

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

### ROLL CALL

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

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the July 16, 2013 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (6-0).

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pringle: On page 10, regarding the 10 inch siding, please change “demonstrate what the siding is going to look right” to “demonstrate what the siding is supposed to look like”. With no other changes, the July 2, 2013, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

### TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. McAtamney:

I think that our last meeting addressed three important topics. There was a meeting with the Fire Department. We met with them and they shared with us video and photos and an account of the Black Forest fire. The presenter was able to show us what the fire looked like and how a neighborhood with good mitigation and defensible space had remained untouched by fire. He had video of himself standing at a house from the mitigated subdivision looking at a non mitigated subdivision while it burned. We will be revisiting the fire policies again and we’ll have some evidence because in this subdivision they were able to defend the homes. In the other subdivisions around it, they were heavily crowned, trees touching each other and the noise of the fire was incredible.

The other thing was that we are going to ask the voters for the 5% excise tax for all marijuana products; a portion of that goes to the Town, schools and another bit of it will go to the State for management. It will be just like our medical marijuana; the hope is that the people that are in business currently will be changing their businesses, and we will limit to the same number of business. (Mr. Mamula: It would be great if the town would do a flyer for our guests, so that they could hand them out to the restaurants and educate our guests; have had a lot of guests unsure of the regulations.) Good idea for some of the funds. We have no idea of what kind of volume there will be; we will already get the sales tax plus the 5% plus 10% of the 15% that the State collects. (Ms. Dudney: You do have the right to restrict usage even more right?) Yes, but the Council has decided to honor the voters’ decision and have recreational marijuana available. (Ms. Dudney: The fines should not be counted on as an ongoing revenue stream.)

Also, there has been conversation about the childcare tax, and there has been conversation about using the marijuana tax for that but we aren’t comfortable yet about it being a long term revenue stream, so we will treat it like we do the RETT until we have more assurance of what the amount will be. The last thing was the childcare scholarship program; it serves 350 families; 60% in care receive some kind of scholarship. We will be looking to the voters to not lower their property taxes as much as they could (different mill levy being reduced this year) so property tax will be going down just a little if it passes rather than the whole mill levy amount. (Ms. Dudney: If that doesn’t pass, will money continue to come from the general fund?) Our hope is that it will pass; a lot of support from the survey results. Especially since the taxes won’t increase, just decrease less. If you have questions about how the program works, I’m happy to answer them. People pay 15% of their income before they can receive the scholarship. (Mr. Pringle: It’s unfortunate that the business

community did not step up to help. I was a little disappointed that they didn't step up since it is needed by employees in Town.) (Mr. Mamula: Not every employer has employees who have children. I have no employees who have children. I also own property, so...) Some of the business owners feel that they pay through the building tax already, the Gallagher Amendment has them paying three times as much as residential. From a pragmatic standpoint it didn't make sense to make this a sales tax. I hope that you will learn more about it and support the ballot in the fall.

We passed some housekeeping amendments as well. We will be revisiting the F-Lot Hotel proposal; that's really the major update on that; want to see more information on how it will affect other lodging. The BRC had their annual meeting and elected their new Board. Any more questions? (Ms. Dudney: I have a question about a development that we are considering this evening, but it doesn't have to do with Code; it is about the Development Agreement. How does the Council come up with the points that are going to be granted in the affordable homes in the project?) We gave direction that, typically we have seen 80% of the homes in an annexation be affordable. We felt that if we were going to do less than that then we should be awarding points proportional to that. (Ms. Dudney: My question was why is the Council in the business of determining points? I'm asking this as future guidance.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: If they had done the 80/20; this one was pretty straightforward so it was just a prorated calculation.) The Housing Committee just gave a general conception on this. (Mr. Pringle: That might be a good subject to discuss if we ever get together again.) (Mr. Mosher: 10% of any project gives you the maximum points, so we aren't going to provide a range because everything we see will be over 10%.)

#### **FINAL HEARINGS:**

1. Brown Hotel Variance (MM) PC#2013055, 208 North Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to obtain a variance from Policy 5 (Absolute), "*Architectural Compatibility*", of the Development Code as it relates to Priority Policy 80A of the Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation District. On June 18, 2013 the Planning Commission approved the Brown Hotel and Stable Restoration and Renovation (Permit #2012005) with a Condition of Approval that the applicant request and obtain an approval for a variance from Policy 5/A, *Architectural Compatibility*, of the Development Code to allow for the connector element as presented with that application. The Application meets all of the requirements of Priority Policy 80A except that portion which provides that the width of the proposed connector should not exceed two-thirds of the facade of the smaller of the two modules that are to be linked. Therefore, a variance is being requested with respect to the requirements of Priority Policy 80A, as conditioned in Brown Hotel and Stable Restoration development permit approval.

1. Did the Commission support a variance from Policy 5/A (Absolute) Architectural Compatibility of the Development Code as it relates to Priority Policy 80A of the Handbook of Design Standards?

2. Did the Commission agree that no points be awarded under Policy 5/R (Relative) Architectural Compatibility of the Development Code as it relates to Priority Policy 80A of the Handbook of Design Standards, since the connector link meets the general Design Standards of Policy 80A?

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Pringle: We would like to see these types of buildings connected with a connector. This is a Condition of Approval for the Brown Hotel and Stable Development permit. The Commission could choose to not support the variance. What would happen to the approved Brown Hotel Permit? (Mr. Mosher: The permit would have to be modified without the variance and the plans changed.) We could say that we won't give them the variance, because you can't connect them without violating policy. (Mr. Mosher: You could.)

Ms. Christopher: This connector caused because it is for a commercial application, they are trying to add bathrooms into the space. You could squeeze in a smaller connector if it was a residence, but because it's commercial it can't meet. (Mr. Mosher: A smaller connector would damage

more fabric as there are several openings in the wall that is being preserved inside.)  
Ms. Dudney: I thought you either granted a variance or not; I was unfamiliar with points relating to a variance. (Mr. Mosher: Variances are for Absolute Policies. If there is an associated Relative Policy, as in this case we have 5/A and 5/R, the points must be addressed also.)

Ms. Christopher: We never gave it points the last time. (Mr. Mosher: We had the Condition for this variance in the last development report.)

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

*Commissioner Final Comments:*

Mr. Pringle: I support the variance; it is a correct solution. I think that a narrow, 4 foot one would be inappropriate so the trade off was good. I am neutral on the points.

Mr. Lamb: I think that it meets the intent of the policy.

Ms. Dudney: I support it.

Mr. Butler: I support it.

Ms. Christopher: I support it.

Mr. Schroder: I support it.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Brown Hotel Variance, PC#2013055, 208 North Ridge Street, with the presented findings and conditions and a zero (0) point analysis. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2. Maggie Point Homes (MM) PC#2013050; 9525 Colorado State Highway 9  
(Mr. Butler recused himself from the discussion as a potential contractor for the project.)

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to develop 18 multi-family units (9 market rate and 9 workforce deed-restricted units). Mr. Mosher noted there was an error in the staff report: the correct total for the point analysis was positive four (+4) points. Each unit has at least a one-car garage and some units have two-car garages. The Planning Commission last reviewed this project as a preliminary hearing on July 3, 2013. At that meeting, the Commission expressed concerns about:

- a) Site buffering to the neighboring residential buildings;
- b) The look of the proposed wood siding;
- c) Reducing the impacts from the extra parking spaces;
- d) Having a site visit.

Changes since the July 3, 2013, Planning Commission Meeting:

- a) The elevations have been updated with each building delineated and accurate grading (existing and proposed shown);
- b) Additional landscaping shown along property edges;
- c) Updated elevations with existing and proposed grade line shown;
- d) Removal of a culvert along the south property line;
- e) A streetscape will be presented at the meeting;
- f) The Applicant's Agent will also have a sample of the proposed siding at the evening meeting.

The applicant and agent had sought a quick turn-around to final review from the last meeting. The submitted plans address the concerns associated expressed by the Commission and with the Development Code. Separately, the applicant is working on the off-site improvements to the access off Highway 9 and how the sewer line will be routed.

Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission believe the perimeter site landscaping buffering to the neighbors is adequate?
2. Should negative points be awarded for the site buffering along the west edge?
3. Did the Commission believe the 1X10 siding being proposed is too dissimilar to the architecture around Town?
4. Staff believes that positive two (+2) points may be awarded for providing 13 common parking spaces for the project. Did the Commission concur? Staff welcomed any other comments.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Mamula: Can you explain the rationale for not awarding points for site design and excessive grading? The Commission has said that the condition you find your property in is the condition that you evaluate it at. Maybe things have changed, but it used to be you developed in the condition that you find it in. It's been hydro-mined, so what? There should be negative points for the massive cut and fill on this site. (Mr. Mosher: Staff has past precedent to not assign points. On good example is the Wellington Neighborhood. There were no negative points awarded on this Dredged property. We also had an example in the Highlands.)

Mr. Lamb: What did we do on the old BBC site? (Mr. Mosher: They came in before annexation, as did Corkscrew Flats, graded and then, after annexation, made their application.)

Mr. Pringle: I agree with Mr. Mamula and might challenge the grading issues, but it's water over the bridge. I know what Mr. Mamula is talking about and I'm sympathetic, but I'm not sure.

Mr. Schroder: What about site buffering? How is adequate buffering judged? Should the adjacent neighbors have buffering as well? (Mr. Mosher: Staff will look at the distance away from the property line, the size of the building and the proposed and existing plant material. Generally is five feet minimum distance we'd expect for a parking lot, which has no height.) It's a judgment on the smaller buildings here and there are going to be new plantings so it varies.

Staff recommended approval of the presented Point Analysis for Maggie Point Homes, PC#2013050, showing a passing score of positive four (+4) points.

Mr. Bobby Craig, Architect:

We have everyone here. As for the site buffering, for those who were at the site visit today I think that we showed you that the actual buildings are not on the edge, but pulled back from the steeper slopes. At the last meeting there were concerns about the decks on Buildings 4, 5 and 6, so we moved three of the four decks on Buildings 4 and 5. The one that remains in place is on Building 4 so that we avoided all decks going over that slope. It also gives us more room for buffer; there are a lot of aspen trees on that slope. So we want to hand-select on site where those landscaping pockets will be to plant the new trees in. We want to save as much of the trees possible. At the last meeting we mentioned getting rid of a culvert along the south property line that would require removing most of those aspens in the ditch; we got rid of the culvert and put in a small wall. Those were our solutions to your concerns about preserving the buffering around the edges.

Detention area: we retained most of the trees there by creating planting pockets. Architecture: our theme here is more of a mountain lodge or rustic finish. Here is an example of what we are not going to do (showing lap siding). Our siding is a true 1x and has a channel edge that locks over the other one showing a joint. In the Town's "Victorian districts" you wouldn't want an 8 inch exposure but we aren't trying to do that here to be different; we are purposely going for a wider plank to make it look like a heavier piece of wood. We have brought samples of the color which will be a 12 inch board with a two inch batten; we may go with a darker color on trim and I have rock samples if you want to take a look at those.

The last thing is the streetscape: we have Building 2 and Building 3 which are the triplexes and Building 4 which is the duplex and Building 6 presents a single story and Building 7 is 1-1/2 stories tall. Generally, with the Point

Analysis prepared by Staff, we have no concerns. The positive six (+6) Points for the housing has been established by the Council. We have tried to address the site buffering but we understand that negative four (-4) points will be awarded tonight. We are actually 18 parking spaces over required minimum. As far as site access goes, we are very close to a final agreement with Ski and Racquet Club HOA. As far as the sewer easement, we are getting closer to working with the neighbors and Ms. Deb Linden (Owner's Rep) is here if you have questions about that. We have no concerns with the Findings and Conditions.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Mamula: What's the length of the driveways on Buildings 4 and 5? (Mr. Craig: They are 25-feet from face of door to edge of drive and 24-feet on the shorter edge; 18-feet is the minimum length and its 18' on Building 7.)

Mr. Pringle: I had the same concern Mr. Mamula did; just seemed like a massive expansion of paving in front of these two buildings. (Mr. Craig: The extra paving is partly because we pushed the buildings away from each other per your direction at previous meetings.) (Mr. Mosher noted that two of the garages are single, with the second parking space tandem, in front of the garage door.)

Ms. Dudney: The cut and fill is between that natural grade and the undulation is between those buildings and the entrance to the property. You are not really disturbing cutting or filling along any of those. (Mr. Craig: Any of the retaining walls that we've added have been specifically to add an additional buffer. We are trying to equal cut and full on the site out and compared to the previous application we've done a better job reducing the impacts.)

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Jay Rust, President of the Woods Manor HOA: Thank all of you who participated in the site visit today; it was very helpful to see what they were talking about. You are all to be highly complimented for sticking it out with the rest of us. In terms of our own thoughts, I'm not an architect or engineer, one of the things that we are concerned about is that we understand that we need retaining walls and from looking at the plans, we trust in Mr. Mosher to ensure that it will be done that way it needs to be done. Building 4; that does not have the decking on the side (it's still hanging out there) is troublesome but with proper landscaping that slope could be retained. There was quite a bit of recent erosion where the deck would actually sit. I don't know if it would be possible to move the access road for the project further east so that the entire project could be moved farther east too. I appreciate that nobody would want to have 5 feet separation between the buildings. So, I don't know what can be done to also give enough space between the buildings and push these further back if this cut into the development could be realigned. The other thought was about site disturbance; at the base of that is our development and we wouldn't want the existing aspen trees to be disturbed. All of that said, this is a vast improvement then we saw before. The architectural features, the plans, are far superior then what we had before. It's going to be developed, regardless; we all had to come in first, so we get that. I do appreciate your understanding of our balconies, our views from Building A and B onto the site and we support everything that was said about buffering. Thank you for your patience, diligence and care for the fabulous town that we have.

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

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Mamula: I went out to the site on my own after the published site visit; can you explain about that west slope? These last two rains eroded that slope a bit, and I'd like to know what the plan is to make sure that it doesn't degrade more and lose the trees, some of them have exposed roots. (Mr. Mosher: There could be individual tree wells to hold new and existing plantings, and as with any project, also trees identified by Staff will be chain link protected, any trees

that are lost are replaced, and landscape netting will have to be put down on the steeper slopes to stabilize the grade.) Can you do tree wells on some of the existing larger trees? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, it's possible to build them up; like cut and fill, and have the tree in a well and cover up where the roots are exposed.)

Ms. Christopher: Is this the plan? (Mr. Mosher: This is a Condition of Approval. Engineering has already warned us that their approval may be very time consuming to look over the details. We are going to be fine tuning a lot of these details with the Building Set of drawings.)

Ms. Dudley: To install retaining walls, aren't we bound to lose vegetation? (Mr. Mosher: These are not retaining walls in this area but stacked stone planters to keep the soil in.)

Mr. Mamula: Rather than having a condition that they will replace them, I would like add a condition to have them be protected prior to moving forward. Somehow, the condition is that some measures need to be employed to protect these specimen trees. Really, I'm concerned about the slope on the west. (Mr. Craig: You just want to quantify that with Staff?) Yes, that in conjunction with the landscaping plans. I get it that we are going to let Staff do this, but I don't feel comfortable saying that that's plenty of buffering for me. Last time when I went out there, there have been two big rains. (Mr. Mosher: Staff expressed the same concerns. Ms. Puester is suggesting is that we can modify Condition #16 on Page 42 of your packet or add a new Finding to identify and preserve the Aspen grove and enhance where needed on the west side of the property. We can then add into the final motion.) (Mr. Craig: Do you want to put it in there that we will walk it with Staff?)

Ms. Dudley: Can you explain why the drive can't be moved further to the south as your neighbor suggested? (Mr. Craig: There is a power pole with some guy-wires and we are already tight up against it. Xcel doesn't want to do it either.) (Mr. Mosher: Also, Town Engineering standards like to see at least 100 feet to intersections, and moving it south would reduce that number.)

Mr. Pringle: The deck on Building 4: you moved the other decks back, is there any consideration in making that the same as the other decks? It seems like it sticks out further than the other decks. (Ms. Diane Yost, Applicant: At the respect of the new owners of the neighboring Allaire Timbers Inn, they did not want the deck closer to their deck, so we left it there.) So its depth is not going to be a concern? (Mr. Craig: No, it's not over the edge at this location.) I'd like to see the calculation of the hard surface of the driveways at Buildings 4 and 5 versus the driveways of any of the other units and why does it appear like there is a significant difference? Do you see what I'm saying? (Mr. Mosher: The function of the different sizes of garages, 2-car and one-car, for the reasoning behind the difference in hard surface. There is more functional snow stacking as well.) I just thought that there seemed to be too much hard surface. (Mr. Mosher: For the most part, it's all functional space.)

Mr. Lamb: I agree with the point analysis; the project has come a long way. On the driveway, I don't think a 25-foot driveway is excessive; I am fine with those two driveways. I am fine with the project and would like to see it go forward. I like the larger siding and it is appropriate for a building like this, especially now that I see it. I think that what we have written now is pretty good, but to make it more iron clad is fine.

Ms. Dudley: I also agree with the point analysis; I think what Mr. Mamula brought up about site disturbance a good point but I wouldn't be in favor of negative points because the perimeter of the site meets existing grade and doesn't have a visual big impact on the neighbors. I have no problem with the siding and I agree with Mr. Lamb regarding additional tree protection. I would like some additional language in the Conditions.

Ms. Christopher: I also agree with the point analysis; the negative points for site buffering and positive points for parking. I feel like parking is a major issue on many Town projects. We could always use extra. I don't have problems with the driveways; the landscape language change I would support. I don't have any problem with the channel siding, but I think that an 8-inch

exposure would fit better on these small buildings.

Mr. Mamula: I don't feel that the landscaping buffering is at all adequate; we see much smaller projects with way bigger number of trees. Most of what is proposed are aspen which are bare in the winter; you're going to see these buildings at least most of the time in the winters. I don't think it's even remotely adequate. Yes, definitely negative points and I'd ask for more if I could garnish support; there are two trees in that buffer along the west in reality between the back of the homes and the property line, the rest are in between the internal buildings. This and only two aspen, so virtually zero buffering. I'd like to see more landscaping behind those two buildings in particular. I'm fine with the siding. The parking you'll get the points for, but the thing is over-parked; we are actually giving extra points for the size of those driveways. I do think that we should ask for negative points under Policy 7 for the site design and grading. I don't remember Wellington grading. That whole experience was a terrible year out of my life, going through that one. I'm going to make a motion for more negative points for excessive grading, we are doing a lot of disturbance on this site, we have a huge retaining wall on the north, we'll need one on the rest there are some site grading issues. Other than that, it's better than it was. Does it belong here? I don't know. Adding density to a site where we have buffering issues still but it seems like this train is already on the move.

Mr. Schroder: I support the point analysis; I would support the positive two (+2) for parking and I support the siding. I support the way it looks and believes it meets code. I would support the point analysis as presented. The language change in the Conditions for buffering is a great recommendation especially given the conversation that has gone on this evening. I'm not in support of too much landscaping against homes. We are talking about fire mitigation around homes and adding landscaping too. There appears to be a conflict.

Mr. Pringle: I think it's hard to talk about site buffering when we don't have a lot of room; basically we are asking for sizable buffering in for screening and on the other hand we are talking about defensible space, I think we have to come to grips about the big picture there. I'll be neutral as to whether or not it is adequate. It's hard to work with minimal numbers; I don't know if we should put negative points or not for site grading; if you're going to award points with landscaping and then create problems with defensible space. I agree with what Ms. Christopher said; with the scale of the buildings 8-inch might have been a better choice, but it doesn't matter. I think that we are getting some oversized parking spaces which add to the problem of the hard surface and looking for places for snow stacking and the other parking spots seem to be more strategically placed more than just a big drives for Buildings 4 and 5. I could be sympathetic to Mr. Mamula's motion and it would still make the project pass. I appreciate the streetscape drawings; I would criticize the streetscape of Buildings 7 and 6 and the garage door look at the front with little else, but I'm not going to bring that up. I'm in favor of the language change.

Ms. Dudney: I would not be in favor of not giving any negative points per Policy 7. The site should be designed to minimize the amount of cut and fill, which is why I would be against assigning negative points.

Ms. Christopher: When we did the old BBC lot, I thought that was part of the Application; we were to re-grade it to natural grade. It's kind of the same here. I thought at the last project it was part of the Application. (Mr. Grosshuesch: There have been several precedents set. Most recent was the approval of the lodge at Peak 8 in March.)

Mr. Mamula: We used to give them negative points all of the time.

Ms. Puester read new Condition #24: "Applicant shall protect existing tree stand not shown on tree survey west of Buildings 4, 5, & 7 as approved by Town Staff through such means as construction fencing, slope stabilization, and tree wells for the purpose of protecting existing buffer."

Mr. Craig: Are we redundant on anything else in here?

Ms. Dudney called a recess for the applicant to review the new condition with staff. The meeting was called back to order after the recess.

Mr. Mamula made a motion to change the landscaping points to negative four (-4) points, changing the final point analysis to an allocation of zero. Mr. Pringle seconded.

Ms. Christopher: Yes.

Ms. Dudney: No.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

Mr. Schroder: No.

Mr. Pringle: Yes.

Mr. Lamb: No.

The motion failed (3-3).

Mr. Mamula made a motion to change the landscaping to negative two (-2) points, changing the final allocation to positive two (+2) points. Ms. Christopher seconded.

Mr. Schroder: No.

Mr. Pringle: No.

Mr. Lamb: No.

Ms. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

Ms. Dudney: No.

The motion failed (2-4).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis as presented by Staff for Maggie Point Homes, PC#2013050, 9525 Colorado State Highway 9. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve Maggie Point Homes, PC#2013050, 9525 Colorado State Highway 9, with the presented Findings and Conditions plus addition of condition #24: “Applicant shall protect existing tree stand not shown on tree survey west of Buildings 4, 5, & 7 as approved by Town Staff through such means as construction fencing, slope stabilization, and tree wells for the purpose of protecting existing buffer.” Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

### **COMBINED HEARINGS:**

#### 1. Beaver Run TDR (MM) PC#2013049; 620 Village Road

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to remodel the exterior of the existing porte-cochere with natural materials and enclose 494 square feet of the existing covered walkway between the porte-cochere and lobby. This project will allow guests to wait inside a heated area of the building rather than outside for personal and shuttle vehicles. This will also assist in reducing unconditioned air from entering the lobby. There is not enough density remaining in the approved Master Plan for this proposal. Hence, the project will require a Master Plan Amendment and density transfer. Beaver Run Resort was constructed in the 1980s. Over time there have been many modifications to the original development permit and Master Plan. Most recently in May 2011, the Planning Commission approved an addition of 820 square feet with an associated density transfer and Master Plan Amendment for the addition of an elevator shaft between Buildings 1 and 2 to improve internal circulation within the resort.

The Planning Department recommended the Planning Commission accept the presented Point Analysis for the Beaver Run Vestibule Airlock Entrance and Density Transfer with Master Plan Amendment (PC#2013049)



showing a passing score of zero (0) points.

The Planning Department recommended approval of the Beaver Run Vestibule Airlock Entrance and Density Transfer with Master Plan Amendment (PC#2013049) with the presented Findings and Conditions and Point Analysis.

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

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Mamula: For the record to Council, I don't think we should be charging for this kind of density to happen; there are a lot of instances on Main Street where it would be nice to add an airlock to allow for better energy efficiency but it would be adding to density. It's more energy efficient which the Town has made a pointed drive towards and somehow we should be allowed to waive density; it should lead to a broader conversation with the Council to allow airlocks in the commercial core.

Mr. Lamb: I agree; no one is living there; its common area. (Mr. Mosher: Staff has discussed this and it is on a list to review.)

Ms. Christopher: We don't allow it in residential for people taking advantage of it, why would we just allow commercial to do it? (Mr. Mosher: This is usually common area, not living area; for circulation and like Mr. Mamula said it isn't livable density.)

Mr. Mamula: There are a lot of buildings on Main Street that could use it; my property did it and it has made a huge difference. It's the comfort in those two or three really cold weeks of the year; and there are a lot of places like that on Main Street if they could figure out a way to make it more comfortable for our guests.

Mr. Pringle: I don't disagree but in principle when you build with maximum density allowed it isn't fair to allow people to come in and then add more density per say to the project. Plus, the historic district character is important to keep; people can add an airlock inside their existing building.

Mr. Mamula: The problem is that the building that we own got passed with lots of positive points. (Mr. Mosher: This will likely always be affecting older pre-approved buildings.) Peek-A-Boo Toys on Main Street has one door; if he could build something like that without altering the feel of the building, it would be better for the guests.

Ms. Christopher: I would err on the side of caution and I can see people taking advantage of it and it looking out of character. (Mr. Mosher: Staff is aware of this.)

Mr. Mamula: We actually have to have a discussion about it before we talk to Council about it. We'll need to carve some time out to plan what we want to take to Council.

Ms. Dudney: A discussion on these issues; the buildings that this would apply to etc. so that we are all on the same page first. (Ms. Puester: We can have a discussion on the Top Ten list in more detail than in the past.)

Ms. Dudney: It could be something on the agenda. When we have to carve out this time, let's have enough time to discuss the point analysis for annexations that bring in this affordable housing too. I'd like to understand it better. Let's make sure to assign some time under other matters so that we can understand.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis as well as the Density transfer with Amendment with a passing score of 0 for the Beaver Run TDR, PC#2013049, 620 Village Road. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

**OTHER MATTERS:**

Ms. Puester reminded the Planning Commissioners about the Committee Reception on July 24, and to please RSVP no later than July 21.

We've got the State APA Conference October 2-5<sup>th</sup> in Vail and Ms. Puester will send out an email to see if any of the Commissioners were interested in attending.

Lastly we have a new intern, Shane Greenburg joining us and we want to welcome him. We are happy to have him.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9 pm.

---

Gretchen Dudney, Chair