

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pringle: Regarding the wall at the Ankenbauer Residence (page 4 of the minutes), please change “I’d rather have it stepped back and maintain precedent we have set and not built into disturbance envelope”. This is wrong and I’d like it to be changed to “I’d rather maintain the precedent we have and build it into the disturbance area” and add “Mr. Thompson noted that there is a plat note that allows us to do that for driveways.”

With no other changes, the March 4, 2014, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

Ms. Puester reminded the Commission that the next Planning Commission meeting is Monday, March 31.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 1) Weisshorn Filing 2, Block 10, Lot 11 Residence (SG) PC#2014012, 106 North Gold Flake Terrace
- 2) Beaver Run Summer Tent 2014-2015 (MGT) PC#2014013, 620 Village Road
- 3) Colorado Chair Replacement (JP) PC#2014014, 1599 Ski Hill Road
- 4) Peak 8 Summer Fun Park Base Plan and Summer Tent (JP) PC#2014015, 1599 Ski Hill Road

Mr. Mamula: On the Weisshorn, I’m assuming this came to us because it doesn’t have a disturbance envelope. (Ms. Puester: Yes, there is a note on page 11 of the packet (under staff comments) and under Mass on page 10, it notes what was allowed and what was proposed. Staff noted what was allowed under the policy.)

Ms. Dudney: On the setbacks, is the negative points because you have to have 50’ combined setback and they only have 45’ setback, because staff report says side yards are 15’ and 30’? Was going to ask Mr. Greenburg, but he’s not here. I want to correct the staff report, I think there is a typo, its 25’. (Ms. Puester: Yes, its 25’; we will make that change.)

With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. McAtamney:

- Legislative: Made it through the historic connector conversation. Mr. Dudick wanted to ask if we should take a harder look at this policy with regard to the two foot difference, specifically in the one story to one story module. Is two feet enough of a difference? There was agreement that the connector needs to be a less prominent element. Discussion included how new structures should look old but not as old. Ms. Wolfe has a concern about live-ability and function of a new structure if the connector is only one story. (Mr. Mamula: Mr. Dudick’s comments were based on single story to single story; he

would like to see more of a distinction.)

- Temporary Structures did not make it to the agenda based on concern for unintended consequences, people trying to get around the code. We left it as it is for the most part, a few minor changes to come back to us.
- Public Projects: Skate Park: Team Pain will be advisor scheduled to be done by mid-August. Getting pitch field for rugby to be changed to artificial turf this spring. We saw new plans for the North Main pocket park, no name yet for this. Still deciding if this should be a quiet place or a loud place; the designers did a good job joining these. Working to finish up Main Street and the heated test sidewalk along Lincoln and then will look at other steep sidewalks to add this renovation. Renovating Town Hall. Riverwalk is also seeing upgrades. The Arts District continues to go along; the little throne is starting to take shape. The Breckenridge Grand Vacations Community Center is going well and is to get C.O. in October with opening in November.
- Housing / Childcare: Working on modification with agreement for Wellington Neighborhood in regards to Lincoln Park (used to be called the South 40), pricing of deed restricted houses. This will be discussed at Town Council next week. Looked at Ski Resort Master Plan Addendum for Summer Activities; our comments had to do with water quality, sensitive wildlife, like most of the other comments from the community. Talked about condo-hotels again, looking to revise the definition as to what is successful. (Ms. Puester said that staff pulled it off of First Reading and put it on to a work session based on Commission comments.)
- North Roundabout Public Art Recommendation: Four different artists gave different proposals and got a lot of public comment, the pieces most popular by the citizens was not the most appropriate for a roundabout. The Public Art Commission recommended the Paley piece which was the right scale but Council felt that people would still want to get up close and touch it. Eventually decided that none of the pieces were the right thing for the roundabout. Did decide that the Paley piece should be purchased and put somewhere else. Maybe the roundabout is not the best place for a piece of art; this will still be discussed and is evolving. Decided to lower the process for finding a roundabout piece as a priority for the Arts Council.
- GoBreck: BRC update which took us through the “Breck Because” campaign also known as the Chalkboard Campaign. They won a Governor’s award and a national award and an important Social Media award. The Council is feeling very good about where the BRC is going with all of this.
- This Friday there will be a Council Forum with all 8 candidates here in Town Hall.
- The Planning Commission thanked Ms. McAtamney for her 8 years of service and her energy she has shown towards her duties with the Planning Commission.

Ms. Puester asked the Commission if they had any comments for Ms. McAtamney to take back to the Town Council regarding their questions or issues on the connector policy.

Commissioner Questions / Comments on Connector Policy:

Mr. Mamula: You can only go so far with a one to one story structure. Most of the time when this issue comes up it is in regards to building a multiple story to a one story. No one will do a one story new module so it will work. With Ms. Rebecca Waugh’s (former Town Historian) thought on looking different with additions, we have gone so far down the road enough that we have created our own fabric in town we don’t want to connect ultra modern to historic like Aspen. To Ms. Wolfe’s comment if you buy in town you understand that you are restricted with the historic guidelines and that you are foregoing the ability to build big, it’s the character and coziness of the area, big is for Shock Hill or the Highlands. (Ms. McAtamney: I look at other communities and notice how historic houses are placed right next monolithic structures that remind me that we end up with a better product that keeps our Breckenridge charm by maintaining the historic look.)

Ms. Dudney: It is my experience that people feel very strongly about more modern versus historic

appearance of additions one way or another, I would recommend that Council take this very seriously and open it up to public debate so that everyone can give input if we are going to drastically change Planning Commission recommendations.

Mr. Lamb: If you build in the historic district you need to stay in the historic district guidelines and it should look historic.

Mr. Pringle: We may have a solution looking for a problem, the town has done well between making new structures look historic. This was decided when Nore Winter (Winter & Company) wrote the standards.

There were no other Commissioner comments.

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1) Old Masonic Hall Rehabilitation (MM) PC#2014011, 136 South Main Street

Mr. Mosher presented an application to stabilize, restore and rehabilitate the historic Arbogast Building (aka Masonic Lodge No. 47 or Abby Hall), replace a small addition at the back of the building, and improve the property for inclusion into the Town's Arts District.

This renovation, restoration and addition are compatible with the Core Commercial Character area. Staff had no concerns with the overall application. Staff noted that this application has met all Absolute Policies. For the restoration plans, Staff is suggesting positive six (+6) points be awarded under relative Policy 24, Social Community. Negative three (-3) points are suggested under relative Policy 24, Social Community for the removal of historic fabric on the north wall for the Handicap access. This brings the project to a passing score of positive three (+3) points.

Staff has the following question for the Planning Commission: Would the Commission support positive six (+6) points under Policy 24/R, The Social Community for restoration and preservation of the Old Masonic Hall?

Staff suggested the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Old Masonic Hall Restoration and Rehabilitation, PC#2014011, with the presented Point Analysis and Findings, to the Town Council.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Christopher: Would this sidewalk be considered for heating? (Mr. Mosher: I haven't heard if the budget can include this. I will note.)

Ms. Dudney: Would you consider heating the plaza area? This is an incredible public area for gathering. (Mr. Mosher: This area gets better sun than the sidewalk and may not need snow-melt. This could be brought up for the Council to decide. There is no reason why this couldn't be heated.) (Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect: The proposed boiler room has ample space for a large enough boiler to heat the outdoor spaces. We are still budgeting some of these items.)

Mr. Mamula: Is the negative three (-3) points the amount we would give for removal of material to other projects? Would it be appropriate add another three points, for covering the east window with the roof form? (Mr. Mosher: There is some precedent for preserving and covering existing windows. The Welcome Center restored two windows in the cabin on the south side that had been covered. Also, a restoration on a house on South Harris Street preserved the window on the outside and blocked half of it on the inside.)

Ms. Dudney: The Jan Radosevich situation couldn't proceed with the renovation as she wanted because of window restrictions. Is this comparable? (Mr. Mosher: No, she wanted to enlarge the historic openings and alter the overall appearance of her historic structure.)

Mr. Lamb: We didn't give points; it violated an absolute and wasn't allowed.

Mr. Pringle: Is the little building on the south side of this building, was that the dentist office? Normally, there would have been windows on the South side that would have been consistent with the

back of the property and it would be natural for there to be windows on the south side which may be more historically correct. I think it would help. (Mr. Mosher: This building stood alone far before the dentist office. If we explore this wall during the restoration and find covered windows we will restore them.) I would like to submit that we consider heating the ADA ramp because there is no sun on that side.

Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for the project:

- The Annex building (the small building attached to the south at one time) was built immediately after the Masonic Hall. (Ms. Sutterley showed a picture of the Annex building.) The Annex building was removed in 1959 due to drainage issues into the Masonic Hall to show the South side of the building.
- To address Mr. Mamula's concern, half of the east facing window is already gone, what remains is the top sash of what we think was a double hung window. It isn't like it is a full original double hung right now. The plan is to restore this opening to full height and have it visible inside the building.
- The colored site plan is from the conceptual design and we would like to now show the current site plan to show the retaining wall adjustments. The entry has shifted and the stairs offset the historic corner and allowed for a bigger perch at the southwest corner of the plaza for people to enjoy the view. The height of the retaining wall is 30". There will be planting in between the retaining walls. We won't take any additional room out of the existing sidewalk as this gets crowded now. There will be a fence on the North wall so the neighbors will not have access and there will be nice landscaping in front of the fence.
- The Town is planning to heat the sidewalks on both sides. This is already on the table for discussion, I agree that the ADA ramp would be good, and further study will be done on all of this, because there are big boilers planned for the mechanical room.

Mr. Pringle: Are you going to have to raise the building up? (Ms. Sutterley: The building will be raised to have a solid foundation underneath it but it will be replaced at the same height roughly so also the floor will be lowered slightly for better access but the appearance from the exterior is the same.)

Mr. Mamula: If somebody else was doing this project knowing that the double hung that is really a single hung that will be tampered with, would we award the same points? (Mr. Mosher: It is not a complete loss of fabric, there is restoration and it is reversible, maybe not. Ultimately, the Planning Commission would recommend a change.) (Ms. Sutterley: We will be exposing it on the inside.) I think we would be having an issue if this were a private builder. I want to treat it the same. (Mr. Mosher: The window can be brought back; it isn't being destroyed, just covered. I think the negative three (-3) points is fair. We would suggest the same for a private applicant too.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: There are certain circumstances here such as it being half of the original window and in the back of the building.)

Mr. Butler: I am curious if you bring back other windows on the South side that this would be a fair trade off for the potential covering of this.

Ms. Christopher: I would agree with the negative three (-3) points.

Mr. Schroder: I agree with staff.

Mr. Pringle: I want to make sure that we interpret the code fairly regardless of who the applicant is.

Ms. Dudney: I agree with staff.

Mr. Lamb: I would like to treat the Town the way we would treat anyone else.

Mr. Mamula: I'm satisfied with this as long as staff would treat anyone else like this. I'm ok with dropping the suggestion for negative six (-6) points. Also, if we are going to provide seating at the area off Washington, I think we should do quaint nice Town benches not the boulder seating. (Mr. Mosher: This was only depicted in the early conceptual plan as a possible area. So noted.)

Mr. Lamb opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public in the audience for comment, and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the positive six (+6) points and the negative three (-3) points that the staff recommended. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Schroder made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Old Masonic Hall Rehabilitation, PC#2014011, 136 South Main Street, with the presented Point Analysis and Findings. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Puester: Just a final reminder that the next Planning Commission meeting has been scheduled for 7:00pm on Monday, March 31, due to the Municipal Election on April 1.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10pm.

Jim Lamb, Chair