

## 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 September 17, 2013 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the September 3, 2013, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Goldreyer Residence (SG) PC#2013076, 422 Timber Trail
2. Hart Residence (MM) PC#2013077, 201 South Pine Street
3. Hauer Residence (MGT) PC#2013081, 312 Westerman Road
4. Hirsch Retail Building Master Sign Plan (MGT) PC#2013080, 216 South Main Street
5. Project X (MGT) PC#2013079, 103 North Pine Street

Mr. Mosher: Some members of the HOA of Hart Residence might be present and it is our understanding that the Harts have not come to an understanding with HOA, but that is not the Planning Commission's matter. (Mr. Lamb: Do they not get a permit if not approved by the HOA?) (Mr. Mamula: No, that has nothing to do with the Town of Breckenridge. The issues are between private property owner and HOA.) Nothing in the code that says we have to make a comment in report, but planning staff usually do.

Mr. Mamula: Question on Goldreyer: Steep slope with fairly long driveway and it looks like the driveway has an unusual switch back? (Mr. Greenburg: That was a private drive, but we requested that they improve it.) Ok, I understand. Now that we see really steep lots being developed that the driveways get longer.

Mr. Thompson: Regarding the Hauer residence, to meet the 8% grade they had to keep it that long. (Mr. Mamula: Are we asking for increased landscaping?) Yes, we did ask for extra landscaping.

Mr. Pringle: Please clarify on the Master Sign Plan. (Mr. Thompson: It gives them a few more feet because previously they weren't using everything available with the previous sign plan, so proposal is to use the full signage allowed. The mature trees make it hard to see the upper level signs.)

With no requests for call up, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

### WORKSESSIONS:

1. Planning Application Reclassifications (JP)

Ms. Puester presented an update to the memo for the September 3 worksession on Planning Applications. Major changes are:

- Class A:
  - Wireless Towers and Antennas (establish a new permit classification addressing land use, visibility and location).

- Class B: (Minor)
  - Vendor Carts, Large (duration of up to 3 years – no change to existing regulations).
- Class C:
  - Vendor Carts, Small (reclassification-currently a Class B, but public notice still required to adjacent property owners within 300’ of proposed location. These would go on consent calendar.)
  - Temporary Structures (new category added for seasonal structures)
  - Clarify that additions to commercial, office or industrial structures of less than 10% of the existing structure mass and under 1,000 sq ft. require Class C permits.
- Class D:
  - Single family, duplex structure or major remodel outside of the Conservation District, with or without an accessory apartment, except where development a) warrants any negative points (including applications which achieve a passing point analysis); b) is located on a lot, tract or parcel without a platted disturbance envelope outside of the Conservation District as defined in Section 9-1-19 4A (Mass); c) has no Homeowners Association Architectural Review mechanism accepted by the Town.
  - Master Sign Plan Modification (new category added).
  - Substitution or modification to employee unit (modification to floor plans added).
  - Minor remodel definitions (clarify 10% residential mass addition).

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Mamula: Class D Single family proposal: can we add that there is no issue with HOA? (Ms. Puester: If we are going to condition that they have something, then we’d have to be responsible to see if the HOA is going to respond. Really can’t hold an applicant up because a third party will not issue an approval. Different if issue is with the code.) It is less about responding and more about responding in the negative situation. (Ms. Puester: Don’t think we can hold it, can ask Tim Berry to confirm.)
- Ms. Dudney: They are going to have to get through the HOA but it is not the town’s responsibility to figure out how the HOA is going to get through it with the individual. Private matter.
- Mr. Mamula: But we are saying that we trust the HOA to not bring an issue to us.
- Ms. Dudney: It will vary by circumstance and the HOA bylaws. (Mr. Grosshuesch: What would we care about if they aren’t objecting to something within the code?) What if the HOA doesn’t believe their style agrees with the HOA? (Mr. Grosshuesch: When it comes to us we look at some different things than they would. We would look at architectural compatibility.)
- Mr. Mamula: When we did the one with the skylight in Miner’s Candle and the HOA came here. How do we handle that? We ended up coming to an agreement with everyone and said that skylight was not compatible. (Ms. Puester: It went through a court process. It’s what we do currently and I can scratch the HOA mechanism part.)
- Mr. Pringle: We must have something in the bylaws/code that the Town does not rely on HOA, could reference if needed.
- Ms. Dudney: It comes down to the Highlands goes through a rigorous process, but if there is not HOA it comes to us. But I think it is well written because there is very few things that get by the HOA and staff. We don’t get in the business of being between the HOA and individual. What does “mechanism accepted by the Town” mean? (Ms. Puester: There could be a subdivision out there without an HOA but you could make one up, not sure on this item. I feel comfortable taking C out.)
- Mr. Lamb: Doesn’t staff still have authority to say that we question it and bring it up to the Commission?
- Ms. Dudney: The issue is that they would be forced to.
- Mr. Pringle: Eliminate C (HOA language).

Mr. Schroder: Eliminate C.

Ms. Christopher: Eliminate it.

Mr. Mamula: Neighborhood preservation; policy 4A Mass applies to those without envelopes. (Ms. Puester: We looked at all neighborhoods that didn't have platted envelopes when we went through that process. When subdivisions are platted with envelopes, we looked at ridgelines, gulch, wetlands setback, any significant environmental features and made sure they were platted through the subdivision process when it went through Planning Commission. At question are those lots without envelopes.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We looked at driveways at grade issues. In the Highlands, we did fit tests to see if structures would fit in envelope, so a good amount of site planning that have envelopes have already had planning review, so what is left is architecture and landscaping.)

Ms. Dudney: Are we ok with not forcing it to come to us, just because it is not ridgeline?

Mr. Pringle: I was opposed to this change and still am. I think it is still the Planning Commission's role to look at single family home development. I would like to have all of them come to Planning Commission except the ones that are no brainers and this list has gotten bigger and I think we need to be more critical. Question on duplex or major remodel: what is a major remodel?

Ms. Dudney: Add the word "a major remodel to" single family homes. (Ms. Puester: Please see page 77-would be included as a class D, major remodel is defined on page 79 "major remodel". Of 10% or more of the existing structure square footage; this is how its currently defined, no change is proposed. Trying to clarify some language on the minor remodel definition regarding less than 10%. A major remodel would follow suite with new single family. If no, envelope than it goes to us.

Ms. Dudney: A, B and striking C does this work? I'm ok.

Mr. Schroder: I'm ok.

Mr. Pringle: Not ok. Still would like to see everything.

Mr. Lamb: I'm ok.

Mr. Christopher: I'm ok.

Mr. Butler: I'm ok.

Mr. Mamula: I'm worried about the future with a different planning staff and I'm worried about the worst case of something passing and then I drive by and see it after the fact and then we go through a big process to address it, but it is too late. My concern is that we don't get to see something and then we deal with it after the fact.

Ms. McAtamney: I'm worried about the future and losing the historic perspective of the staff we have now. And all of sudden a stucco house gets built. If everything is on consent calendar then we might miss things that need to go on the Top 10. We have enough left to do that I don't want to see the Town lose the work we've done on planning.

Mr. Pringle: If we just wave things through we don't get the moment to talk things through.

Ms. Dudney: Let me be devil's advocate. The reason they brought this up is that is save significant staff and Commission time and there are very few staff call ups, less than 1% of single family homes and historically we've not had issues and it saves the homeowner 3 weeks time not that that part should matter to us to much but short season.

Mr. Pringle: I still think that the Planning Commission still should weigh in and have the opportunity to look at things.

Ms. Dudney: Ultimately the Town Council needs to weigh in on this.

Mr. Mamula: When we first started seeing hardy board / planks, those were long discussions that led to the way the code was interpreted and we hadn't done this we would have had homes in Sunbeam Estates with terrible looking hardy board siding, if the Planning Commission hadn't brought it up and changed the code.

Ms. Puester: We do point out the issues we see in the application especially when we see new materials and raise that to the Planning Commission.

- Mr. Mamula: Is it possible to do this for a year or some amount of time to look at projects?
- Ms. McAtamney: In Wellington Neighborhood, there is a lot less variety of homes than there were in phase 1. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We could do an annual retreat that we could go and point out the projects for the year but we have worked hard to get the code to this point. No new issues have been brought up in a while. If we see an issue with something we bring it to the Commission's attention.) (Ms. Puester: Second bullet point gets to this issue: to know all the applications that are in the process, we could put this in administrative rules so that is followed into the future with whatever staff is in place then.)
- Mr. Pringle: I don't know how many current staff have sat through the process before we streamlined it to this. We've streamlined quite a bit. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We have written some good code provisions and know what the key issues of the Town are. It is the ones that we don't review frequently that do need review; historic additions, duplexes, etc. I would ask you to consider that we have a lot of these issues dialed in and the idea of having a Planning Commission retreat for single family so that we can see what we think about them after they were built. After a year, if this isn't working we could change it.) I would caution is the notion that familiarity breeds contempt, if someone reviews same type of homes over and over, we need to worry about the incremental creep and we end. (Mr. Grosshuesch: There are six of us that look at these plans, it isn't just one person who is forgetting something, there is good give and take at the internal meetings and we catch a lot of things.) (Ms. Puester: We would still be doing those full planning staff reviews, even if we don't take it to the Commission.)
- Ms. Dudney: We could take it to the Council with removing section c and say that the 2 most experienced commissioners have some qualms.
- Mr. Mamula: I'm willing to try this concept and have a site visits at the end of a year to see what occurred.
- Ms. McAtamney: I will take this to the Council, but believe you are going into with eyes wide open.

#### Class D Discussion:

- Mr. Mamula: Can we put a cap on the amount of additional mass? (Ms. Puester: Like the amount of additional square footage?) At some point the neighbors need to know and neither Class C nor Class D require notice. (Ms. Puester: Even if we leave single families we currently don't give notices when there are new houses so require it for new additions?) What if I put an addition of 300 square feet? (Ms. Puester: You would still have to get a building permit and staff would look at that, could bump it to Commission if there was a concern or if there was no envelope.)
- Ms. Dudney: Maybe you are getting back to the definition of "major remodel"?
- Mr. Mamula: It is more about the older neighborhoods that don't have envelopes. (Ms. Puester: If it didn't have an envelope than it would be reviewed by the Commission.)
- Ms. Dudney: It needs both definition of square feet and percentage. (Ms. Puester: I would like to put it at 500 square feet to be consistent with policy 4 mass.) Could this be brought to the Town Council?
- Mr. Schroder: On page 78 of the packet; didn't know what satellite earth station was? (Ms. Puester: It is a giant dish, this is outdated and that is why we are going with Class A reclassification for wireless tower and antennas.)

#### 2. Top Ten List / Council Joint Meeting Prep (JP)

Ms. Puester presented a memo outlining the Planning Commission Top Ten list as suggested topics for the joint meeting with the Town Council, scheduled for November 12.

The items accomplished from the prior Top Ten List are: Moving Historic Structures; Solar Panels in the Historic District; Town Solar Gardens; Arts District Expansion; Energy Policy Modification. Suggested Top Ten list priorities, in no particular order, are: Planning Classification Class A-D Modifications; Transition

Standards Near Carter Park; Condo Hotels Update (Amenity Bonus, Check-In Desks, Shuttles); Mass Policy: Airlock Entries and Other Mass Consuming Energy Conservation Features; Wildlife Policy; Snack Bar / Restaurant Water PIFs; Wireless Communication Towers / Antennas; Employee Housing Annexation Positive Point Allocations; Parking: Residential Parking in Garages (Positive Points); Water Conservation Practices.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Ms. Dudney: Is this condo space into saleable space? (Ms. Puester: Previous requirements were check in space and now people are checking in online. This code is outdated, have had inquiries on converting space.)
- Mr. Pringle: There are two different kinds of condo hotels: very small or very large. We don't address the large ones in this code and we need to update this. (Ms. Puester: It needs to be updated.)
- Ms. Dudney: What about marijuana? Is it addressed in the condo hotels? Are people allowed to use it and does this affect our development code? (Mr. Grosshuesch: No, Council is going through this now.) I was worried about private clubs. (Ms. McAtamney: We are not allowing private clubs.)
- Ms. McAtamney: Is the restaurant water PIF issue about paper plates? (Ms. Puester: Yes.) (Mr. Mosher: It is more a council issue and tells us who we see.) Priority on top ten: Employee Housing Positive Point Allocations should be top priority.
- Mr. Mamula: Clarified why we were giving positive points for screened parking when people don't use garage. Staff confirmed this is why this issue is on the list. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Regarding water conservation, there are some jurisdictions that allow only minimal formal landscaping and town could push for more water conserving landscape practices).
- Mr. Lamb: Please clarify the wildlife. (Mr. Truckey: We don't take wildlife into account right now. In certain development applications it may be important to consider negative/positive points. We would need to go through analysis to determine this code.)
- Mr. Lamb: Bear proof trash cans; is this in the wildlife policy issue?
- Mr. Mamula: This is in an enforcement part of the code. We have a law on that. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We could consider wildlife friendly fencing or allow for no fencing. Also, reconsider use of Kentucky blue grass from a habitat compatibility perspective.)
- Ms. Dudney: List of Town Council Retreat: Is this part of this? (Ms. Puester: Should narrow it to discuss the top 2-3 with Council. Employee Housing Annexation. Mass Policy. Condo-hotel?) Need to present info to us about this before November 12. (Ms. Puester: Will do, thanks.)

**TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:**

Ms. McAtamney: Pleased to see John's lengthy report from last meeting. Big meeting, dealt with licensing on how to govern retail marijuana. Regulations must be in place by October 1 to have control. 6-1 vote that it didn't belong on Main Street. We worked through all the situations that let one grandfathered store stay through September 1, 2014. We had different vendors from Airport Road and Main Street and the opinions were very split between the two locations. We will next look at the questions of marijuana use. Clearly, amendment 64 says no use on public property and would like to have a handout for guests on where they can use. (Ms. Dudney: I would think public areas in private property would be a big deal.) We are going to take the smoking ordinance and update that, but marijuana may have issues, like concerts. We got a letter from the Feds that said as long as the state creates and enforces laws then they won't interfere with legalization of marijuana.

We updated our theft ordinance. We approved a long term lease with the Breck Bear people at McCain property. Subdivision standards cleaned up. How much we can fine you in municipal court changed to \$2,650 with an inflation measure.

Public Project: Harris Street project: the trees that came down were impinging on the foundation and there is an extensive landscaping plan.

Pence Miller: one of first Town Ordinance properties that will be looked at, majority of Council liked it; I believe that it is way too big.

Breed specific regulations based on pit bull issue that occurred on Hosier Pass during bike race. Mr. Gallagher thought we should look at other state regulations and the Chief brought information. We would like to have a bigger discussion about dogs and people being irresponsible with their pets. Look for some more conversation in the community. Reviewed the Weber Hut environmental analysis, which is at the end of public comment period, biggest issues are size (16 people), concerns about trails and parking in this letter.

BOSAC: Cucumber gulch channel restoration.

Joint Meeting with Art Commission: Putting out request for a piece of art for the big roundabout. They also asked for a permanent location to put the “bikeffel” tower and put it on a pedestal that could be moved for future pro cycle challenges. This really captures our community, people liked this idea. When the roundabout is finished people could pose by it. It is currently on the Stillson property. The County is going to put it back together. Another statue called the Nest by Mountain Thunder Lodge and they are talking about moving that to Riverwalk near the river. It is a 15’ sculpture. We also spent time on the fact that the Town is looking for a “culture czar” to help bring Riverwalk and Arts district together.

Marijuana was very interesting and well vetted. (Mr. Butler: The women presenting for the arts district stated that the budget was way out during the council session, why was that?) We are seeing a 10-15% cost of labor increase and also HVAC was a lot more expensive in the metal arts building. Harris Street: The abatement was difficult with asbestos and the costs went over because of this. There is foundation work and contractor prices have really gone up. Our sales tax monies also increase too on a positive point. We are disappointed by local contractor participation; we have been seeking outside contractors because we aren’t getting local bids. Look forward to seeing you for joint session next Nov 12.

(Ms. Dudney motioned for a five minute recess.)

#### **PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

##### **1. Peak Ten Bluffs Master Plan (MM)**

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to master plan the property previously known as Angel’s Lookout for the development of eight cluster single-family homes on eight individual lots. Two existing private driveways will access the properties. The applicant plans to obtain approval of, and construct, each of these eight cluster single-family homes. Each home will be developed with the Class C Development permit process. With the change from duplex to cluster single-family use, the previously recorded plat, a master plan and a new subdivision must be created first. The purpose of this Master Plan is to review how the proposed cluster single-family development on this property can meet the intent of the Development Code.

Mr. Mosher pointed out the two new additional retaining walls sitting behind the houses and the landscaping with stone retaining walls between each of the units. Homes are being put inside the hillside. Ridgeline hillside development code says that it is discouraged unless there is no alternative, but County already did a variance.

After years of having this as an abandoned development site, Staff was pleased to see a proposal to carry this forward to completion. It is a very difficult site to develop and the applicant has made great efforts to meet all criteria identified in the Development Code. Staff had the following questions for the Planning Commission:

1. Did the Planning Commission support the change from duplex units to cluster single-family home units?
2. Did the Planning Commission have any additional comments regarding the landscaping for this proposal?

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Lou Glisan, Applicant: I've been meeting with Mr. Mosher for the last 3 years. I wanted to give you some background on myself and my team, building in the County for 15 years, done 45 real estate transactions, last Breckenridge project was in 2005 and took a downhill lot on 4 O'clock and had it in 2005 Parade of Homes and took the grand prize. 2006 home in Keystone spec home and won Parade of Homes again. We've done difficult projects in the past and have a successful team; Ms. Elena Scott is new as landscape architect, my wife, Julie, is an interior designer and a key player in our success. She also does the exterior color selections and has been very successful. Just completed 20 townhomes in Wildercrest and have been trying to sell them since 2008.

(Ms. Christopher: I'm curious about average distance between units?) (Ms. Elena Scott: The most narrow are 15' between and up to 30-40' between units at the wider parts.) (Mr. Schroder: Page 91 in our packet; the conifers seem to be pushed to steepest part of the area. Why is it so much thinner on conifers on the right side?) (Ms. Scott: Landscaping: Privacy between units was one chief goal, we also want to soften the hillside and there is already a nice existing landscape buffer.) (Mr. Schroder: Minimums were listed for 6' tall trees, is there a way to get taller trees?) (Ms. Scott: Sure, we do have some steep slopes and size of root ball is key starting with 6' as a minimum we will have to hand dig some of the steep slopes. Existing disturbances will allow us to plant larger trees. (Ms. Dudney: What is your plan for materials for pedestrian trail?) (Ms. Scott: We haven't selected any material yet, but we do want switchbacks, buffering and some benches.) (Ms. Dudney: The interim landscaping until it is built out, what will this look like?) (Mr. Glisan: Similar to the poppy fields you see about Town and this will have to be heavily irrigated but can do this temporarily.) (Mr. Mosher: There were two more fire hydrants added to the site per the Fire Department. But, we will need to consider the existing lodge pole and be firewise too and we can do this at next planning session.) (Ms. Dudney: What is time table for construction?) (Mr. Glisan: We are going to build a model and sell that. Hope to start this November and build over the winter and have it ready for Parade of Homes.) (Ms. Christopher: Is there a building plan on what is built first?) (Mr. Glisan: Would like to Build D first as model which is in the middle.)

There was no further comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Mamula: We would never approve this type of development now; back in 2001 the whole development was a mess back then. I would like to see some assurances that we don't get stuck with another eyesore. (Mr. Glisan: I have 15 years of history to get you comfortable.) I would like to go have a look at the steep home that you just built. I do like the single family home vs. the duplex. This is a "fix it" and I'm glad you are going to take on a difficult eyesore project. My main concern is how the height is reading and how the height will read with code and the 35' max which is not a guarantee. Particularly with A, B, C and how they read from the road which may look like a 45-50' building. A few sides of the buildings are very monolithic, almost like towers in particular on A, B the towers of stone on page 98, west elevation on building A. This reads taller than it actually is, from bottom to top. The profiles and columns make it look looming.

Ms. Christopher: It reads as two stories of stone. (Mr. Dave Nakhjovani, Architect: Distances between residences, I had to address it with fire separation and building code, the way the buildings interact they have points of closeness but the further apart I could separate the better. I understand the concern with two much stone which actually costs my client more money, but it is a function of getting them in under 35' on the steep hillside. When you get into the plan the distance up on the other side of the hill it is different. Some of the verticality may be exaggerated with the two dimensionality of the elevation plan.)

Mr. Mamula: In essence this is a 2-story district but some of the renderings look like a 3-story project from below. (Mr. Nakhjovani: I understand. In most of these cases, these residences are next

to each other.) Except for the west side of A. That is the biggest issue with looking like a 3-story elevation on the west. It is reading bigger than Land Use Guidelines suggest. (Mr. Mosher: I think comment is well taken and we need to take special attention on A on this side when it comes up for its Class C submittal.) It is really just A, B, C and I know this is the steepest part of site. It is hard for me to tell what landscaping plan is on computer but I will take the staff's recommendations. I appreciate you doing it well and taking measures to make this a decent project.

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

*Commissioner Questions / Comments (continued):*

Ms. Christopher: I agree with Mr. Mamula, height on stone on some units is a concern of mine liked he pointed out. The landscaping plan: we can't see detail but I would encourage the varied height option and I do understand the challenges with the steep slope. I highly commend breaking up the masses and making cluster single-families versus the original plan of duplexes.

Mr. Butler: I concur and like the single-family homes vs. duplexes.

Ms. Dudney: I agree, like the single-family homes and I agree with Mr. Mamula's point about building A.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with everything said so far. I didn't make the site visit but I did go visit it a few hours ago and I know this will be a steep site and difficult project. Maybe you could break up the one side of A. I like the idea of varying the height of trees. I think we are off to a good start.

Mr. Pringle: With respect to Staff questions, I support the change to single-family. I will reserve any comment on landscaping based on the job of staff working with and I realize the tight relationship between defensible spaces and landscaping needed. I would like to call attention to the elevations, the massive look on west elevation on Building A and the east elevation makes it look like an entirely different building. The incorporation of all the stone adds to the mass of the building. The east side is a real winner. I like Mr. Mamula's struggle with the walk up elevation and the perception of height from far away. This will be critical to address. Difficult to comment on this now. I think this is wonderful application and am excited to see good looking homes on this site.

Mr. Schroder: I support the single-family homes and landscaping will be addressed further next time. I think with what we've seen and the ideas we've given I would be happy to look at this from a final.

Mr. Mamula: One more comment: take building A, top of this building is roughly 70' above White Cloud Drive below and would like to see some more landscaping at the view area as people start heading up the hill, maybe use trees to see how those structures are going to loom. It would be nice to get some buffer to help soften that "looming". (Mr. Mosher: Forgot to mention, the next submittal will show a lot more detail at a larger scale.)

2. Peak Ten Bluffs Subdivision (MM)

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to re-subdivide the property previously known as Angel's Lookout for the development of eight cluster single-family homes on eight individual lots. Two existing private driveways will access the properties. With a previous owner and with the previous County approved subdivision, this property had been approved by the Planning Commission and Town Council with two development permits, a duplex for Lot 3 (PC#2003079) and a duplex for Lot 4 (PC#2003080). Lot 4 was under construction and then later all development was abandoned by the previous owner. The property remained with no further improvements for several years. The current applicant has since removed the existing foundation and the vertical construction for Lot 4. The development permit for Lot 3 was never started. Since this is a re-subdivision, the proposed improvements must meet the Town standards instead of the County standards.



The applicant has worked closely with planning staff to create a development that has the least amount of impact on this difficult site. The subdivision was previously approved in the County. As currently proposed, each cluster single-family home should be able to be submitted and abide with all applicable policies in the Development Code. At this preliminary review, staff has found no outstanding issues related to policies in the Development Code. Staff welcomed any Commissioner comments related to this application. If possible, the applicant would like to return for final review.

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

**OTHER MATTERS:**

Ms. Puester: Will be looking at doing a Planning Commission retreat in October. Would we like to go look at the condo hotels in town and stay in town to do retreat in town. Are there other ideas?

Mr. Pringle: I think some of our best retreats are staying here in town.

Ms. Christopher: Maybe we could include interior space, airlocks, etc.

Mr. Mamula: October will be hard for me; we are doing a big remodel.

Ms. Puester: We will talk about date and timing.

Mr. Pringle: The flooding event in Boulder County, have we learned anything from these big natural disasters? We could be setting ourselves up for this kind of big disaster. Maybe this is more of a town issue, should we be looking at a really big picture?

Ms. Puester: We will be looking to do an RFP on the McCain property, one of the things could be looking at what happens with an overflow of the banks. We can definitely look at flooding and we have been doing a lot of options to address fire wise plans in our codes. Talked about rock rings and other materials being used. Watershed protection plan for the Tarn we have contact with communities in Waldo canyon fire. We are working on a plan and running models with mitigation measures could be put in place and working with USFS on this too. We are doing background work on how to protect our community. There are issues with water and fire and we are working on those. We may come back with some development code modifications or we may put some of these on the web site for people to reference. The watershed protection plan won't come to this group but I would be happy to provide it to you. I'm working on it with Tetrattech.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 pm.

---

Gretchen Dudney, Chair