bread truck.)

Mr. Pringle made a motion to call up consent calendar number #2 (Village at Breckenridge Exterior Remodel, PC#2008114), and approve consent calendar items 1 (Lot 2, Timber Trail, PC#2008112) and 3 (Oakley Rolling Lab Fuel TV Shoot, PC#2008113). Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Village at Breckenridge Exterior Remodel, PC#2008112:

Staff presented the application. There is currently all stucco on the building. Proposal included less stucco, cementitious siding, and natural stone. Staff struggled with allocation of negative points, and found the proposal to significantly improve on the existing buildings. No negative points were recommended.

Architect, Tobias Strohe, JG Johnson Architects: Pointed out changes which occurred since his last presentation to the Commission. Explained that real stucco (rather than EIFS) would be used on this project. May still make minor changes and may reduce stucco a bit more on some buildings. Use of natural materials would have required sprinklers on decks, which would be a problem with freezing in winter. Actual stucco colors were presented at the meeting, since color copies did not accurately reflect colors. Mr. Strohe also presented a window color sample (dark bronze) and stone samples.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Girvin: Thanked the Village Homeowners for taking on this huge and expensive project which will provide a public benefit.

- Mr. Schroder: Agreed this is an upgrade to the property. Could less stucco be used to mitigate negative points for its use? Is there a way to get it under 25% on a few more elevations? (Mr. Strohe pointed out stucco is being used to balance the use of materials.) He sought clarification regard the term EFIS. (The applicant defined EFIS.) Would suggest not awarding positive points, since some elevations exceed 25% stucco.
- Mr. Lamb: Averaged the five buildings viewing this as one project and can live with stucco being used as an accent. Was concerned about awarding positive points when an applicant does not meet the 25% requirement because this is a code requirement in the first place. Those points could be used elsewhere to mitigate negative points. When looked at as a whole, the project would be right at 25% stucco. They are doing the best they can with a challenging project.
- Mr. Pringle: Would suggest a finding pointing out the reduction of stucco was almost 75% from existing when taking an average of all buildings, and this would be such a big public benefit. These were significant improvements but unclear why this project can be broken up from the other three buildings at The Village when they were all approved by one master plan. If this trend continues all the buildings at Main Street Station could spin off and take on their different architecture. (Mr. Neubecker explained that the Village Master Plan is very old, and does not specify architecture and materials. Barring this, we revert to the Development Code.) Worried about the potential that only five of the eight buildings in the Master Plan would be remodeled, and breaking away from a unified look. What sort of precedent would we be setting?
- Ms. Katz: Wouldn't want to get hung up on a particular policy which could prevent improvements about to happen on an existing project which would be of public benefit. Couldn't think of other properties with as much stucco as this property. (Staff pointed out other similar properties.) As a resident of Longbranch, I can tell you that a major remodel is worth it.
- Mr. Allen: Sought comment on Mr. Pringle's concerns regarding the original Master Plan. No other members expressed concern or had any comments. Could even support positive points for this improvement. Would any wood burning fireplaces be removed with this project? (Mr. Strohe: No.)

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

Mr. Pringle moved to approve this application with a finding pointing out that the un-official average of stucco usage on all five buildings was 25%, and that the significant reduction from the amount of existing stucco on the five buildings is of such public benefit that the Commission used all five buildings to determine an average of 25% stucco per elevation, and this amount was used as a guide to assign zero points under Policy 5 (Relative) Architectural Compatibility. Ms. Katz seconded and the motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Locomotive Train Park (JP)

Ms. Puester presented a memo and some conceptual drawings of the train park, which Town Council directed the Breckenridge Heritage Alliance to pursue at the Wellington Lot, 123 North Main Street. Engine #9 is owned by the Town of Breckenridge through an agreement with the Colorado Historic Society (CHS), and after its restoration by the CHS, may be arriving in Breckenridge as soon as April, 2009. The Engine was the operating steam locomotive in the Breckenridge area from 1884-1937.

The presented site plan showed the engine on the south side of the Wellington parking lot with associated landscape and park area, pedestrian pathways, benches, shelter location, and boardwalk. Twenty three parking spaces will be lost with the application.

The Colorado Historic Society has required the Town to shelter the locomotive as part of the restoration contract. The shelter proposed will be an open air shelter which would allow for pedestrians to get up close and view the locomotive. Some conceptual renderings were included in the packet.

Staff requested comments and input from the Planning Commission on the site plan and conceptual shelter architecture. As this shelter would be within the Conservation District, Staff also requested to hear any comments the Commission may have regarding the historic character and elements of the structure. Specifically, would a brick or masonry column base be acceptable, favored roof material (corrugated metal, wood shingle, standing seam, etc),

cupolas, steel or wood wrapped columns? This project will be processed as a Town project and come back before the Planning Commission and Town Council as a combined public hearing.

Mary Hart, agent/designer of the project, gave an overview of the proposal and asked the Commission for comments on the materials for the structure.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Ms. Girvin: Agreed corrugated roof would be best. Would like to see metal or wood instead of masonry at the bottom of the columns. Make this as simple as possible so individuals focus on Engine 9 as opposed to the building. Liked the lawn space shown.

Mr. Schroder: Asked where the metal idea originated from; was metal used in the historic district at inception? (Ms. Hart pointed out that the manufacturer provided this option.) Suggested corrugated roof and favored wood as opposed to steel since wood seems to be more historic. Liked the platform for viewing.

Mr. Lamb: Liked corrugated roof, standing seam metal roofing seemed inappropriate. Suggested using posts at the bottom to eliminate the bottom-heavy look of the masonry.

Mr. Pringle: The corrugated roof would look great and would come off well. If the structure were steel then would suggest a column base like the Welsbach light poles. Pointed out all comments made are specific to engine # 9, not #111.

Ms. Katz: Liked corrugated roof. Did think the structure looked “bottom-heavy” and would lighten up the look, simplify it. No strong feeling for steel or wood. I park in this lot every day and this lot does not fill up.

Mr. Allen: What would the height of the roof be compared to adjoining buildings and roof pitch? (Ms. Hart pointed out the roof would be comparable with a 6/12 pitch.) Asked the applicant if the minimum number of parking spaces were being eliminated. Concerned with the numbers of spaces being lost in the North Main Street area. (Mr. Mamula pointed out Council had vetted this issue and the decision has been made by Council.) Agreed with Mr. Schroder that corrugated roof should be used and would like to see more wood than steel. Would like to see the structure height stay in scale with the surrounding properties. Asked about the train moving or operating. (Linda Kay Peterson, of the Breckenridge Heritage Alliance, explained that the mechanics were being worked out and that the train would not be planned to move much.)

Mr. Mamula: Pointed out the Town agreed to cover the train and allow it to move in accordance with the Colorado Historic Society agreement. Suggested Council be briefed if a different engine (other than #9) is being considered. Had a bit of an issue with the height and wanted to make sure this structure would not be too tall, which would take away from the adjoining structures.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT: Council is wrapped up in the budget and trying to maintain services and staff in light of the reduced funds that the Town will have to work with. Discussed that the home size limitations would need to be discussed further with the individual neighborhoods that this policy would affect, and to move forward with a FAR and maximum size approach that would be neighborhood specific.

OTHER MATTERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35p.m.

Rodney Allen, Chair