

to be preserved and thus this policy is important. Pointed out that size becomes important when considering natural habitat and preservation of vegetation, birds, insects, etc. Some argue that the town should give the sustainable building code a chance, but a 10,000 square foot home was approved tonight so maybe the sustainable building code doesn't work. Need to count basements that daylight in the above ground calculations.

Mr. Schroder: Struggled with a policy that restricts a property owner; nevertheless, thought limitations and maximums would be important to prevent mega homes. Could this be a relative policy? Approach #2 was most desirable. Liked the 80 or 90% idea because it allows for additions. No strong feelings. Many unknowns were in his mind at this point.

Mr. Lamb: Had a fear that the folks were unaware the town is considering such a policy. Didn't want to invest a lot of time to have it shot down and the end when these neighborhoods express their concerns. Would suggest a mass mailing to everybody in the impacted neighborhoods. Logical choice was approach #2 (80-90% conforming). Mr. Pringle has a point about assigning negative points if you exceed a set limit. Would like to know if there is a concern from subdivisions about being having a large home next door. The hybrid and sliding scale seem to work out about the same. Agreed that anything underground should not count against density.

Mr. Pringle: Suggested treating this policy the same as density and height policies in the code. What about a relative policy concept? As you go bigger, you have to offset. Points could be extremely difficult to make up as you get very large. Liked the approach taken elsewhere in town where you are able to build based on your lot size and if you build larger than allowed, you are assigned negative points. Assume most homes are ¼ acre or larger and figure out how to mitigate from there.

Mr. Allen: Sought clarification as to the difference between the hybrid and the FAR. (Ms. Puester ran through examples as requested on differences of the hybrid and sliding scale examples.) Would like to see all the background spreadsheets to better understand in the future. Did not agree with this policy but Council asked us to look at it. Include a new column on what the owner could build to if maxed their current setbacks and height for the Weissshorn example. Would like to see a grandfather clause in case of fire. Liked approach #3 with maximum existing size as a benchmark unless it is an extreme anomaly. Would like a relative policy more. Opposed to 7,000 square foot limit on large lots (over 1.0 acre) and it should be larger and vary by subdivision. Liked the sliding scale most. Also show the average lot sizes in the chart. The public needs to get involved and express their concerns.

Mr. Mamula: The guy with the biggest check book builds the biggest house with the sustainable code. Nothing wrong with the Highlands, but it is a dark neighborhood. Detracts from what this town is; wanted to be careful to make sure real people can live here. Community character is one of the most important issues for the town. Second homeowners do not add to the character and have their lights on year round. Airport Road might end up where all the lights are on because that is where the affordable housing is. Locals will be priced out. There is a huge gap between second homes market and affordability. Can't regulate good taste. Everyone has different taste. The shortest but not necessarily easiest way is to limit home size. Pointed out this code is intended to preserve the character of the community.

Mr. Allen opened the worksession to public comment.

Marc Hogan, Architect: Agreed with the goal to preserve the character of the neighborhoods. The design, not the size, usually poses the problem. He pointed out examples were good design hides square footage through breaking up rooflines, putting square footage below grade. Agreed with Ms. Puester that below grade should not be included. Suggested creating incentives for good design and allow for additional square footage, such as through TDRs, to allow homes to get bigger than a set limit. Many tools are in the code already to address these issues. Different lots such as up slope or down slope have different impacts; homes can be stepped down to have lesser impact than a 4,000 square foot home that does not step. Need to build with restrictions on appearance.

Andrew Webster, Summit Builders Association: The public that showed up at the last meeting seems to be against such policy from his view. The building industry has experienced many new policies recently, including housing impact fees and green codes; limiting home size will not necessarily change the character of the neighborhood. The policy should focus on the shape and appearance of the home, not the size. Wait and see what the Sustainable Code will do to limit sizes. Limiting size does not preserve character. Pointed out that the Sustainable Code didn't apply to the 10,000 square foot home approved earlier in the agenda; code takes affect in 2009.

Lou Fishman, Summit Builders Association: Concurred with Mr. Hogan and Mr. Webster. It's all about design versus size. People buy homes under the impression that policies like this will not hinder their desire to change their property.

Kem Swarts, Member of Warriors Mark and Warriors Mark West HOAs. Went through this information with Ms. Puester on Friday. He pointed out agreements that were hashed out during the annexation. Wanted to make sure that if there is a fire that people can rebuild to the size they have now, even if it is nonconforming. Has an eclectic neighborhood character. He would like to see an owner be able to rebuild at their current square footage if the need arose. During annexation it was quite clear that the lots on the slope side didn't have basements, therefore accommodations were made to mitigate this unique situation. Annexation agreement anticipated variances. Wanted to make sure that there is some flexibility to allow for solar panels in the future. (Mr. Pringle asked if there is concern regarding the neighborhood character protection.) More concerned with lot line vacations and the ability of someone to build a super-house on what was once two lots, and overpowering rather than a typical scrap off as the lots are mostly smaller.

With no more public comment, Mr. Allen closed the hearing.

2. Planning Commission Field Trip (CN) (Memo Only)

Mr. Neubecker presented a memo reminding those Planning Commissioners attending the field trip to Park City Utah of the logistics for the trip leaving Wednesday morning, October 8th.

OTHER MATTERS:

Mr. Mamula pointed out that the Planning Commission was getting a raise that would be mitigated by increased fees. The Council will work on the budget next week and their will likely be reduced spending on special projects next year.

Ms. Girvin wanted to put in a plug for the county's Citizens for 1A, Vote Yes.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:37p.m.

Rodney Allen, Vice Chair