

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**WORK SESSION**

1. Comprehensive Plan (MT)

Mark Truckey presented the updated changes to the comprehensive plan recommended by the Planning Commission from the February 5 meeting. He explained an open house would be held on the plan prior to the Planning Commission's March 4 meeting.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Pringle: Absent

Mr. McAllister: Arrived at 6:45pm

Mr. Joyce: Does information exist regarding the effects of using insecticides to prevent beetle kill? (Mr. Kulick responded that staff had done some research and although the data was not definitive, it indicated a strong concern with impacts of insecticides, particularly when introduced near water sources. Staff indicated Town Council direction was to pursuing tree spraying only on specimen trees this year.)

Mr. Bertaux: Arrived at 6:26pm. Watershed protection area should be mentioned under forest resources. (Staff noted it had been added.) Appears use of pine beetle insecticides is still inconclusive regarding impacts. 4 O'clock road and Park Avenue intersection needs some management, such as no left turns.

Dr. Warner: Didn't think beetle kill is "devastating" (as text suggests) but a wildfire would be. Make sure the environmental policy notes "preserving, maintaining, and enhancing" open space. Consider language regarding understanding the use of insecticides to control beetle infestation on the environment. List additional ways to prevent gridlock during peak days.

Mr. Allen: Concerned whether time allocated on plan document was sufficient. (Staff reminded Commission that each chapter in Plan had been previously reviewed by the Commission.) Suggested adding time on the March 4 agenda to allow public input and direction from the Commission. Sustainability section is example of time needed to prepare a document like this. It seems this plan is quite dated referring to 2004 not 2008. (Staff explained that the data in the document is being updated accordingly. Mr. Grosshuesch informed Commission of the utilization of the plan for the Town of Breckenridge and how it differs from the way most jurisdictions use their comprehensive plans.) Concerned that trends now may be different than four years ago and is that captured in the Plan? Suggested some word changes regarding the beetle kill paragraph. Page 10 in former version of Plan mentions 150 foot setback in LUD 4; is this still in effect? (Staff explained the Shores development is not within 150 feet setback from highway.) Water storage should be addressed in the master plan (McCain property). Page 100, check July 2007 numbers. Page 102 regarding hauling and storing snow, do we need to expand to discuss need to ensure snowmelt water is filtered/cleaned prior to release to streams? Page 103, include a statement on need for sidewalk along Airport Road. Page 105 regarding need for traffic light at 4 O'Clock Road and Park intersection. Page 107 is dated as employee-parking permits are already happening. Page 108 review for a lot has been completed already. Page 113, #19, again update this line, much has been accomplished in coordinating parking issues with the ski area. Page 124 regarding daycare, should we note that there may be a need for one additional day care facility (or at least continue to assess needs)? Page 134 under economy section, should we encourage a large conference facility? (Staff indicated that the issue has been discussed previously and was rejected partly because of large anchor hotel that would be required to support large conferences.)

Mr. Khavari: Agreed that beetle kill would not be "devastating" as Plan mentions. On the global warming section, do we have an advantage in the ski industry at our elevation? (Mr. Truckey: probably yes at least in the short-term.)

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:08 P.M.**

**ROLL CALL**

Michael Bertaux  
Peter Joyce  
Sean McAllister

John Warner  
Mike Khavari

Rodney Allen  
Dave Pringle arrived @ 7:19pm

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES***

Mr. Allen suggested a change in the work session part of the minutes. Minutes should change to reflect that he had asked “if members of the Commission could attend and speak at a Council meeting ‘as an applicant’, or on an issue with a conflict of interest?” With no other changes, the minutes of the February 5, 2008 Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (6-0).

***APPROVAL OF AGENDA***

With no changes, the agenda for the February 19, 2008 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (6-0).

***CONSENT CALENDAR:***

1. Valette Residence Permit Renewal (CN) PC#2008017; 301 South French Street

Mr. Joyce: on page 21, does condition of approval still exist that north deck be removed? (Mr. Neubecker: Yes, that is still a condition of approval. Staff showed the same plans from a few years ago, which still reflected the deck at the time.)

Dr. Warner: pointed out this home would have a driveway that would be heated. Should single-family residences be given a free ride regarding heated driveways? Or should negative points be assigned? The Commission will discuss in a work session.

2. Dudney Residence (CK) PC#2008016; 229 Highlands Drive
3. Vlach Residence (JS) PC#2008015; 1227 Discovery Hill Drive
4. Thomas Residence (MGT) PC#2008019; 478 Preston Way

Mr. McAllister: sought clarification regarding the driveway and the points assigned. Staff explained the reasoning behind the longer driveway. The long driveway was caused by the need to keep the slope of the driveway from not becoming steeper than 8%. The alternative was to snow-melt the driveway.

5. Lot 7, Warriors Preserve (MGT) PC#2008018; 111 Victory Lane

Dr. Warner: pointed out FAR regarding this item.

6. Summer Fun Park (CN) PC#2008014; 320 North Park Avenue

Dr. Warner: asked about fencing around this project.

7. Norton Residence (CK) PC#2008008; 117 Sage Drive

Dr. Warner moved to call up item #6, Summer Fun Park, PC#2008014. Mr. Joyce seconded. The call up passed 4-0. Mr. Bertaux and Mr. Khavari abstained.

Dr. Warner: sought clarification regarding the fencing, material and color.

Regarding the fencing, Rick Sramek from the Breckenridge Ski Resort explained to the Commission the type of fence to be used. Mr. Joyce asked if an alternative fence could be considered such as the steel mobile panels. Mr. Allen was supportive of the Fun Park but concerned about the visibility of the Fun Park on the Highway side of the project. Staff pointed out the fence would need to be mobile for seasonal purposes. Staff also brought attention to page 70 which illustrated the use of the fence. Mr. Allen asked if the Alpine Slide would continue to run. Mr. Allen was ok with buck rail fencing to be used with a matching color.

Dr. Warner moved to approve item #6 with condition 18 adding that “The fence along west side of the site shall be constructed of buck and rail with a fabric barrier attached, and the fence shall be removed by October 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. McAllister seconded. The motion was approved 4-0, with Mr. Pringle, Mr. Bertaux, and Mr. Khavari abstaining.

With no other motions, the remainder of the consent calendar was approved.

**COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Block 8 Subdivision (MGT for MM) PC#2008013

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal on behalf of Mr. Mosher to resubdivide a portion of Lot 3, Block 6, of the Wellington Neighborhood (this would be the third filing for Phase II) in connection with the recently approved Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Master Plan. This resubdivision would create 12 lots for the construction and sale of 11 single-family homes and 1 double house (duplex) on one lot. The lots would be: Lots 1-12, Block 8, Wellington Neighborhood, Filing 3.

The initial subdivision for the Wellington Neighborhood (PC#1999149) encompassed the entire 84.6-acre property, while only a portion was initially developed. Lot 3, Block 6 was left unimproved and anticipated for future development. The Planning Commission approved the Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Master Plan (PC#2005042) on February 7, 2006 and the Town Council approved it on February 14, 2006.

The first re-subdivision of Wellington Neighborhood Phase II (Wellington Neighborhood Re-Subdivision of Block 5 and Lot 6 PC#2006013) was approved by the Planning Commission on February 21, 2006. This is the third re-subdivision filing, pursuant to that Master Plan, that identifies the lots to be created on a portion of Lot 3, Block 6 of the Wellington Neighborhood.

The layout of this block is similar to the illustrative plan of the Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Master Plan Modification. Staff has advertised this application as a combined preliminary and final review as they believed the pertinent issues were reviewed under the first re-subdivision. However, if the Commission believes that the layout of this re-subdivision is not ready for final approval, we suggest continuing this hearing to a future date.

Mr. David O'Neil, Applicant, pointed out that the same architects are designing this project as used in the passed.

Mr. Khavari opened the hearing for public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Pringle: Final Comments: OK to approve this application with a condition that landscaping be added to buffer Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8 from French Gulch Road.

Mr. McAllister: Final Comments: OK to approve this application with a condition that landscaping be added to buffer Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8 from French Gulch Road.

Mr. Joyce: Final Comments: OK to approve this application with a condition that landscaping be added to buffer Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8 from French Gulch Road.

Mr. Bertaux: Final Comments: OK to approve this application with a condition that landscaping be added to buffer Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8 from French Gulch Road.

Dr. Warner: When cars are driving up French Gulch Road will their headlights shine into the windows on the Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8? (Mr. O'Neil did not think the headlights would impact the residences much. Mr. Thompson stated that on Lot 11, Block 7, Mr. O'Neil agreed to mitigate the effects of headlights with additional landscaping. Mr. O'Neil agreed to add landscaping to Lot 1, Lot 7, and in the common space for Dragonfly Green near French Gulch Road.)

Final Comments: OK to approve this application with a condition that landscaping be added to buffer Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8 from French Gulch Road.

Mr. Allen: Landscaping on private property should be included in the Conditions of the Development approval. Additional landscaping at the north end of Dragonfly Green should be included in the Conditions of Resubdivision.

Final Comments: OK to approve this application with a condition that landscaping be added to buffer Lot 1 and Lot 7, Block 8 from French Gulch Road.

Mr. Allen moved to approve Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Block 8 Subdivision, PC#2008013, with conditions to add landscaping to Dragonfly Green. Dr. Warner seconded. The motion was approved 6-0 with Mr. McAllister abstaining.

2. Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Block 8 Development (MGT for MM) PC#2008012

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal on behalf of Mr. Mosher to construct 13 units on 12 lots. 11 units are on single-family lots and 2 units are part of one duplex lot. Four of the single-family units are slated as “possible” market-rate units and the remaining lots are proposed as deed-restricted. The Planning Commission has previously seen all of the proposed models with earlier applications. The models for this block are: Winter Rose, Juniper, Hawthorne, Cottonwood, Oak, Copper Rose, Ponderosa and the Mountain Ash.

The last review of new homes on Block 7, PC#2007049, was presented to the Commission as a Class A (rather than separate Class Cs). Since the Commission has reviewed so many of these typical developments before, Staff presented this application as a combined Preliminary and Final hearing.

Mr. Khavari opened the hearing for public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

- Mr. Pringle: Wanted to make sure switching market rate units wouldn't negative negatively impact availability.  
Final Comments: Does it meet the requirements of the Master Plan? (Mr. Thompson answered yes it does meet the Master Plan.)
- Mr. McAllister: Abstained due to possible conflict of interest. Mr. McAllister has represented David O'Neil on a limited basis as an attorney.
- Mr. Joyce: Sought clarification regarding drainage. The applicant addressed his question.  
Final Comments: Fine with this application.
- Mr. Bertaux: Sought clarification on market rate units; staff clarified.  
Final Comments: OK
- Dr. Warner: If one is coming up French Gulch Road will the headlights shine in the windows on Lot 7? (Mr. O'Neil didn't think headlights would be an issue.) (Mr. Neubecker suggested the garage on Lot 1, Block 8, be moved to the north as far as possible without impacting the installed utilities, to block headlights. Mr. O'Neil stated he would check with his architects and see if the garage could be moved to the north to help mitigate headlights coming into the residence windows). How wide are the Greens compared to past Greens? (Mr. O'Neil pointed out they are about the same. Mr. O'Neil stated he thinks the greens are about as wide as the Pearl Street Mall. Mr. O'Neil believes there is something about this width that frames a sense of place.)  
Final Comments: Wanted to see extra landscaping on Lot 7 to mitigate headlights coming into windows.
- Mr. Allen: OK with this application with the addition of the more landscaping on Lot 7, and perhaps in the Right Of Way of French Gulch Road.  
Final Comments: I am fine with this application, no additional comments.
- Mr. Khavari: Final Comments: I am fine with this application, no additional comments.

Mr. Allen moved to approve Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Block 8 Development, PC#2008012, with two additional conditions of approval: moving the garage on Lot 1 to the north and additional landscaping in the French Gulch Road ROW or north end of Dragonfly Green. Dr. Warner seconded. The motion was approved 6-0 with Mr. McAllister abstaining.

***FINAL HEARING:***

1. 100 South Harris Street Restoration and Addition (MGT) PC#2008003; 100 South Harris Street  
Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to complete a full historic restoration on the residence and the barn in the rear of the property and construct a small addition to the main residence. The residence currently sits two and a half feet over the north property line. The applicant proposes to lift the residence, obtain Landmark status for the residence and the barn, and add a basement under the house and the new residential portion of the shed. The historic frame will be stabilized and moved temporarily to Lot 2 to facilitate basement construction. New floor framing is proposed as required, 15" above existing floor elevation to correct drainage. Restore the historic barn and turn it into a two-car garage. Applicant proposed to turn the lower roof (labeled as shed on site plan) part of the barn into an accessory apartment.

Staff appreciated the changes the applicant has made to work within the recommendations of the Development Code and “Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation District”.

Staff had two questions for the Commission:

1. Did they support the use of vertical siding on the rebuilt concrete shed?
2. Did they support the amount of glass proposed on the west side of the accessory apartment/shed?

If the Planning Commission supported these changes, then Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Sutterley Residence, PC #2007003, Lot 1, Block 7, Yingling and Mickles, located at 100 South Harris Street, with the attached findings and conditions.

Staff also asked for the Commission to make a second recommendation to the Town Council that this property be designated as a Local Landmark.

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect: Discussed shed and adding a new window. Pointed out the window will not be in street view. South facing siding is beat up. Landscaping was designed together with adjoining lot. In terms of landscaping, she feels positive points are warranted. Point analysis for historic restoration should warrant positive twelve (+12) points rather than positive nine (+9). Significant public benefit may include cooperation with CMC students studying historic preservation degree.

Mr. Khavari opened the hearing for public comment.

Mr. Lee Edwards, local Architect: Landscaping sometime in the future will block the historic home. Historically, landscaping wasn't abundant. Allow applicant to raise the home out of the ground. Extensive work is being performed and positive twelve (+12) points are warranted. Concrete wall on East side of shed is deteriorating. Felt that vertical siding was appropriate for the east elevation (existing concrete grout shed) of residence.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Pringle: Regarding landscaping, more is not always better; rather, "better is better". Asked the applicant if she wanted to discuss landscaping points when she didn't need them. (The Applicant stated she did want to discuss landscaping points. She was trying to establish a precedent for next project, and thought this was worth positive points.) Sought clarification from staff regarding obtaining positive twelve (+12) points for restoration. If Commission goes ahead with positive twelve (+12) points, should the siding be horizontal and the openings be adjusted?

Final Comments: Wanted to say that the historic preservation effort is of "significant public benefit", but only meets the requirements of positive nine (+9) points. Would prefer to see some adjustments for positive twelve (+12) points but would suggest positive four (+4) points for landscaping.

Mr. McAllister: Not in favor of positive four (+4) points for this landscaping plan. Positive nine (+9) points for historic restoration, not positive twelve (+12) points. Vertical siding on east elevation ok. Fine with the amount of glass shown on shed.

Final Comments: Agreed with staff regarding positive nine (+9) points for historic preservation. Vertical siding fine and ok glass proposed. Ok with Landmarking.

Mr. Joyce: Asked if the proposed windows lined up with the historic openings. (Ms. Sutterley stated the window openings weren't exact.)

Final Comments: Ok with landscaping as planned and would be in favor of positive points for landscaping if the sizes were increased. Not supportive of vertical siding because of Priority Policy 125. Landmarking supported. Points proposed were agreeable.

Mr. Bertaux: Asked how many times have positive fifteen (+15) points have been awarded for historic preservation? (Staff could not think of an example. Ms. Sutterley thought her current house had received positive fifteen (+15) points under the old point system.)

Final Comments: Agreed with staff's points analysis; would support positive four (+4) for landscaping.

Dr. Warner: What was the original use of the barn? (Mr. Thompson: A shoe and boot place, shop for making skis, and most recently a wallpaper business.)

Final Comments: Supported Landmarking. Felt that the landscaping is exceptional and thus warrants positive four (+4) points. Likes flat rock work proposed. Supported positive nine (+9) points for historic preservation; as proposed positive twelve (+12) would be possible with one less

window. Vertical siding only ok in the eave; would prefer horizontal siding on shed where concrete is replaced.

Mr. Allen: Asked Ms. Sutterley if the log underneath the siding was usable. (Ms. Sutterley pointed out those logs may not be chinked, may not be good to expose.) Sought clarification regarding landscaping absolutes. (Staff explained criteria for points and gave examples of positive points awarded in the past.) Regarding garage doors on Lincoln, he suggested remote door openers to improve traffic flow, so user would not need to park in ROW while opening door.

Final Comments: Supported positive four (+4) points for landscaping. Following examples in Development Code leads to positive nine (+9) points but significant public benefit leads to positive twelve (+12). Positive twelve (+12) points with minor changes would be possible.

Mr. Khavari: In the eave area (where there is currently vertical siding) vertical siding is appropriate. All other elevations should be horizontal.

Final Comments: Supported positive nine (+9) points as is. Horizontal siding on concrete replacement encouraged.

Mr. Bertaux moved approval with staff's point analysis as is, seconded by Dr. Warner. Motion passed 4-3. There was then a long discussion about the motion, and what was just recently approved. Staff indicated that there should be one motion on the point analysis, and only once the point analysis is finalized, a motion on the project.

Mr. Allen moved to amend the previous motion and Dr. Warner seconded but both parties withdrew amendment.

Mr. Pringle moved to rescind all actions taken above. Mr. McAllister seconded. Approved 7-0.

Mr. McAllister moved to approve point analysis as is with no changes, and Dr. Warner seconded. Motion denied 1-6.

Mr. Pringle moved to change point analysis to assign points for landscaping from zero (0) to positive four (+ 4) points. Mr. Allen seconded. Approved 6-1.

Mr. Pringle moved to approve 100 South Harris Street Restoration and Addition, PC#2008003, 100 South Harris Street, with the modification for point analysis regarding landscaping. Mr. Bertaux seconded. Approved 7-0.

### ***WORK SESSIONS:***

#### ***1. Solar Panels (JS)***

Ms. Skurski presented. The topic of solar panels is on the Planning Commission's Top Five list. Solar panels have been a recent issue with the installation of solar panels on a few buildings in Town, and with a greater emphasis on renewable energy. Staff foresees that applications for solar panels will increase in the future out of concern for energy conservation and the Green Building Code. There are no standards in the Development Code, which would specifically prohibit this; therefore, Staff has allowed the use of solar panels both inside and outside of the Conservation District without any negative or positive points.

The purpose of this work session is to discuss an approach to drafting a policy, which would create consistent regulations for solar panels both within and outside Conservation District, if the Commission would also like to address this.

Staff asked for feedback from the Commission on the following:

1. Would the Commission like to address solar panels outside of the Conservation District in addition to the Conservation District?
2. Were there any additional concerns with solar panels other than what was mentioned in the memo?
3. Should policy 5R or 33R be re-worded to better address renewable energy sources and design standards?

#### ***Commissioner Questions/Comments:***

Mr. Pringle: Should remote arrays be specifically mentioned and encouraged? Do we want to see solar in the historic district? If so, panels should not change the slope of the roof. If positive points are awarded for solar and then the solar is removed what will the town do? What is the life of the

- shingles type solar cells? (Mr. Allen replied that it was 20 years.) Based on the technology today, there is not a way to have zero visual impact.  
Final Comments: Integrity of historic homes is paramount. On historic structures, panels should be allowed by special review only. Fine with solar panels on new buildings in the District.
- Mr. McAllister: Panels should be out of sight and out of view. Fine with points but it is difficult to get too specific with type of PV for a certain amount of points when technology will constantly be changing in this field.  
Final Comments: In favor of severe limitations, with similar pitch line of the existing roof. Don't change angle of roof, and put the panels out of sight, off of the primary facade.
- Mr. Joyce: Panels should be the same color of the existing roof, black or bluish black. Parallel to the pitch of the roof. Look at the multiplier and types of PVs. 3" above the existing roof seems like the standard.  
Final Comments: Agreed with Mr. Pringle and Mr. McAllister's final comments. Did not want to prohibit having panels but would prefer panels to match roof color.
- Mr. Bertaux: How flat is "flush mounted"? (Staff replied that typically we have been seeing 3 1/2" above the roofline).  
Final Comments: Inside the conservation district and outside are two different worlds. Inside is difficult but did not want to prohibit them or allow for any potential damage to the historic structure. OK with the existing policies in the Historic District Guidelines. Not concerned with solar panels outside the district.
- Dr. Warner: Should there be a standard (gold, silver, bronze) regarding points assigned for different materials used? What about a new pitch of panel if it is in the rear of the building? Would be all right with 3"-5" above existing roofline, or industry standard. Believes that the shingle style cells are better than remote arrays.  
Final Comments: Would like to discuss panels both inside and outside the Conservation District. Remote arrays and shingles should be studied further specific to this area and the snow here. Inside the district: hopeful of new technology. Concerned but would not want to close the door. Policy 69 alleviates most of concerns. Would be OK with special review of historic structures. Put in the conditions of approval. The Town of Breckenridge needs to monitor panels throughout their life. Reword policy 5R and 33R.
- Mr. Allen: Final Comments: Incentives for solar panels with positive points and make sure they continue to work. Points should be assigned according to type of panel used on a case-by-case basis. Match the pitch and color of the roof. Inside and outside the historic district are two different topics of discussion. Inside should not be on the primary facade. Outside of the District would be ok with the panels being on the primary facade. We need to discuss wind power and Policy 33 in the future.
- Mr. Khavari: Sought clarification regarding the Green Building Code and its limitations on where and how the panels would be installed (Mr. Grosshuesch stated that the Green Building Code allows for points on the building side but does not address appearance or placement.)  
Final Comments: Agreed with special review, not highly visible and does not effect the integrity of the structure and roof. Should not have any adverse effects to the Historic District.

## 2. Landscaping Policy (JC)

Ms. Cram presented. Within the last year, three new ordinances have been adopted, one regarding Noxious Weeds (Ordinance No. 15, Series 2007) another regarding Mountain Pine Beetles (Ordinance No. 16, Series 2007) and lastly one regarding Water Features (Ordinance No. 39, Series 2007). In addition, staff has been discussing the importance of improving forest health through forest management plans, wildfire mitigation and replanting with diverse species. Staff has also discussed the possibility of adjusting the point multiplier for those developments that propose new landscaping with the Town Council.

Staff believes that updating the Town's Development Code with regard to Policy 22 – Landscaping, to include new absolute and relative policies is necessary to be consistent with the recently adopted ordinances noted above and desired forest management goals for future development. This would assist the public in knowing what requirements there are pertaining to these ordinances and provide potential opportunities to mitigate negative impacts when applying for a development permit.

Staff introduced some of the proposed changes to Policy 22 to the Planning Commission. Staff shared these with the Town Council in October and received feedback on what policies should be absolute and those that should be relative. Staff will use Planning Commission feedback to work with the Town Attorney to draft changes to Policy 22.

With the goal of trying to improve forest health, reduce wildfire risk and maintain buffers within Town, it is important to look at updating our existing landscaping policy. Staff welcomed any additional thoughts that the Planning Commission had with regard to landscaping.

Staff discussed water features and replanting for Mountain Pine Beetle infected trees with the Commission. Due to lack of time, the Landscaping Ordinance will be discussed again at the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

- Mr. Pringle: Asked about water rights on water features. (Staff pointed out that water in Town is metered.) Size needs to be addressed for disturbance and energy issues. Seek information from the CSU forest service on replanting recommendations for Mountain Pine Beetle. Let's think about where we are planting trees so that trees don't become a problem in the future by being too close to structures.
- Mr. Joyce: Page 143 regarding replanting for Mountain Pine Beetle trees, what about 2-3 acre lots? Staff pointed out that replanting would be required in a reasonable manner. The Commission suggested defining "reasonable".
- Dr. Warner: Suggested a ratio to define reasonable time for replanting after removal of Mountain Pine Beetle infested trees.
- Mr. Allen: Ok with year-round operation of water feature with negative points assigned under energy conservation. Strictly against use of any chemical to prevent freezing. Pointed out Policy 9 on page 146 might be illegal. Really like three zones for defensible space.
- Mr. Khavari: Would like to regulate size for water features.

***TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:***

None

***OTHER MATTERS:***

None.

***ADJOURNMENT:***

The meeting was adjourned 11:20p.m.

---

Mike Khavari, Chair