

- Mr. Pringle: Changes made are appreciated. This project is compatible with development to the north. I understand the views that were enjoyed by the neighbors, but the applicant has a right to develop the property, and it follows the design guidelines. Unfortunately, the views that were enjoyed for years will now be developed. The restorations to the sheds are positive. Agreed with landscaping points assigned.
- Mr. McAllister: Sought clarification from staff regarding views. (Staff pointed out policies addressing views, in policy 6 and 7.) The code doesn't specify situations like this application. Code does not have mandatory view preservation. Point analysis was acceptable.
- Mr. Bertaux: Agreed with others. Project is approvable by point analysis. Additional parking space in front of garage doors is not restricted. Yes, it will have some impact on the use of the alley. There would be a big change to the neighbors but the code allows for the change. This is a good-looking building that respects adjoining properties. Landscaping points assigned are acceptable. This is a good addition to the historic district.
- Mr. Allen: Agreed with Mr. Pringle's comments. Landscaping proposal is acceptable as proposed, as well as points assigned. No need to increase landscaping size for points.
- Mr. Khavari: Simple architecture with adequate landscaping. Vistas are important and the applicant has taken it upon themselves to protect the neighbors view to the best of their ability. Ok with garage on the alley. Ok with the connector element. Ok with landscaping as proposed. Vistas are important, but Ms. Sutterly has done what she could with the design.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Hastings Residence (Lot 2, Block 7, Yingling & Mickles), PC#2008002, 102 South Harris Street. Mr. McAllister seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the variance request for the Hastings Residence (Lot 2, Block 7, Yingling & Mickles), PC#2008002, 102 South Harris Street. Mr. McAllister seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Hastings Residence (Lot 2, Block 7, Yingling & Mickles), PC#2008002, 102 South Harris Street, with the findings and conditions as proposed by the staff. Mr. McAllister seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Maggie Placer Development (MM) PC#2008024; 9525 CO State Highway 9

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to develop the Maggie Placer property with 18 deed/equity permanently restricted housing units in the form of condominiums. Pursuant to the Annexation Agreement, there shall be 6 one-bedroom Restricted Units, 8 two-bedroom Restricted Units, and 4 three-bedroom units. All parking for the units is surface spaces placed south of the building.

Staff has been working with John Springer, of Springer Development, and John M. Perkins, AIA, of JMP Architects to present a proposal to the Planning Commission regarding the development of the recently annexed Lot 6, Tract 7-77, Section 06, Quarter 2, Maggie Placer, MS#1338, (Maggie Placer Development). 82% of the proposed units would be permanently affordable (this application) and the remaining four market units would be cluster single-family homes (separate applications). The permanently affordable rate is set at 80% AMI to 115% AMI. All of the affordable housing would be constructed prior to the sale of the four market rate lots. This development would not be phased.

This proposal is off to a good start and, with the small lot, had obtained 82% of the units as permanently affordable. The cluster home sites and subsequent development of the homes will be reviewed as separate Class C applications after the subdivision is processed. Staff did have concerns with the overall building height and expected revisions for the next hearing. The Planning Department recommended this application return for a second review. Staff is working with the Town and County engineers to improve access off of Highway 9 to avoid flow through the Ski and Racquet Club driveway. Additional trees are proposed along east side to add buffers.

Staff requested Commissioner comments on the site buffering and any other aspects of this application.

John Springer, Springer Development (Applicant): Trying to break even on this project. Wanted to develop a quality project. Larger than average units with 9-foot tall ceilings. Willing to bring ceilings down to 8 foot if need be to address building height. These units will have gas radiant heat and will have high-end finishes. Regarding Ski and Racquet concerns, he explained his interpretation to the Commission and pointed out the improvements he felt would be made to the intersection and access points. Had not contacted neighbors yet as the design was just reviewed by the engineers.

Mr. Khavari opened the hearing to public comment.

George Grill (The Corral HOA): Drainage at the north end of the site is a concern since the Corral is directly downhill. Didn't want to see water from the hard surface areas of this development being channeled off-site to the Corral. Concerned about the setback from Highway 9 and the need for a provision for a footpath down into downtown to avoid trespassing through the Corral property. (Staff noted that there is already a Town sidewalk built along Highway 9. The existing trespass is from the Ski and Racquet Club tenants.)

Dan Olmer (Agent for Ski and Racket): Concerned about access to the site from Highway 9. He felt communications haven't been open between the HOA of Ski and Racquet and the developer. We sent a letter to the developer requesting a meeting, but have not heard back. The parking for the number of units proposed is insufficient. Open storage for "toys" is another problem he foresees. There is not enough space for either parking or storage.

Jan Bowman (Director with Ski and Racket): Was totally opposed to this application. Regarding access onto the highway, it is already a mess now and increased usage would only worsen the situation. The drainage pond is a terrible mosquito breeding ground. A sewer drain would help this problem. Two thirds of the units in Ski and Racquet are owner occupied. There are already too many cars trying to access Highway 9. Ski and Racquet is totally opposed to allowing any access via the existing curb cut along Highway 9 for this project. Project accesses site through Ski and Racquet property, but permission has not been granted. Access was granted to Allair Timbers.

Norman Stein (Director with Ski and Racket): Suggested other access points should be considered.

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

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

Mr. Pringle: Are we able to sustain the buffers on the north or backside? (Staff explained yes, they would be sustained.) Nice architecture. Access to the driveway needs to be worked out. Access could be from Highway 9, but that would make matters worse. Parking and storage should be bumped up if possible. Height overage needs to be addressed. Consider snowmobile and other toy parking on-site if possible, as these are always a problem. Consider adding guest parking. The four single-family lots should be considered and discussed further.

Mr. McAllister: Agreed with Mr. Pringle. Snow storage will be dealt with in detail later but will there be any issues? (Staff felt comfortable with snow storage to be addressed later.) Salute you for trying to make the site work for employee housing. This is an aggressive program for a small piece of property. Extra on-site storage is a concern. Will the proposed indoor storage be sufficient? Extra parking will also be a concern. Glad to see the design conform to the Ridgeline Development recommendations. Site drainage and subsequent impacts needs to be addressed. Work to avoid future lawsuit with neighbors. Circulation is key to address. Eager to hear solutions to Commission's and neighbor's concerns.

Mr. Bertaux: Sought clarification for next meeting regarding the detention pond. (Staff discussed options.) Sought clarification regarding square footage for the different types of units and number of bedrooms. (Mr. Springer: 1-bedrooms are 786 sq. ft., 2-bedrooms are 1,114 sq. ft. and 3-bedrooms are 1,614 sq. ft.). Storage is a concern; are there additional storage areas? (Mr. Mosher: no.) Work on height issues with staff. Must be convinced circulation and site access issues are resolved with neighbors. Parking lot needs more landscaping and buffering, looks too tight. May need to add guest parking. Need to solve access problems. Needs more landscaping for buffers. Maybe spray the lodgepole trees so they will survive in the future. Mr. McAllister said the site plan was "aggressive"; I would say it is "tight". Address drainage issues Mr. Grill discussed.

- Mr. Allen: Agreed with comments made. Sought clarification regarding whether or not this application would need to comply with the new landscaping policy. (Mr. Mosher: explained the applicant would not be required to follow the new policy because their application was submitted prior to policy revisions.) Sought clarification regarding height. (Staff addressed height policy.) Efforts applauded for affordable housing on such a tight site. Height must conform to Code. Floor plans are generous and 9-foot ceilings are great; try to keep them and knock them down only where needed to address height. Buffering and visual impact is a concern around the site; but won't put much weight into existing lodgepole pine forest. Trail or sidewalk plans would be appreciated. Parking, although meeting Code, might be insufficient and overflow parking is encouraged, as it would help with guests. The legal access needs to be sorted out.
- Mr. Khavari: Agreed with all comments mentioned. The applicant needs to talk to Ski and Racket and work things out. Generous square footage is very nice.

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Solar Panels (JS)

Ms. Skurski presented a memo and first draft on the solar panel policy for buildings within and outside of the Conservation District.

The topic of solar panels on historic structures is on the Planning Commission's Top Five list. With a greater emphasis on renewable energy, Staff foresaw that applications for solar panels would increase in the future. There are no standards in the current Development Code that would specifically prohibit this; therefore, Staff has allowed the use of solar panels both inside and outside of the Conservation District. This policy would serve as a guideline to where solar panels would be appropriately placed on structures or sites. Staff drafted a policy based on Commissioner comments and concerns for structures and sites within and outside of the Conservation District. Staff would like to get Commissioner comments on the drafted policy.

Staff had presented this topic as a worksession item to the Commission on February 12. The following bullet points summarize the direction given from that previous worksession:

- Do not change the slope of the existing roofline.
- Permit panels on the non-primary elevation.
- Distinguish new construction from historic structures.
- Include detached site arrays in criteria.
- Panels must not damage the historic roof or structure.

Commissioner Questions/Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Historic fabric is of primary concern; the historic character should always take precedence. It should be a compatible color. There may be some instances where panels may not be allowed if impacts to the historic character are too great via stark color contrast or would reduce the rating of the house. (Ms. Skurski stated that technology will ultimately evolve and may allow for better, less obtrusive and less visual applications in the future.) The roof color should be considered for new construction to blend. Research wind power along with solar panels.
- Mr. Bertaux: Would like a percentage limit of the roof to be covered by panels, such as 50%. Pictures of various applications and a material sample would help. Include language which would not allow for a stark contrast.
- Mr. Allen: If it is new construction, the roof should match the color of the panels but if it is not a new roof, the color should be complimentary. Regarding paragraph A: with a single pitch, would a panel be approved? (Ms. Skurski stated that a definition for non-primary elevation could be added.) Sought clarification regarding replacing historic windows beyond repair with solar windows.
- Mr. McAllister: If panels are used, the colors of the panels and the roof should match. Might not be approved if the panels are contrasting. The historic character is the first concern.
- Mr. Khavari: It's amazing how windows can be repaired to make them efficient; it's expensive but works well. Liked the first paragraph, but would strengthen it even more to justify saying no if it doesn't work for the site.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Dr. Warner was absent; therefore, there was no Town Council report.

OTHER MATTERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16p.m.

Mike Khavari, Chair