

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Gretchen Dudney Jim Lamb
Dan Schroder Dave Pringle arrived at 7:13pm
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison
Eric Mamula and Ron Schuman were absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the May 19, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 2, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Last Council meeting was light so wanted to talk more about Work Session.
- Wetlands TDR's was one topic. It is cheaper for developers to buy wetlands lots than backcountry lots when development happens that needs TDRs. We are on track to pass an ordinance to limit any TDR transaction to a maximum of using 25% of wetlands lots as TDR's. This will be discussed at the next Council Meeting.
- Sign code was also discussed. This is still on track, big thanks to the Planning Commission for your input on this topic. This has been an ongoing conversation and Council went on a Main Street field trip and we are definitely sticking to our decision to ban sandwich boards. Council feels that window sign wraps, like Blue Sage Spa has, that are tastefully done are probably acceptable. We also have varying incidences of directory signs with stores not directly on Main Street. We want to work on these so that everyone has a better directory sign--we are working on sizing and a look for these signs. This will help places like La Cima and Main Street Station to have tasteful directory signs even though they may be tucked in off of Main Street. Also working on seasonal decorations, the garland and bows get a little bit tired by spring break so we are going to rework the code so that those come down right after President's weekend. This will be a plan for Main Street commercial areas. The overall sign ordinance will take effect the end of July but active enforcement is planned in September.
- The parking structure is the anchor to the big parking plan. Tomorrow there will be the first meeting with various constituents in the Community starting with the Restaurant Association, there may several Council members present at this meeting. The meeting will mostly be focused on the parking structure but will also discuss the overall parking bundle of solutions. We believe that the structure should eventually tie in with all the other parking plans because it opens up other possibilities for public and employee parking. We really want to get feedback from the Community on the structure first.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Kelley Residence (MM) PC#2013111; 210 North Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a new, 2,242 square foot, 3 bedroom, 4.5 bathroom, single family home with an attached 2-car garage. At the last hearing, the Commission was supportive of the site layout, building massing and architectural details. The proposed landscaping warrants positive points, though not needed for a passing score, and the Commission was supportive of positive two (+2) points. Since the last review, the Town has removed the un-platted public water line that was crossing the north edge of the property. The applicants have modified the finishes of the garage to abide with the design guidelines of the Handbook of Historic Standards. Otherwise, the report is essentially the same as the last report. Changes reflect the design of the garage. The finishes and color of the garage have been modified since the July 1,

2014, submittal.

With this proposal falling within the recommendations of all associated Development Code policies, Staff finds the proposal meets all absolute policies and have awarded positive two (+2) points under Policy 22R, Landscaping with the addition of two more spruce trees. The applicant's agent has worked closely with Staff for this proposal. The only outstanding issue from the last review was the finishes for the garage. This has been addressed and we have no concerns.

The Planning Department recommended approval of Point Analysis for the Kelly Residence (PC#2013111) showing a passing score of positive two (+2) points. The Planning Department recommended approval of the Kelly Residence (PC#2013111) along with the presented findings and conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

No questions for staff.

Applicant Presentation (Mr. Mark Provino, Architect for the Applicant):

No other comments.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: I like it.

Mr. Pringle: I think that the code wants the garage to be subordinate to the main structure and not compete with the primary structure. I'm hoping that we can modify the garage, secondary structure to not compete with the main structure with future applications. I concur with the point analysis. (Mr. Mosher - The Development Code supports this design that has the main house and secondary building as being different.)

Ms. Dudney: I think this is very attractive and a great addition to the block.

Mr. Schroder: I agree it will look great in town.

Ms. Christopher: I also agree.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Kelley Residence, PC#2013111, 210 North Ridge Street, showing a passing score of positive two (+2) points. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Kelley Residence, PL#2013111, 210 North Ridge Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

2) Miller-Huntress Restoration (MGT) PL-2015-0075; 309 South Main Street

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to restore the front façade of the building per the historic photo, including adding an ADA compliant door to the north elevation, adding a ramp with handrails and an patio /deck addition.

Changes from the May 19, 2015, Preliminary Hearing:

- The applicant has designed the detention areas to the satisfaction of the Town of Breckenridge Engineering Department.
- The snow storage area between the paved parking lot and the Riverwalk will have top soil and grass seed as requested by Staff.
- Applicant has agreed to remove the deck encroachment over the property line.

Staff recommended positive one (+1) point under Policy 24/R, for: *On site historic preservation/restoration effort of minimal public benefit*, for a passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Miller/Huntress Restoration, PL-2015-0075, located at Block 6, Lot 5, Stiles, 309 South Main Street, with a passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point and with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: Is the deck going to look like the one that was approved previously? (Mr. Thompson: The code allows a zero setback and so we are ok with this plan; we have a preliminary agreement to allow the Crepe Cart to be over the property line and this will be a condition for the C.O.) Will we have any idea of what the deck will look like? Will we have a picture or what it looks like? There is no detail here and would like to see that buttoned up. (Mr. Thompson: The stairs will remain it will just be pulled back and then a new deck added onto the back of that. I don't have a picture.) It would be nice to have a record of what we approve tonight because in the future we want to have this record in case it isn't constructed the way we approve it. I want to see an elevation so that we can have it for future reference. (Mr. Thompson: There is a condition of approval that it be cut back to the property line.) (Ms. Puester: You could add a condition of approval that they submit a Class D minor for the deck so that staff double checks that this is done correctly and there are no code design issues.) (Mr. Thompson: This will also go through all the building codes too and make sure it complies.)

Applicant Presentation (Mr. Marc Hogan, Architect for the Applicant):

We met over at the site today with the Crepe Cart owner and we will cut the deck that is 12" high so no guard rail is required. There are currently flag stone pavers that are over the steps so we will extend those pavers to the new deck and we have no problem with the additional condition. (Mr. Barry Noam, Applicant: Thanks for everyone who we worked with at the Planning Department, Matt, Julia, and Peter.) (Mr. Pringle: A lot of this is your give and take too, so thank you.)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I don't have any problems; I'm glad to see you bringing this property back to life. I would like to see the Class D approval for the deck be added.

Ms. Dudney: I think this is terrific and I would like to thank staff and the applicant for getting this done so quickly; I didn't think this would happen so quickly. (Ms. Puester: If we want to add a Class D minor permit for a deck, put it on condition number 19 as prior to a building permit and then all the conditions will fall after.)

Mr. Schroder: I think it is a great project and great to see something happening here.

Mr. Lamb: I think it is a great project. I'm not concerned with the deck, but I could go along with the Class D for the deck.

Ms. Christopher: I also agree, thanks to all the cooperation between applicant and staff. I'm fine with the Class D.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Miller-Huntress Restoration, PL-2015-0075, 309 South Main Street, showing a passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Miller-Huntress Restoration, PL-2015-0075, 309 South Main Street, with the presented findings and conditions including a Class D minor permit for a deck, put it on

condition number 19 as prior to a building permit and then all the conditions will fall after. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Gold Pan North Elevation Siding (MGT) PL-2015-0087; 103 North Main Street

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to install 22-gauge corrugated rusted steel on the exterior of the first floor of the north elevation of the building and install vertical pine shiplap siding of various widths on the second floor of the north elevation of the building. The historic windows will remain the same. Priority Policy 220: Maintain the clear distinction between first and upper floors. Policy 225: Maintain the present balance building materials found in the Core Commercial Character Area. While the applicant is not proposing painted wood lap siding as the primary building material, they have provided a photo from the past showing vertical stained wood for the entire north elevation. Also, Policy 225 is not a priority policy. Priority Policy 220, *Maintain the clear distinction between first and upper floors*, is a priority policy. Furthermore, taking into consideration that this is the north side of a two story building, which will have a new building (The Elk) built within five (5') of the existing Gold Pan, the snow will get trapped in between the two buildings, sitting up against the building siding. Hence, Staff feels that it is an acceptable concept to propose rusted metal siding on the first floor, and vertical shiplap siding on the second floor. It will be a considerable improvement on the existing rolled asphalt faux brick pattern existing on the north elevation. Also, the metal siding will protect the historic structure from the effects of snow right up against the wall of the building.

Staff does not believe this application warrants positive or negative points. The application is found to meet all absolute policies. The Planning Department recommends that the Planning Commission approve the new siding proposed for the north elevation of the Gold Pan building, PL-2015-0087, located at 103 North Main Street, Lots 81-82, Bartlett & Shock, with a passing point analysis of zero (0) and the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: The Elk building to the north will be set back so that the north window on the second floor will be exposed so that the west edge to the window will be visible? (Mr. Thompson: Yes. There is fear that if it wasn't set back then there would be too much snow piling up against the window of the Gold Pan, which could damage the historic fabric.)
- Mr. Schroder: Will there be a fence between the buildings? (Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for the Applicant: No fence and also there will only be a two feet separation between buildings.) I was worried about people sleeping late at night in between the buildings. (Ms. Sutterley: There is a connector. There is only 2 to 3 feet here in between buildings for about 18 feet. The corrugated metal was to really provide a weathering base. The historic picture shows stone wainscoating here. The Elk building starts just behind the first window of the Gold Pan.) It seems to me that the question is, would we be able to see it?
- Mr. Pringle: I'm just trying to decide is the corrugated metal appropriate for this area? A ten foot panel that comes out all the way to the street corner? I'm wondering if this is appropriate for this visible section.
- Mr. Lamb: It seems ok. The Theobald building has corrugated metal. I would argue that there is precedence. (Ms. Sutterley: To me the photo shows historically it was vertical wood siding.)
- Mr. Pringle: I'm just wondering if we want to go with the siding material of metal all the way out to the front corner. Is this truly the best historical interpretation?
- Ms. Christopher: I just don't know where you make the distinction- between a 2 or 3' wainscot for 5' and then shoot it up to the whole first floor?
- Mr. Pringle: Yes. I would like the vertical siding coming down to the window that is exposed, have a small amount of metal wainscoating and then go back to the whole first floor.
- Ms. Dudney: What materials?
- Mr. Pringle: The wainscot could be just the corrugated metal and then vertical wood would go up the rest

of the wall.

Ms. Christopher: If the Elk building wasn't there I think this would look kind of jig sawing. So with that I'm ok with the whole first floor being metal.

Mr. Lamb: I think the whole first floor being metal is appropriate.

Ms. Christopher: I think protecting the Gold Pan is top priority to me.

Mr. Pringle: This will be a very public view of the building and I'm not sure if 10' of corrugated metal is historically correct.

Mr. Lamb: Theobald did it. I see other examples of historic buildings with metal siding around Town.

Mr. Pringle: But I don't want to keep making the same mistakes.

Ms. Christopher: Can we make it clear that this is not to be followed in the future? (Ms. Puester: You could create a special finding for this property.)

Mr. Pringle: This used to be a big deal, but I guess it isn't any more.

Ms. Dudney: I see both sides but since this is not a priority policy, I don't have a personal objection to the corrugated metal. I'm following the lead of the staff and I don't hear them saying that this is a big deviation to the historic standards.

Mr. Pringle: Corrugated metal wasn't a historic material; it was used later when people needed a different material. As a dominant side this looks like an addition material as opposed to a historic material. (Ms. Puester: Being as this is not the primary elevation on a historic structure that needs protection, staff feels we can allow it. If it was a primary elevation we probably wouldn't support it.)

Ms. Dudney: If we had lower corrugated metal on the lower portion on the front five feet. If the Elk Building wasn't going to be built, how would you feel about the corrugated treatment?

Mr. Pringle: I would go with a more historically accurate look because that corner of that building is going to be exposed.

Mr. Lamb: Aren't there other historic buildings in town that have metal siding? (Ms. Sutterley: Yes there are other buildings like the Brown that have metal siding.) There are buildings that exist.

Mr. Pringle: Yes, but those aren't the original condition of the buildings, they were done in the 1940's or later. Anyway, we do know that there will be another building built there. (Mr. Thompson: Per the historic guidelines is that any building pre-1942 is considered historic. That's why the Theobald building metal siding was approved because the metal siding was added prior to 1942.)

Ms. Dudney: I think it is going to look nice the way that it was proposed and meets the intent of the Code.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with Ms. Dudney.

Ms. Christopher: I too like the full story of metal. I like saying that this is not precedent for other buildings, this is a unique situation. Would be ok with a special finding if that makes other Commissioners more comfortable.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: It is not a primary façade; I too see precedent around town that shows this material does a good job and shows that this distinguishes the two floors per Priority Policy 220.

Mr. Lamb: I agree too; it follows Priority Policy 220 that keeps the top floor different from the bottom. I think that metal was used historically. I think it will look much better.

Mr. Pringle: I don't believe that it complies with 5A and is an incorrect interpretation of use of a building material. I can't give it a full endorsement.

Ms. Dudney: I support it as presented.

Ms. Christopher: I support it too, even if it isn't a historic material I think it does a good job of protecting the building.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Gold Pan North Elevation Siding, PL-2015-0087, 103 North Main Street, showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried (4-1).

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the Gold Pan North Elevation Siding, PL-2015-0087, 103 North Main Street, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1) Milne Park Site Improvements (MGT) PL-2015-0159; 102 North Harris Street

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to remove the corner section of the fence at Milne Park to allow pedestrian access into the park (repair fencing where necessary). Add pedestrian cross walk stripping across Lincoln Avenue and then across North Harris Street to connect to the Breckenridge Grand Vacations Community Center. Add stone pillar gateway signs with brick landing as an entry feature. Thin and prune existing trees for visibility into the park. Add cottonwood trees to the park along Lincoln Avenue. Provide new interpretative signs to identify and provide history of the Milne House, Briggles House and the Eberlein House. Build new benches for seating. Add top soil to smooth out undulating areas on approximately half the lawn area and re-vegetate with native grasses and wildflowers.

Staff finds no reason to assign any negative or positive points to this project. The application was found to meet all Absolute policies. This is a Town Project pursuant to the ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013). As a result, the Planning Commission is asked to identify any concerns with this project, and any code issues. In addition, the Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the Town Council.

Planning Staff suggested that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Milne Park Improvements, PL-2015-0159, located at 100 and 102 North Harris Street with the presented Findings.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Do you know where the benches would be? (Mr. Thompson: Showed them on the plan and the interpretive signs too.)

Applicant Presentation (Ms. Mary Hart, Designer for the Applicant):

I'm here to answer any questions. A simple project that is designed to improve accessibility we are not trying to make it really manicured, a little rough around the edges and still feeling fairly native. (Ms. Dudney: Is the goal to bring people into the site to get a hands-on feel for it?) Yes, we would like people to get in there. Right now they walk on by thinking that it is just a private area. With the library so close, people can probably get WIFI and use this public space. (Ms. Dudney: Is that a wooden walkway?) Yes, it is existing and used when BHA does tours there; we are hoping that this continues and is still a public use area. (Ms. Dudney: So this is not a winter space?) Yes, that is true; it is just for the summer, it is not maintained during the winter. (Ms. Dudney: Are the buildings only open for tours?) Yes, the buildings are only open to tours.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I think it is great; I support the application as presented.

Mr. Lamb: I support it 100%; up until now I always feel like it is trespassing when I'm there. I especially like the crosswalk.

Mr. Pringle: I also fully support it.

Ms. Dudney: I am fully behind it also.
Ms. Christopher: I approve of it as well.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Milne Park Improvements, PL-2015-0159, 102 North Harris Street. Mr. Pringle seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

Update on Track E, Shock Hill and Lincoln Park Master Plan: The 30 day challenge periods have ended and no one challenged either application and so the decisions stand on both of those.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 pm.

Kate Christopher, Vice Chair