

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Eric Mamula	Trip Butler	Gretchen Dudney
Dan Schroder	Kate Christopher	Jim Lamb
Dave Pringle		
Jennifer McAtamney, Town Council Liaison		

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Mosher announced that the Preliminary Hearing for the Abbett Addition, Lot 7B SFR, PC#2013111, 210 North Ridge Street, had been withdrawn by the Applicant and would be presented at a future meeting. With that one change, the February 18, 2014 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Puester noted that the consent calendar has two homes that are Class C applications; both do not have building envelopes, one has points and one does not.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 21, 2014, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Daisy Residence (MGT) PC#2014001, 1003 Boreas Pass Road
- 2) Haynes Residence (MGT) PC#2014004, 105 North Gold Flake Terrace

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

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. McAtamney:

- The building code revisions had a second reading and were approved 6-1 by the Council. Mr. Dudick voted against the building code revisions because they do not require sprinkling all homes over 5,000 sq. ft.
- The Council will be undertaking a public outreach project to discuss a new water plant. The current plant is a single point of failure if there would be a fire in Upper Blue. Also, the current plant is quite old. A public process will start with the community. If it was started today, no new plant would be constructed until 2022, it takes a long time. We will be looking to bring in partners with this project. Water will be a big factor for the future of Breckenridge and the whole country.
- Tomorrow night at Riverwalk, the maquette presentation for artists presenting their ideas for sculptures at the roundabout.
- The Town has received the scoping notice from USFS for Breckenridge Ski Resort Summer Activities that include canopy tours and bigger zip lines, additional Jeep tours and climbing tours.
- Construction in the Arts District is on pace. Lots of projects going on around town between Arts District, roundabouts and medians. Looking for local contractors to bid for summer projects.
- April 1 is the day to vote on Town Council members.
- (Ms. Dudney asked about the activity of trees coming down by bike path towards Frisco.) This is part of the Ophir Mountain dead tree removal that has been approved and on going to remediate the beetle kill and fire danger.
- (Mr. Pringle: Is the Council taking any position on supporting the Breck Ski Resort summer activities?) No, not yet. We want BOSAC to comment first. (Mr. Truckey mentioned that there will

be an Open House hosted by USFS on March 5 open to public to understand more of the summer activity proposals at the Breckenridge Ski Area and the Council will be reviewing the proposal at its March 11 meeting.)

- Council approved the Dayton's to have events at the "Oh Be Joyful" Lodge, with staff to add conditions to protect Cucumber Gulch.
- (Ms. Puester noted that the Council had also discussed Condo-Hotels.) Yes we did, we basically agreed with the Planning Commission recommendations except for the size limit. The Council decided that the market would dictate better what would meet the threshold for amenities as long as the covenant was there and persistent rather than the 50 unit cut off. The covenant would ensure if later owners converted things like the registration desk to something else, then they would have to pay TDR's then. We asked for there to be clear examples of how TDR's would work and what it would look like if amenities went away in the covenant. We added that there needs to be an HOA ownership of the unit for rental only and that the Housing Authority must monitor the deed restriction.
- (Mr. Pringle: Want to reiterate, in minority but I'm totally opposed to change anything regarding condo-hotels. This is a Pandora's box situation. I'm opposed to letting them off the hook, because they got all the goodies and bonuses and now they could get off the hook.) We are concerned about the current financing for condo-hotels now and that there are spaces that are going unused. (Mr. Pringle: I'm trying to protect everyone who is currently operating under the terms of approval; we've given so many huge economic benefits in the past.) (Mr. Mamula: But it is done now, times change, these guys are opting to do this is because the spaces aren't used anymore. I think this is a good solution. It is done; the space is empty and useless. The Town may as well use it as affordable housing, dispersed affordable housing.) Rental not sale for these units is the option for these condo-hotels; this is a deed restricted rental unit. (Ms. Dudney: Could they use the proceeds for upgrades/ audits of energy efficiency?) Yes, they could use them for energy audits. There is nothing in effect to have them implement the audit recommendations, but the HOA will have the audit information for the next time they consider a remodel and will hopefully implement some of those recommendations at that time.

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Policy 80A Connector Elements

Ms. Puester presented. The Connector Policy drawings were inadvertently left out of the packet; therefore, the Commission received them by email and there were also hard copies available at the meeting for the Commission and the public. Staff has reviewed and vetted a proportionality method for connectors to provide another option for Commission consideration as requested after public comment. Typically, residential character areas are limited to 1-1½ story modules. Creating a proportional method exceeding one story is difficult to execute when attached to the typical 1½ story module, and is not applicable when attaching to a 1 story module. Maintaining the distinction between modules is important to the character of the District, ensuring that building masses do not creep and overwhelm the historic character of the area. Staff believes that a connector taller than one story (13 feet measured to the mean per Building Height definition) really doesn't achieve the obvious distinction between modules that is the goal of the policy (Diagram 2) and will lead to uncertainty about the historic context. Architecturally, it is possible to connect floors in two different, two-story modules with a connector having a 13 foot mean, depending on the interior design and floor/plate heights (Diagram 1). Therefore, staff is recommending the one story connector with a simple design.

As shown in Diagram 1 presented, the connector can be designed to connect two stories within the 13 foot mean height with minimal stairs. Diagram 1-A depicts how this may be included in the Handbook of Design Standards for visual reference.

Mr. Mosher discussed Diagram 1 that depicts how to have 2 stories in the 13' mean on roof.

Mr. Mamula: Typical facades are 26'. Is it possible with a 13' mean to get a roof that is so steep that is still two feet under the height of the two buildings that we need to put a roof pitch limit on this also? (Mr. Mosher: There is enough in the historic standards that are architecturally dictating the roof pitch. For example, we won't see a 12 x 12 pitch in this district.) I care about the height so that we don't end up with a steep roof pitch like an A-frame if someone really was trying to force the connector issue. (Ms. Puester: I think there is a way we can address this concern with existing policies.)

Ms. Puester continued. Should the Commission desire to see connectors taller than 13 feet to the mean via a proportionality method, staff would recommend the following to replace the fifth bullet point in the draft policy attached. *"A connector shall not exceed 70 percent of the height of the smaller of the module to be connected. A connector shall not exceed 19 feet in height to the mean (1½ stories). The connector shall be a minimum of 4 feet lower than the modules to be connected."* This, like Diagram 1, would also allow for designs to connect two levels through the connector without much interior design alterations for stairs.

After additional review of the policies, staff recommends changes to Policy 80A, 90, 91, 92 and 95 as presented. The language proposed would ensure a simplistic connector design and clear separation of modules.

The primary changes proposed include:

- Further clarification of the intent of the connector policy;
- Clarification that a connector should be located to the rear or setback from on the side of the façade on a corner lot;
- A required 6 foot minimum connector length;
- A one story connector;
- A simple design and gable roof form.

Staff recommended that connector be limited to one story in height. As shown in Diagram 1, the proposed 13 foot mean height would allow for 2 stories to connect internally while maintaining the differentiation between module sizes and protecting the historical context. The concern of being able to connect 2 stories within the connector is addressed with the proposed language.

Staff would like to get Planning Commission direction on the items above. Staff has presented Diagrams 1, 1-A and 2 in addition to proposed code changes in ~~strike~~ and **bold**.

Mr. Lamb opened the worksession to public comment.

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect: Comments I have, item number 1: I totally agree with a minimum of 6' but it might need to be more than that, maybe the "Barry House" the house next to the post office has a connector that is too small, something is not right there proportionally. I suggest we all go a look at it. In diagram 1, the connector looks correct but, I don't see people buying into the stairway. I don't think this is realistic. We are calling these 1 ½ story buildings, but buildings are getting taller. Picture the two pieces on the top diagram going higher, so you will have taller vertical elements where the connector will look strange there, if you went up as high as you could on the two masses as someone approaches the maximum height with the plate heights. I thought the 13' connector was to the plate height not to the mean. So my question is when we are measuring density I use the 14' plate height, so could we look more to the plate height. It can be done but its not ideal. (Mr. Lamb: It is really hard to look at just a two dimensional drawing. Our intention is to make it a connector, not a bathroom with another room.)

There was no further comment, and the worksession was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Our thought our policy was working really well until we had the project on Ridge and French. I hate to see us now have the pendulum swing so far back. We don't want to see bedrooms, bathrooms in connectors.
- Mr. Mamula: I like what the Staff has done. The connectors that work are single stories; I like the pendulum swinging back. I like how the historic house in the front and the connector is not a major element and the bigger house in the back is not dominating.
- Mr. Pringle: I think this policy is good for a renovation. The problem is when we have a big lot and there is too much density a one story connector looks odd.
- Mr. Mamula: But it will look way less massive and more appropriate in the historic district. (Ms. Puester showed an example of a big house of the Hermanson residence to depict.)
- Mr. Pringle: I'm not advocating a two story connector element; I just want it to be proportional.
- Ms. Sutterley: In diagram 2, this is more of the solution with the 4', you've got the taller buildings and you've got a bigger drop in the connector. She showed this on the Hermanson Residence with a line of the connector being two more feet down. (Mr. Mamula, Ms. Christopher and Mr. Schroeder said that it doesn't make any difference having the connector be four feet lower on the Hermanson residence. Still doesn't read right, too tall.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The design standards require that we use roof forms that perform the same function of character in the different neighborhoods such as the East side neighborhood.)
- Mr. Mamula: Could we add language that says we intend them to use the roof forms of the neighborhood?
- Ms. Christopher: I think a one story connector is the solution to make the buildings look like they fit in the historic district.
- Mr. Butler: I agree with Staff.
- Mr. Mamula: I agree with Staff direction.
- Mr. Schroeder: I am heading to the 13' mean on the connector. It maintains the context in the district. It does what a connector should do, step down and break up the modules.
- Mr. Pringle: If I look at the Hermanson drawing, the connector is muddled with too many other elements. Bringing down the height would indicate two different modules, but I still think it is too confusing with architectural features and different roofline coming into the connector.
- Ms. Dudney: I think what you are addressing are found in staff's language about a connector being simpler. I think it needs to say in #5 that we add the words "at least" 2 feet under.
- Mr. Lamb: Let's keep in consideration that I can think of the mother-in-law house like Fish's house and 208 South Harris where you don't need more than a one floor connector. I think that the example of the Hermanson residence has too many details in looking like two different masses. It is a big house. (Ms. Puester: I would like to bring up another subject Dave and yourself just raised. Showed the Hermanson residence as an example: tall roof mass on door entry of a module that blocks the connector element behind it. Elements added in front of the connector make it confusing. Perhaps have a zone around the connector saying that you can't have any architectural elements over one story height in the "connector zone.")
- Mr. Lamb: I think we should continue to say that the connector should be simple.
- Mr. Mamula: But I think the area around the connector should be visible but not defined in detail.
- Mr. Pringle: But let's not tie it to height. I think we should say that it be something that four people agree to, to allow flexibility for proportionality. (Ms. Puester: It sounds like the one story element is acceptable to the majority of Commissioners. Also, that the design is simple and architectural elements should not confuse the connector)
- Mr. Schroeder: I think it is a good point that in some case the connector element has been obscured. (Mr. Mosher: Go to the house by the Community First Bank that has the connector element obscured by a roof element.)
- Ms. Dudney: I don't like the "connector zone" wording; it drives the architecture too much.
- Mr. Lamb: I think we are just tightening it up a little bit.

- Ms. Dudney: Does this mean that there couldn't be a zone? I don't want to legislate every little thing. We should leave some of this open for options.
- Ms. Christopher: I think calling it is already addressed.
- Mr. Mamula: What if we say that the connector must be one story, have a gabled roof, and also "be visible as a connector?" (The majority of the commissioners thought this was a good idea and agreed that the other policies proposed by staff were good. Next step is to take it to Town Council.)

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

- 1) Abbett Addition Lot 7B SFR (MM) PC#2013111, 210 North Ridge Street (Withdrawn at the request of the applicant.)

OTHER MATTERS:

- 1) 2013 SustainableBreck Annual Report (MT)
- Mr. Truckey presented. The Town Council adopted the SustainableBreck Plan in July of 2011, after several years of development and community input. During the adoption process, the Planning Commission reviewed the draft Plan and made recommendations on the Plan to Town Council. One of the key focuses of the Plan was a goal of monitoring the Plan over time to see how the community has progressed on the different topics addressed in the Plan. Thus, a series of "Indicators" were created with baseline data established for each Indicator. Staff has prepared the 2013 Annual Report, with the Indicators being one of the main elements of the report. The report also outlines some key achievements related to different sustainability topics. Attached for the Commission's review is a copy of the draft Annual Report.

As outlined in the Annual Report, a number of actions were undertaken in 2013 to further the Town's sustainability efforts. Some highlights include:

- Installation of 1,000 kilowatts of solar panels at two community solar gardens. About 66 percent of the energy generated is used in Breckenridge, with the remainder being used in other Summit County communities.
- Adoption of the Disposable Bag Fee and implementation of the fee at retail stores in October, along with an extensive public outreach effort that included the distribution of thousands of Breckenridge reusable bags.
- Twenty-five Town businesses are actively participating in the SustainableBreck Business Certification Program and nine of the businesses have been certified to date.

No action was required by the Commission. Mr. Grosshuesch noted that when the Town is drafting ordinances they typically key off of policy documents like the SustainableBreck Plan for policy guidance. These are representing the adopted policies of the Town.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Christopher: On the SustainableBreck web page the 2013 annual report is shown but what about the 2012 Annual Report? (Mr. Truckey: We will be adding previous year reports on the webpage.)
- Mr. Lamb: One interesting statistic I found was that we are seeing more scrape offs (9%) as new construction.
- Ms. Dudney: The Housing table on page 60 says something to me. It says that the median sales price is so much lower than households at 100% at AMI, even people with 80% of AMI, can afford to purchase at that level. Is the Town policy goal that everyone gets a single family home? There is no longer a gap so this is going to be an issue when the sales tax comes up for re-adoption in 2016.
- Mr. Mamula: The goal is that people can get a single family shelter. At no point did the Town say let's

- build a multifamily structure.
- Ms. Dudney: This is a problem of having discreet funds. The Town Council should get to make this decision every year to decide if the taxes should happen or not.
- Ms. Christopher: I still look at this chart that the green line (single family median prices) is way above all the other lines. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The multi-family stock that we have is in short term housing. That isn't where we want to put families.)
- Ms. Dudney: I thought the argument was that we would have places for families to live, not necessarily that everyone gets a single family home. (Mr. Grosshuesch: They are not all single family homes. Pence Miller would be new multi-family, and Valley Brook is multi-family. Our buy down program targets multi-family units. Those units, we have found are difficult to re-sell, and we believe it's because they are bought out of the short term rental pool and not where most families would desire to live.) That is the issue when you look at the numbers and see that people who are making \$100,000 should be subsidized to buy single family units.
- Ms. Christopher: I commend that affordable units are put into neighborhoods like Wellington and Valley Brook because that grows the community and not just putting them into worker only housing neighborhoods. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We have a long history of covenants being transferred out of multi-family buildings in the bed base into single family neighborhoods because short term rental neighborhoods are undesirable places for families.)
- Mr. Lamb: There have not been huge subsidies in neighborhoods such as Wellington which are seen by many as being very successful.
- Ms. Dudney: Many people might object when people can go out and buy houses at market rate and not need to buy deed restricted houses.
- Mr. Pringle: I remember in the 80's that Council and many others argued that we shouldn't invest in affordable housing.

The Commission thanked Mr. Truckey for the SustainableBreck report and gave kudos to Ms. Puester and Mr. Kulick for helping with the report.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Jim Lamb, Chair