

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Michael Bertaux	Rodney Allen	Dan Schroder
Leigh Girvin	Jim Lamb	Dave Pringle arrived at 7:25

Mike Khavari was absent.  
Eric Mamula, Town Council Liaison, arrived at 8:30pm for the worksessions.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

With no changes, the minutes of the September 2, 2008 Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (5-0). Mr. Pringle was absent.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Neubecker announced an additional worksession on the Planning Commission Top 5 to be discussed after the Highlands Park Fuel Break. In addition, there will be an update to the Planning Commission field trip. With no other changes, the Agenda for the September 16, 2008 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (5-0). Mr. Pringle was absent.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Abbett Placer Inn Solar Panels (MGT) PC#2008101; 205 South French Street

Mr. Lamb asked if there was a requirement that the color of the solar cells needed to match the color of the roof. (Staff explained code requirements. Staff encourages applicants with new roofs proposed or new construction to match the roof color to the solar panels, but they do not require applicants to change existing roof shingles or colors when solar panels are installed.)

Mr. Schroder asked if solar panels could vary in color.

2. Deal Residence Addition (MGT) PC#2008100; 683 Settlers Lane

Ms. Girvin: What about if the next door unit decides they want the same feature? Is a precedent being made in this situation? What kind of precedent is being set? (Staff explained if an applicant has room on their lot and they meet the code they would be allowed to move forward.)

Mr. Allen: Who controls the remaining density and mass? (Staff explained that the HOA controls the remaining density and mass in the subdivision.)

With no motions, the consent calendar was approved unanimously (5-0). Mr. Pringle was absent.

**COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. BBC Master Plan Modification (MM) PC#2008102; 13445 State Highway 9

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to modify the original Delaware Flats Master Plan (Permit #2000159) to allow the addition of 2,100 square feet of density on this site to allow the enclosure of an exterior storage shed and to allow the approved Master Plan architecture of the exterior sheds to allow this enclosure. There were no other changes proposed.

Mr. Mosher explained how the 40 SFEs of Service Commercial density on Lots 1, 2, and 3 was flexible with Lot 1 establishing the base remaining density for Lots 2 and 3. This modification moves 2.1 SFEs onto Lot 1 to cover the enclosure of one of the storage sheds. Jon Brownson owns all three lots, so he is aware that less density will be available on Lots 2 and 3 if this proposal is approved.

Staff believed the submittal met the intent of the Development Code and the original Placer Flats Master Plan. Staff suggested the Commission approve the Modification to the Placer Flats Master Plan, PC# 2008102, by supporting the presented Point Analysis along with the Findings and Conditions.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Bertaux: Final Comments: No comments, supported the project

Ms. Girvin: Would this satisfy the need for more storage? (Staff explained yes.) Will this application come before the Commission again? (Staff explained this was a combined hearing. A class D application will be submitted to staff.)

Final Comments: Concurred with Mr. Bertaux.

Mr. Schroder: Sought clarification regarding the density and if it was available. (Staff explained that density was available.)

Final Comments: Concurred with Mr. Bertaux.

Mr. Lamb: Final Comments: “Slam-dunk” application.

Mr. Allen: Final Comments: Fine with application.

Mr. Bertaux made a motion to approve the point analysis for the BBC Master Plan Modification, PC#2008102, 13445 State Highway 9, as presented and Mr. Lamb seconded. The motion was carried unanimously (5-0). Mr. Pringle was absent.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the BBC Master Plan Modification, PC#2008102, 13445 State Highway 9, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0). Mr. Pringle was absent.

**PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1. O’Rourke Square (MM) PC#2008091; 226 South Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to remove the existing small non-historic house and then construct a new single family residence with an accessory apartment. The main house would have four bedrooms, four and one-half bathrooms and a two-car garage. The accessory apartment would have one-bedroom and one bath with a one-car garage.

This application has been started well. Pending the comments on possible positive points being sought, the above ground density coverage may be adjusted to ensure a passing score on the final review.

Staff had four questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission believe the module massing was met on the north elevation?
2. Would the Commission be supportive of allowing the upper level deck on the south elevation facing Washington Avenue ROW?
3. The applicant would possibly be seeking positive points for donation of the existing building to the Town. Staff welcomed any Commissioner comments.
4. The applicant was seeking positive points for the proposed landscaping. Staff welcomed any Commissioner comment.
5. Staff also welcomed comment on the proposed solar panels.

Staff welcomed any additional comments on the overall development. The Planning Department recommended this application return for another review.

Alice Santman, Agent from BHH Partners, presented the initial color schemes to the Commission. Concurred with what staff had presented. Ms. Santman would like to obtain enough information tonight from the Commission to move forward to the final hearing. Pro-forma on the solar panels is difficult to obtain at a preliminary design. This is a prime location for solar use.

Amy O’Rourke, Applicant: We took great pains to comply with code and present a project agreeable to everyone. Had several meetings with staff to present a preliminary review that had already addressed many concerns. Plan to have this house “off the grid”.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Ms. Girvin: Why would the Arts District want this building? (Staff explained they were interested in the building character, and the size is right.) What was the story behind it? (Ms. Santman explained that the building could be destroyed and disposed of or be refurbished and reused. The goal here is to save the building.) Questioned the on-site parking: three garage spaces and would there be three parking

spaces available in the driveway? (Staff explained that three spaces were required and the garage spaces fulfilled this requirement. The spaces in the driveway do not meet the required depth and were not counted.) Can the accessory apartment be rented? (Staff explained that the only requirement for the accessory apartment is that it be kept under one ownership. It can be rented or simply used by the owner.) How would this proposal improve the current ice damming along the sidewalk from water running out of the alley? (Ms. Santman pointed out that Public Works did not want the heated sidewalk for maintenance reasons.) Do you want to be off the grid or have net metering? Massing was fine, perhaps a dormer on the north side would be appropriate to break up the roof form. Fine with upper level deck. Landscaping positive points would be fine, but focus on quality vs. quantity. Would like to see the landscape plan tweaked before awarding positive points. Having problems with awarding positive points for moving a white elephant (the existing building). Seems like double dipping as the Town incurs the costs and hassle. Would like additional info regarding the Arts District's desire for the building. Wanted to be sold on the positive three (+3) points. Concerned about residents or renters parking in the alley. (Ms. Santman pointed out that the alley paving was away from the property line. The actual paving of the driveway would allow parking without affecting circulation through the alley.

Mr. Bertaux: How does one discern the historic average age of a house? (Staff explained how the average was determined with County records.) Was there a grade change as the alley heads north? (Ms. Santman explained how there was just a small change in grade to the alley behind the garage and then the alley climbs more as it heads north.) Pointed out that the letter from the applicant indicated that the home was built in the 1960's. Concerned this project with the accessory apartment will be used as a duplex or lock off and generate unwanted impacts to the site. Concerned intense use will adversely impact the neighborhood with excessive parking etc. Massing is to the code but this building appears as a duplex with the link. Why two paint color schemes? Proposed upper deck was fine. Positive points for the donation of the old house would be suspect if the town doesn't really want the building. Try to get more information for the next meeting. Beef up the landscaping to obtain positive points. Agreed with Ms. Girvin that the Adams Street sidewalk icing should be resolved.

Mr. Schroder: Liked the design style. Highlighted the link criteria paragraph in the staff report. Didn't look at all like a duplex. Looks appealing and will be an asset to the corner. Module massing met on north elevation. Pedestrian friendliness was fine. Upper level deck or porch was fine. In support of positive three (+3) points for donation of building to town. Sought clarification by next hearing regarding solar power data. (Ms. O'Rourke stated goal was to be as off the grid as possible.) Wanted to be sure enough energy can be gained before positive points were awarded. Landscaping was fantastic. Reverse meter might be better than off the grid. Going down the right and good road.

Mr. Lamb: Have positive points been awarded for donation in the past? (Staff pointed out the Nichols received positive points for donating the Quandary Antiques building.) Duplexes are equal size and this is not. Didn't look like a duplex. Massing looked good. Upper level decks would not be a problem and they looked fine. Struggled with positive points for building donation. Find other ways to reduce points to make application easier to pass. Rebecca Waugh's comments would be warranted. Positive points for landscaping was fine, beef it up though. Loved solar and glad to see the applicant is doing it.

Mr. Pringle: (Arrived at 7:25pm.) Asked if a cultural resource survey had been done on the property. (Staff and applicant confirmed one had not occurred.) Suggested maybe one should be done first. Not in favor of donating what appears to be a contemporary building into the Arts District. Sought clarification regarding the connector element in the middle of this project. (Staff explained a connector element is required per a priority policy whenever the above ground density exceeds the suggested nine units per acre. This is done to break up the perceived massing.) Pointed out this looks like two separate single family homes or a duplex. Stated duplexes are prohibited in this district and this looks like a duplex. Would prefer not to see the connector element. Reads to him as two separate houses with two separate functions which is prohibited. Felt like two single family homes on the lot. Upper deck was nice but maybe don't go so deep. Not persuaded about the donation of the existing house to the Arts District and not supportive of the positive three (+3) points without more information. As for the landscaping: better is better, plan for the future growth of the plantings so the site is not overwhelmed later. This is a very prominent pedestrian route.

Mr. Allen: This will greatly improve the site. Liked module massing. No problem with upper deck. Positive points for donation would be ok if he can be persuaded the Town wants the building. Would like to see the applicant contribute some of the costs associated with moving the building if positive points

were awarded. Landscaping quality over quantity more mature species. Was ok with positive points for solar generation. Take care of grading and icing which may earn more positive points too.

**WORKSESSIONS:**

1. Highlands Park Fuel Break (JC)

*(Mr. Mamula arrived at the start of this work session.)*

Ms. Cram presented a proposal to reduce fuels around Tract D, Highlands Park, involving the removal of trees to reduce possible fire spreading and allow space for fire fighters to work. Project would take about one week. Will be visible from valley. About two truck loads of usable lumber will be hauled off site. Others would be chipped or burned once there is snow on ground. Some natural revegetation will take place over time. Some seeding may be necessary in a few years to assist regrowth. We have been working with the RWB and Highlands Park HOA.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Ms. Girvin: Weeds follow this kind of work, hope this will be monitored and weeds mitigated if they sprout up. Skid roads serve as emergency access. If this is fire mitigation, don't we want to keep this area clear and not replant? (Staff explained fire mitigation doesn't always mean keeping a forest clear. The RWB fire district is in favor of what was proposed.)

Mr. Schroder: The forest has changed and we need to change with it. Can we gain anything from salvageable logs? (Staff explained that the decision to treat the areas included the contractor being able to salvage some of the lumber.)

Mr. Lamb: This isn't clear cutting, this is forest management.

Mr. Pringle: Is blow down a concern? (Staff explained Eric Petterson, consultant, has addressed the potential for blow down in the way that areas are treated.) What would be the likelihood to do some light grading for emergency access which would be very beneficial if a fire ever broke out? (Staff explained that the skid roads would aid in this regard.) A good time to plant a tree was 20 years ago and today.

Mr. Allen: No comment.

Mr. Mamula: Good job.

2. Planning Commission Top 5 List (CN)

Mr. Neubecker presented an update to the Planning Commission Top 5 List.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Ms. Girvin: Attach weeds to landscaping and wildfire item.

Mr. Pringle: Energy conservation needs to be discussed so it can be quantifiable and measurable. Sunsetting density is important but shouldn't be in the top five. Concerned about deed restrictions in light of the foreclosure pace in the current economy.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

Chris Kulick mentioned that October 8, 9, and 10, 2008, are the dates for the Park City field trip, which is still on. He discussed the tentative agenda. Staff will buy airline tickets very soon.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

---

Rodney Allen, Vice Chair