

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Eric Mamula Jim Lamb Gretchen Dudney
Kate Christopher Ron Schuman Dan Schroder
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:03pm
Ben Brewer, Town Council Liaison, was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Council member Ben Brewer will not be in attendance so there will be no Town Council update. With no other changes, the January 20, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 6, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Public Art (Policy 43, Relative) (JP)

Ms. Puester presented. The topic of Public Art has been on the Planning Commission Top Ten list since 2013. The concern with the Policy 43 developed when an application for a single family home in the Historic District (PC#2012020, Harris Residence, 206 S. French) proposed one positive point for public art which was to be hung on the historic barn along the alley.

The Breckenridge Public Art Commission (BPAC) reviewed the proposal and thought the art piece was appropriate. However, the BPAC did not like the location proposed by the applicant due to the lack of public accessibility and visibility. The architect then posed the question of allowing the public art piece on a different property in the same neighborhood which was more visible. In this situation, the art piece was proposed to be placed at the historic barn at 100 South Harris or the BGV Community Center on Harris Street, about a block away from the Harris Residence on French Street. The policy states that one point may be warranted for “...*art in publicly accessible areas on private property.*”. Although the piece was favored by the BPAC and would have had strong visibility to the public, the proposal was denied since the public art was to be located off of the development site, thus not complying with the Development Code policy.

Staff was asked to consider a policy change which would allow for one positive point for art in public places or on a more visible private property. We would like to pose the following questions to the Commission to see if there is any interest in making any alterations to the policy.

- Should one positive point be allowed for public art located off site under certain conditions?
 - If a positive point is a consideration off site, should it be allowed on public property only or also for an acceptable private property? Should there be a distance limitation from the subject property of the development permit application?
- Should one positive point be allowed only for commercial or multi-family residential properties, thereby excluding single family and duplex developments?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: I have a question about the Art Commission, art is such a personal thing, a lot of this language seems to rely a lot on whether the Art Commission deems it good art and in an appropriate location; we only come into play when there is a concern. (Ms. Puester: The Art Commission is comprised of art professionals, so they are the overseers of approving pieces and locations in town. They are the experts on that. The staff doesn't want to take on these decisions of the appropriateness. There are some location considerations they use when it relates to the one positive point allowed in the Development Code.)

- Mr. Mamula: I think the real question is do you feel as a Commissioner that off-site positive points could be gained and mitigated off-site? Over the years we've discouraged off-site mitigated points except for capital improvements off site and employee housing. Our recent concept has been to mitigate negative points on the site that is being affected.
- Ms. Dudney: Is public art something we want to see off-site is the question? If it is allowed off site it would be on town owned locations?
- Mr. Lamb: My concern is that if someone in a residential area that put up art on their site and then moved what happens if the new owners remove it? (Ms. Puester: It shall remain permanently on the site unless they go through a permitting process with the Town to change their point analysis.)
- Mr. Pringle: Is there a compelling outcry in the Community to change this policy? (Ms. Puester: It was definitely a discussion that came out a few years ago when this particular application came up and continues to come up when it comes to public spaces that could benefit from public art. Also, we are hearing developers say that there are not many options anymore to gain positive points since years ago positive points off site were taken out of the code.)
- Mr. Mamula: How many projects have not passed recently? It seems that developers are getting to build and they are able to pass a point analysis.
- Mr. Pringle: I agree and say to the developers that the way to get positive points is not to do the things that accrue the negative points.
- Ms. Dudney: I agree but this seems to be a political point if the politicians want to provide support for public art than it is up to them to incentivize.
- Mr. Mamula: We need to tell Council that either we do or don't want it in the code.
- Ms. Dudney: Is it easy to get through the Arts Commission to get this positive point?
- Mr. Mamula: I think a \$10,000 bronze sculpture could be a cheaper way to get a project approved.
- Ms. Dudney: The only way I want to go for this is if the Town Council says that this is a high enough priority to get more art. (Mr. Mosher: The Commission looks at how long the art piece can withstand time, weather, being climbed on, etc.) Is the Art Commission a rubber stamp? (Mr. Mosher: No, they most likely are a durability test first and foremost.)
- Mr. Pringle: Who owns the art on Town property? (Mr. Mosher: The Town takes care of it on Town property if it is on private property they maintain it.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The way we are looking at this topic is that the Council has already said that they want to reward Public Art with a positive point. It's in the code now. In the case example that was mentioned, the art just didn't make sense where it was proposed but the applicant came forward to put it on another location that was more visible, but the code wouldn't allow it. I don't think the driving force is to find a cheap way for the developer to get a point. There could be a prioritization to say that you have to find a suitable place for the art on the subject property and then the second would be off site.)
- Mr. Schuman: If we decide to fail something, the applicant can still go to the Town Council to get our decision overturned? Why didn't they do that? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Because the code didn't allow the positive point to begin with. The Council lives with the same rules you do in this case.)
- Mr. Schroder: Often times, art brings you in and if someone wants to see the art up front and brings that public into someone's backyard. How would this work? (Ms. Puester: That is a concern especially with single family homes or duplexes. The public might feel it is private property. That is one of the questions, should this be tweaked to apply only to commercial and multifamily were you have more people walking around. What is the proper location for the public art which the one point applies to?)
- Mr. Schroder: Does there have to be liability insurance? (Ms. Puester: Yes as well as for the piece, we require that.)
- Mr. Pringle: I think the policy works as it is now.
- Ms. Christopher: To me this comes down to where should the points be mitigated? I think they should be

- mitigated on site.
- Mr. Mamula: You can do public art on site.
- Mr. Lamb: If you are failing by one point then you don't have a very good project.
- Mr. Pringle: Worried that this opens the door for off-site landscaping and other mitigation off-site.
- Ms. Dudney: I don't agree with all of you; if the Council has made public art a priority then I think we should let the Art Council should be able to decide the location.
- Mr. Schroder: I am ok with a positive point as long as the art is on an appropriate off-site public location.
- Mr. Schuman: I am not supportive of off-site points.
- Mr. Lamb: I also don't think we should give off-site points for anything other than affordable housing.
- Mr. Mamula: I don't think we should support off-site mitigation.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

The Town Council meeting update was given by Ms. Puester. Mr. Brewer sends his regrets not being here tonight.

- Pinewood Village II proposal it is going to receive low income tax credits there are some operational steps: The Town has created its own housing authority that is a specific financing mechanism to qualify for the Pinewood Village II. This is a single purpose entity and may do subsequent tax credit deals; this will not replicate anything that the current Summit Housing Authority does. This entity is similar to the Breckenridge Finance Authority.
- Worked on density planning for Maggie Point; we gave TDR's for that project which has people moving in currently.
- Open Space Acquisition in the Golden Horseshoe area; a joint acquisition with Summit County it is yet another mining claim.
- The Council did discuss the sandwich board signs; they decided to not allow the sandwich boards keeping the code as is. The staff is looking at a ticket system for violations instead of having to take people to court. We will still give verbal warnings first.
- Reviewed the State of the Open Space which you will see this evening.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

- 1) Lincoln Park (Wellington Neighborhood Phase II) Master Plan (2nd Preliminary) (MM) PC#2014038, 710 Stables Road

Discussed the Potential Conflict of Interest of Commissioner Schuman:

- Mr. Schuman: I have completely withdrawn my company for management of any part of the Wellington Neighborhood. I'm still on the Board of Directors, but to date neither David O'Neill nor Courtney Kenady have disclosed anything to the Board that hasn't been disclosed here at the Commission. No financial information or anything else regarding Lincoln Park.
- Ms. Dudney: I'm ok with Mr. Schuman staying.
- Mr. Pringle: I don't have a problem, I think it is ok.
- Mr. Schroder: I don't have an issue as you are a volunteer on the Board.
- Ms. Christopher: I don't have a problem.
- Mr. Lamb: I don't have a problem either.
- Mr. Mamula: Me either.

Mr. Mamula discussed the order of this preliminary hearing and how to make public comments.

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to amend the approved Wellington Neighborhood Phase II Master Plan (PC#2006082). This meeting is to review modifications to the site vehicular circulation, traffic calming, pedestrian circulation and trails. This portion of the neighborhood is to be called "Lincoln Park at the Wellington Neighborhood". There is no change in the previously approved density or uses.

Changes since the previous submittal:

The applicant has requested that the Commission review and comment on the modifications to the vehicular and pedestrian circulation as the proposed design will be key to the layout of the rest of the development.

- Bridge Street has been realigned avoiding any connection to Stables Road until it meets Wellington Road. 1,800 feet long without any substantial turns.
- Right of way connections/bridges from Midnight Sun and Bridge Street are shown connecting to Bridge Street on the south side of French Creek.
- A pedestrian footbridge is shown across French Creek connecting to Central Park.
- 3-way stop signs have been added at Wolff Lyon Road and Midnight Sun, at Logan Road and Bridge Street and at Midnight Sun and Bridge Street.
- Way finding signage to direct foot traffic to the neighborhood trail system.

We are pleased to see the modifications to the approved 2006 Master Plan maintain many of the key components that are fundamental to the overall Wellington Neighborhood that was conveyed at annexation. We are also pleased that the concerns from the Red White and Blue Fire District have been addressed.

This report has primarily focused on the key circulation issues that will have graphical impacts on all subsequent plans. Staff has the following questions for the Commission and welcomes any additional Commissioner comments on the proposed circulation as it relates to Policies 16 and 17, Access / Circulation.

1. Did the Commission support the vehicular connections at Midnight Sun and Bridge Street?
2. Did the Commission support the traffic calming measures in the existing neighborhood and in Lincoln Park?
3. Did the Commission believe that traffic calming measures are needed along the south alley in Lincoln Park?
4. Did the Commission support the proposed inter-neighborhood pedestrian circulation and the proposed trail connections?

The applicant is seeking a final review of this Master Plan modification at the next hearing. Staff believes this may be possible if the separate agencies and the applicant can coordinate the necessary details such as the project phasing, public transportation, and the timing of the Public Improvements per the Master Plan.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: It says optional future parking south of the Alleys, is there something is not disclosed? (Mr. Mosher: The agreement with Xcel needs to be modified because an earlier approved design.) Is the area beyond possible for future development? (Mr. Mosher: No, it is just for parking spaces and is under the Xcel easement. This will be illustrated correctly on the final.) Would there be larger parking spaces for campers, snowmobiles? (Mr. Mosher: I don't think the applicant has any interest in providing this but Staff doesn't care either way as long as it is screened.) We know that we want garages to be used for parking. (Mr. Mosher: It is properly regulated by the Wellington Neighborhood Board of Directors.) I'm worried about people using it for other uses.

Mr. Mamula: Let's just stick to questions.

Mr. Schuman: The alleys on the backside of Logan, are they narrower than 14-feet? (Mr. Mosher: The alley will still be 14-feet not narrower than what is there now like on the backside of Logan.) At the sidewalk crossings, are there bump outs or speed bumps? (Mr. Mosher: They are just striped. We have to balance traffic calming with snow removal. Signage will be important here.)

Mr. Mamula: Please explain the alley connection to Stables Road, what is the deal here? (Mr. Mosher: The

south alley leaves the property and picks up Stables Road. Not sure about the paving option or any deal with the developer, I will have Mr. Daugherty address.) (Mr. Tom Daugherty, Director of Public Works and Engineering for the Town of Breckenridge: At the very beginning discussion we talked about this access. The main idea is that we have a road already and we don't need to build a whole new road right next to it.) Why wouldn't we make the applicant pave the whole thing? (Mr. Daugherty: There is no reason why we shouldn't.)

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. David O'Neil:

The plan background, Tom Lyon (architect) wishes he could be here but is injured, between Tom Lyon and Dan McCrery we have almost 100 years of building experience. We've learned a whole lot over the years. We view this last portion of the development as Wellington "version 4.0" after all the development of other projects in Summit County are 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0. We like this Master Plan. At the last meeting, there was a variety of objections and in your packet we've addressed every point except for Midnight Sun access.

Mr. Mosher keeps referencing the original Master Plan of 1999; things have changed since then. We've changed too, we think you need vehicular for safety but we want to value the pedestrian movement as more important. So Midnight Sun, the choice we were given there was if we chose to do a pedestrian bridge at Midnight Sun (no vehicular connection), we would then have to have a 24-foot wide paved section on Bridge Street. All of the neighborhood rights of ways are 20-foot wide. We think there will be no traffic that will use the vehicular bridge on Midnight Sun. I see that this is a red herring, the big thing I'm worried about it getting a 24-foot wide street on Bridge Street. We have been working on this for a long time and we want to get this thing going. The Stables Road area, Mr. Daugherty and I have discussed the paving, I'd ask to leave the paving off the table because we've worked on the area, this is a workforce housing issue and we don't want to add costs.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: Will we talk about the traffic calming on the alley on the south side? (Mr. Mosher: Next time.)

Mr. Schuman: Was the option to put more traffic on Rodeo still discussed? (Mr. O'Neil: That has been off the table for a while.)

Mr. Mamula: Acknowledged the letter Kelly Owens and acknowledgment by 14 other residents in the Midnight Sun area sent to Planning Staff today.

Mr. Mamula opened the hearing for Public Comment:

Mr. Bart Rahn, 314 Stables Drive: I'm concerned whether this road is going to be paved. The dirt is tough in the summer and I'm worried about the snow plowing. I am also interested in the trails. This road is a town road and may need improvements like sidewalks and street lights. (Mr. Mosher: The trail head access near your property stays the same.) (Mr. Mamula: This will be part of our discussion.) (Ms. Dudney: Are you saying that it is better not to pave?) No, I am advocating that you do pave it. The trucks and the fast cars blow a lot of dust up. I wish that it would be better paved and I wish that it would be plowed.

Ms. Kelly Owens, 82 Midnight Sun Road: I'm talking on behalf of the people who submitted the letter today. We do appreciate your time. We certainly feel that this was a much more central issue; we are hoping that you would either remove the vehicle bridge at Midnight Sun or grant the 20-foot wide Bridge Street with a variance. We think that there is already dual access to the site. And we think that the Midnight Sun access is not necessary. Besides, I don't think that a fire truck would want to use this as a viable access. We want safety; I think you have been able to find ways to grant variances in the past. Additionally, I think that bridge

will be far more costly than the \$100,000 to pave Stables Road, than to build the bridge and we would like Midnight Sun to be a walking bridge.

Ms. Mary Gervais, 67 Rodeo Drive: I really like the trail connections to the South, what happens to those trails when they hit Country Boy Mine? I feel that the people who live on Bridge Street who have concerns about the bus stops have real concerns. (Mr. Mosher: The bus is to be discussed at the next meeting.) I think all the pedestrian bridges are really great, I would like to ask that all the pedestrian bridges be wide enough so that a stroller, a bike, a dog could use them and wide enough for snow to be cleared.

Ms. Gretchen Hamilton, 111 Bridge Street: I fully agree about the pedestrian crossings and the need for them to be wider as someone who pushes a double stroller. Impatient Green is the only connection right now between phase 1 and 2 and it is impossible to get a double stroller through. I brought some pictures that show a very typical day on Bridge Street, the children come out in mass on any sunny day and they bring out all of their toys. Bridge Street is where so many of our children play. I'm very excited about all of the connectivity but I'm very concerned about changing Bridge Street with the bridge. It functions very well as it does now as a dead end. I have reservations about safety for our children if Bridge Street is used for vehicles; any extra traffic will cause extra risks. When I first moved to Bridge Street I thought the bus stopping by my house would be great, but shortly after living there and having children, I understood how it is used by the kids, know I don't think it is good for a bus or more traffic. My house is just past the proposed road, there are 36 grade school children that live between my house and French Street, over 30 will be affected by the traffic increase. They won't have a place to practice riding their bikes and doing things that kids do. There is no room for sidewalks and there are none in the neighborhood. I think Bridge Street is known as an unofficial gathering spot for these kinds of kid activities throughout the neighborhood. These kids are learning to ride bikes with the Strider bikes at an earlier age and they are more at risk at an earlier age. Things can get away from these younger children really fast. Kids like to ride things in circles, the kids lap around the street to the eastern alley over and over again. There is a 6% grade around here and kids can pick up some speed. The kids could be coming down and potentially into oncoming traffic. I see people blowing through stop signs all the time on Wellington Road. I know that we are a neighborhood that has a bunch of kids and worried about kids growing up and then learning to drive, there will be increased traffic. I am having a hard time understanding why we have to connect these two neighborhoods. I don't think it is in the best interest of our little neighborhood. Thank you very much for considering my input and as a homeowner I hope you will take my opinions seriously. Bridge Street is truly a special neighborhood. It needs to continue as it exists now.

Mr. Blaze Panariso, 45 Bridge Street (on the corner of Logan and Bridge): I'm coming to this late, I could not agree with Ms. Hamilton more, everyone here is invited to come sit on my porch, Bridge Street has paved functions just like the greens, kids play all the time. If you haven't spent a lot of time around here, you should check it out. Doing anything to increase automobile traffic will destroy the neighborhood. I have a one year old and I have a fence and at some time she'll figure out how to get out of it, having buses come through or more vehicles will make me want to move. If you don't understand this neighborhood, please call me to stop by. Protect the pedestrian neighborhood that is here now.

Ms. Candace Panariso, 45 Bridge Street: Bridge is a family friendly street. Our street functions like a green. While I understand the proposal for more stop signs, I live at the only stop sign now and people blow through it all the time. I am very concerned for adding additional traffic and I don't think additional stop signs will help.

Ms. Angela Brownley, 57 Midnight Sun: I live where the stop signs are planned to be added. I sit on my porch and I see the kids come through the intersection and not stop and I scream at them. When we bought our house on Midnight Sun, we looked at possibly living on Bridge Street and I decided not to be there because I knew that Bridge Street would go through with a bridge. Why does that road need to be there? (Mr. Daugherty: This would be the only remaining version to have some kind of connection; this is really for the

new development to have a connection as was proposed in the earliest version of the development. There is not a traffic engineering issue as much as it is more the new urbanism concept presented to Town Council so that you are not overburdening any one street.) Where will the construction trucks come through? (Mr. Daugherty: They will come through the new Bridge Street.) I have noticed trucks before. (Mr. Daugherty: Child safety is big concern for us too.) (Mr. Mamula: When did you buy your house?) In October of 2013. Also, Wolf Lyon is super steep with no stop signs. I concur with everything Ms. Owens said.

Mr. Jamey Andrews, 70 Midnight Sun Road: My big question is why? All of this sounds like this is based on personal opinions and just the thing to do. It hasn't been mentioned once that the Fire Department says it is necessary; there are no traffic studies, why is a new neighborhood getting more? We, in Phase 1, don't have sidewalks, and snow removal is below average. Where are the studies? It seems all opinion based. There are 87 homes in the new subdivision and 187 on this side. We don't need more access points. I would like to see the studies and data proof. I would also like to see that the Rodeo bridge crossing be put back on the table, my understanding is that Rodeo is off the table because 10 residents said "no" and now Midnight Sun has 23 residents all saying "no". Why not enhance Rodeo to be a feature? I haven't heard one good reason other than this was in the plans. Where is the consideration of safety for the existing residents not just the safety of future emergencies?

Ms. Ellen Reid, 108 Bridge Street: There is a question of why this is being proposed. I asked Mike Mosher, Why do we have to connect these two neighborhoods? I had the pleasure of a fire truck coming to my house with a boiler issue. The truck was able to get there help us at the end of Bridge Street and turn around and leave just fine. I think we can get more creative with traffic calming than just adding stop signs. I think we have smart people in this Town and we can come up with a better solution. I think we can make a better design that will serve the people who live there now and it won't be an issue for the people who are supposed to move in there. I don't think we need to just base this on the 1999 master plan.

Mr. Dave Rossi, 6 Cedar Green: I'm celebrating my 12th year in the neighborhood. The last meeting I did a head count of where you were (to the Commission), Mr. Mamula said, "let's get creative". I don't know how adding a bridge is being creative. I think the developers gave in to the planners for the bridge and I think they can be more creative. I think this seems more about politics and I think staff and the developers can buck this and think creatively on how to make this a better design. I do question why these neighborhoods need to be connected with vehicles. I think there are other options for emergency access. Staff has not demonstrated that there needs to be any connections between the two neighborhoods. Mr. O'Neil did a traffic study that said there didn't need to be connectivity. We are back to anecdotes and hypotheses. We are used to the accessibility that we have currently. What do you as Planning Commissioners think? We don't have the ability to be in all of these meetings with staff, we are looking to you guys to represent us. You work at the pleasure of Town Council who in turn work for all of us. We are asking you to be more creative than the proposal tonight. I'm hoping that you guys will forego any staff direction and look at whether the neighborhoods need to be connected. The neighborhood that I live in really works. I see the kids every day; there is no place for kids to get out of the way if there are cars. I know that Town Engineering said that more people would use Bridge Street to access Stables road. I would like you guys to think about whether this has been based on fact of just hypothesis. Let's think about the families. This is a fraction of the people who are bothered about this proposal.

Ms. Amy Mastin, Land Title Employee: It is my privilege to do the closings of the people who have purchased into the Wellington Neighborhood. Listening to Mr. Rossi I felt compelled to speak. I first met Mr. O'Neil when the Wellington Neighborhood when working at Main Street Station, and I heard about the "extracting of the pounds of flesh" he endured at each Town meeting. It is now 204 homes and is a great asset to the Town, I feel like this is now these neighbors' lives. I feel like you are trying to impose another hypothetical "pound of flesh" on the developers. It has been my pleasure to meet these people who are excited to purchase in this neighborhood and I don't want to see this be harmed.

Mr. Alex Blank, 32 Midnight Sun: I purchased in October 2013 and I thought I would be getting a safe location I was not aware that I would be getting a bridge. I chose my location specifically for access to the bus and what my corner of the neighborhood would like this. I would not have chosen this home with two young kids if I knew that there was going to be a road bridge here. I can't see this plan as being useful. Getting a fire truck across the Midnight Sun jog is not a fun proposition. They are going to use the major roads. There are a lot of other ways around. There are very few bottlenecks as they exist now in the current neighborhood. I would love to see a study to see why it needs to be there; at this point I don't get it. The headlights that would shine right into the houses across from the bridge with this would be unacceptable.

Ms. Kelly Sanders, 83 Bridge Street: I agree with everything that all my neighbors have said tonight. The Wellington Neighborhood has become a way of life for all our kids. Overall, they are in a safe neighborhood. I don't see the benefit of this connection with the new neighborhood. It won't benefit the existing. It is not ok to ruin the way of life of the existing neighborhood. It will be extremely negative for everyone in the existing neighborhood. We are going to worry about our kids now going out. It has been a safe, awesome, incredible place for us to live. With the connectivity we will see an increase in traffic. I don't see the purpose of the connectivity between the two neighborhoods.

Ms. Amy Pombo, 12 Dragonfly Green: I don't live on either Midnight Sun or Bridge Street but I do like the way these streets are used and I think we can be more creative than the proposal before us.

Mr. Ian Hamilton, (partner of Mr. Mamula's business), 111 Bridge Street: Largely everything has been covered that I was going to say. I personally would like to see no connections between the two neighborhoods for personal reasons. I think Wellington is a very functioning neighborhood, I think there might be enough connection with Stables road for the new neighborhood. Just because Mr. O'Neil is building another development there shouldn't have to be another connection. I think if we do this a kid will get hit.

Mr. Russell Backhouse, 37 Huckleberry Green: Wellington Neighborhood 0. By eliminating the bridge, you don't eliminate the connectivity.

Ms. Trisha Florio, 95 Bridge Street: I agree with everything said (by the public) at this meeting.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Mamula: Thank you to all of you who showed up for this meeting tonight. The Commission will have discussion now.

Ms. Christopher: Please clarify the current and approved 2006 Master Plan. (Mr. Mosher: Going back, the approved Master Plans have shown pending vehicular crossings shown at Midnight Sun for 3 previous master plans: 1999, 2002, and 2005; all showed possible connections.) It is not a jogged line but straight at Midnight Sun? The current approved is Rodeo and Midnight Sun? (Mr. Mosher: Correct, just a straight line.)

Mr. Pringle: I appreciate all of you coming out here tonight. We know how passionate you are about the Wellington Neighborhood. I have been part of this development from the beginning. I love hearing all the comments about the quality of the neighborhood. I'm agnostic about having the connections. The Town Engineer and Planning dictate that it is preferable to have these connections. I think that is what is driving the desire to have the connections. The connections have always been part of the project. I know how much fun it is for the kids to play, but it was always called Bridge Street because there was going to be bridge connection here. I don't know how we can soften it up; we need to be creative to solve this. I have a question, where will all the increased traffic come from? I think if it comes from anywhere,

it will come from you folks. The only impacts of increase traffic will be coming from you, not Town. I don't see when I look at the vehicular patterns; it will be just people coming from one side or the other. I think they will go out to the main roads avoiding the bridges. I'm not quite sure if we are opposed to what is happening based on the reality of what could happen or just opposed to just changing what now exists. Our charge is to make good public policy and what is best for everyone. This is not what we proposed, we are just supposed to review what the developers and staff have been discussing. I think if no connections are the best then I'll agree, but if we hear that if we need this for Public Works, the bus system, etc. then we do need the connection. If we have options, then you will hear about them. I don't think we are going to abandon Bridge Street and make it a permanent playground for the kids. These are not easy decisions for us to make and listen to impassioned public comments. We take our jobs very seriously but we have responsibilities to the Town to make the best decisions for the public. On the four questions: 1. At this time, I feel compelled to support some connections and I think Bridge Street has always been the plan for a future connection. I guess the Midnight Sun connection I will go along with, but I would like to see those connections be as limited to emergency situations as possible be mostly pedestrian. 2. I will agree with Mr. O'Neil that a 22-foot wide road is a lot quieter and calmer, engineering likes straighter, flatter, road. I think a safer road is a narrow, windy road. 3. Any traffic calming is good, but I don't agree that stop signs are the best solution. Calming measures on the South Alley are a potential solution. I think that the South Alley is the best way through to leave the neighborhood. 4. The trail connections and inter-neighborhood circulation is great.

Ms. Christopher: Are two roads / bridges, was that requested by Town Engineering? (Mr. Daugherty: Yes that is requested for connection to the new neighborhood.) 1. Connections at Midnight Sun: not ok with this connection but I am in favor of the 2006 Master Plan with a bridge at Rodeo and Bridge Street. I don't think the jog at Midnight Sun is a good egress location. So many people have purchased on Midnight Sun and that wasn't on the 2006 Master Plan. Since 1990 something Bridge Street was always supposed to have a bridge. I was under the impression that Rodeo Drive was taken out because of the riparian corridor. Midnight Sun is a good pedestrian crossing bridge. The pedestrian bridge is a great crossing for the Central Park. 2. Traffic Calming should be whatever needs to happen to make the neighborhood slower. 3. The slowing of traffic on the South Alley I definitely think needs to happen. I do think that the developer needs to pave Stables Road that the new neighbors will need to use. 4. Circulation for pedestrian and trails is all great.

Mr. Lamb: 1. Vehicular connections: no one likes Midnight Sun or Bridge Street; maybe we should re-look at the vehicular connections between the two neighborhoods. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Yes, Stable Road paved.

Mr. Schuman: I appreciate the comments to the public comments before the final meeting. 1. No I don't support the Midnight Sun connection. Bridge Street if it could work, could be an emergency access only if possible. Rodeo connection with Vern Johnson Park makes more sense for me. 2. I think traffic calming measures have been created a result of overall poor design; I support them as much as we need them but a good design would minimize the need for them all together. 3. Same thing here with South Alley; I think we can do something better here. 4. The more inter-neighborhood pedestrian the better, the wider the pedestrian bridges the better for kids, and plowing.

Ms. Dudney: I'm not an expert planner or traffic engineer but I am a mother and can empathize with the parents. However, the Town Engineer says we need these connections and if not then a 24-foot wide road. The developer says that this wide of a road is bad. The residents say traffic endangers the kids. Ultimately, I have to support the Staff recommendation and agree with Mr. Pringle. But when I have no traffic or expert planning experience, I rely very heavily on the very knowledgeable Mr. Mosher and Mr. O'Neil. So, the fact that the developer says no

24-foot wide bridge but concedes to the bridge on Midnight Sun, it is because he feels comfortable that the neighborhood will survive and thrive.

Mr. Schroder: I'm your neighbor and a lay person, our main task is to take the Town Code and make a recommendation to the Town Council. The traffic crossing is an absolute for the emergency access. This entire development was always proposed to be one neighborhood and was always in all the same Master Plans. I fully support pedestrian connectivity throughout the neighborhood. I'm one alley up from Bridge Street, the fire department also made it to my house. Improving the connectivity is important. If there was a major incident for the emergency vehicles there could be conflict on the streets. This whole neighborhood will continue to change. 1. Midnight Sun, I too am agnostic on this. I feel like there should be another connection, the Midnight Sun job is awkward. 2. What else to you do besides stop signs or landscaping? I do like the proposed road staying skinnier. I like the idea of a "No Wake Zone". 3. South Alley: I think traffic calming will help. Plus a quarterly update in HOA communications would help. 4. Fully support pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Mamula: I am still tragically underwhelmed by where we are now. I can't believe that after the last hearing, this was the solution. I am not a developer or engineer and I can't draw but there is no creativity in this solution. When I looked in the packet and saw that this is worse than the 2006 Master Plan I was very disappointed. This has now become just "bang some houses out". What you have given to the Town Staff is what has resulted in you having an angry neighborhood. I too would be furious if I bought houses on these streets without knowing about these changes. 1. I think the road should be straight. I think there shouldn't be connectivity on Bridge Street, things change. I still don't understand why we can't have a gate for emergency vehicles. 2. I stop at stop signs, I guess I don't have to, but part of this is a good solution, so I'm in favor of the traffic calming. Minor collectors and through streets are discouraging through traffic, this is not happening here. You are not discouraging me from using these minor collectors and local streets so this doesn't work according to the code. 3. The South Alley seems like a solution to make new urbanism work. It is longer than any other alley and seems like a very poor solution. I'm almost offended that this is a solution to dump 100 cars onto a dirt road that is going to blow dirt on all the people. Stables Road needs to be paved, I don't care who does this, but it needs to be paved. Overall, this development is not better for Town as it is proposed. I am really underwhelmed and I think that we can do better. If Bridge Street has to happen but some of this other stuff makes me bummed. There needs to be better solutions. 4. Pedestrian circulation is great, but this is easy. To all of you who attended this meeting, the next step will be a review at this level will be about different aspects. I would suggest that you come to the next meeting. Then this will go to Town Council and I suggest you go to that meeting too and follow this all the way through.

OTHER MATTERS:

1) State of the Open Space Report

Mr. Truckey presented the 2014 State of the Open Space Report. The report provides an update on the Town's Open Space and Trails program, including data on open space properties acquired and trails constructed in the last year. This is intended as an update for the Planning Commission and no action is required. Staff will be glad to field questions regarding the report.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Do you typically spend all budgeted funds? (Mr. Truckey: The way the funding plan was written was that the funds have to be spent for this purpose. We've had a big balance in the past but we have purchased land over the years.) You will carry about \$600,000 into the new year? (Mr. Truckey: Yes.) The 6 person trail crew will continue for the future. (Mr. Truckey: Yes.)

- Mr. Schroder: Does most of your funding go towards acquisitions? (Mr. Truckey: Over 50% of our funding goes towards acquisitions, much to pay off previous acquisitions.)
- Mr. Mamula: It is stunning the progress this program has become. It is incredible; you have done a masterful job, so thank you. The new trails are kickass. (Mr. Truckey: We have a great staff from planners to the guys on trails crew. I think it has put us on the map. We are able to leverage all of our dollars because the County is typically putting up half the funds on these acquisitions.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45pm.

Eric Mamula, Chair