

**Town of Minturn  
Planning Commission Meeting  
January 13, 2010**

**Regular Session - 7:00 p.m.  
Town Hall Conference Room – 302 Pine St**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 pm by Chairman Stuart Brummett. Other Commissioners present included Tim Osborne, Lynn Teach and Michael Gallagher. Lael Engstrom was absent.

Staff present included Town Planner, Chris Cerimele, Town Manager, Jim White and Administrative Assistant, Michelle Metteer.

**Approval of Agenda Items**

M. Gallagher made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. L. Teach seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0

**Approval of Minutes** – Minutes from November 3, 2009  
– Minutes from December 16, 2009

Michael G. made a motion to approve the minutes from November 3, 2009 as presented. Tim O. seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0

Michael G. made a motion to approve the minutes from December 16, 2009 as presented. Tim O. seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-0

**Public Comment**

None

**Action Items:**

None

**Discussion Items**

1. **Land Use Code Revisions (Minturn Municipal Code Chapter 16)** – Discuss new lighting standards for the Town of Minturn.

- Chris C. discussed moving forward with changes to chapter 16 and specifically the lighting section. Crested Butte, Vail, Gypsum & Avon were all referenced for their lighting standards. Town of Minturn's existing lighting standards were acknowledged as inadequate and improvements to the code need to be made.
- Input from Commission was request for a sunset provision for non-conforming fixtures. Chris C. recommends a 5-7 year period.
- Michael G. asked if the Town of Minturn is in any violation of the proposed code.
- Stuart B. stated that currently public street lights are the biggest concern.
- Stuart B. recommended the Wal-Mart parking lot as a starting point for a guideline. He recommends a max 60 incandescent and 13w fluorescent for code fixtures. Aspen/Pitkin County code was referenced as a good example.
- Lynn T. expressed concerns that a 60w might be too low for visibility. Discussion ensued.
- Michael G. expressed that 60w is not reasonable for security purposes. He recommended that for security/motion sensor lights an alternative wattage may be viable exemption to the potentially proposed code.
- Stuart B. expressed that this is an issue of aiming and shielding the lights rather than the exact wattage. Motion sensor lights need to be shielded. The Minturn Inn was cited as an example of a light system being too bright.
- Stuart B asked about low pressure sodium lamps being used for street illumination however vs. incandescent or 15w fluorescent or less being preferred, Chris C. stated that this section of the code is up for complete revision.
- Jim W. brought up the point that Xcel is in charge of the street lighting system and for a cost they will come in and change out the lighting system to something more artistic.
- Michael G. expressed concerns over 90 degrees. He offered an example of 60 degrees or possibly 75 degrees. Chris C. provided illustrated examples of the different degrees that gave a better example of what the numbers mean. Michael G. said this assisted in clarifying and said 90 degrees is acceptable.
- Stuart B. would like to see improved diagrams of the codes and that no diagrams contradict each other.
- Lynn T. asked how Christmas lights would fit into the code. Chris C. referenced the section of the code allowing for variances in the code during seasonal timelines.
- Stuart B. would like to see verbiage added regarding maintaining and keeping all holiday lights operable.
- Michael G would like to see some adjustments to the code where it states "in your yard" noting that it is difficult to get the motion sensor light to only detect items on your specific property.
- Stuart B would like to see the code set at 5 years for a fixture replacement period guideline.
- Stuart B brought up neon signs. He states that they are "fun" in limited capacity. Chris C referenced the sign code and stated this may be an issue of

enforcement because currently per the code neon signs must be turned off by 11:00 pm or closing, whichever comes first.

- Stuart B would like to see a 15w cap on fluorescent lighting. Fluorescent tube lighting will be strictly prohibited.
- Stuart B mentioned that seasonal lighting differs between commercial and residential areas. Ornamental lighting must be in working order.
- Jim W. suggested referencing a “dark sky” ordinance
- Tim O. suggested the website as a reference for the town residents when needing lighting information and energy efficient information
- Lynn T said she would be the devil’s advocate and expressed that this has all been discussed before. She said energy efficiency is the “in” thing right now, but may not be in the future.
- Recap of changes to code:
  - i. Add diagrams of fixtures
  - ii. Provisions for security lighting
  - iii. Ornamental lighting provision
  - iv. Fluorescent tube lighting will be strictly prohibited
  - v. Energy efficient lighting sources are encouraged

**2. Planning Commission presentation of development examples throughout Minturn.** The goal of this discussion is to illustrate development projects in the Town of Minturn that contain attributes that should be used for future developments in Town. These efforts will be used for future updates of the zoning code.

- Michael G. gave a presentation on examples around town that work as well as examples that don’t work in following the code.
  - i. Stacked parking was given an example as a “do or die” situation
  - ii. The parking spaces next to the Town Manager’s house were given as a “poor” example since they were associated with the Iron Works Building. He stated that buildings need to provide meet their parking requirement on site.
  - iii. Backing out onto a US HWY is a bad idea and unsafe. Stuart B mentioned that when a garage is counted as a parking space that it doesn’t always work because people don’t always use their garage for parking
  - iv. Design examples
    1. Protrusions, recesses and colors all help to improve a buildings appeal.
    2. Rooftop gardens help to give a building appeal when no land yards are available
    3. Telluride was given as an example of good design options.
    4. Stuart B gave a suggestion that we need to know what we want developers to propose in order to avoid such bad planning in the future.
    5. Permitted densities need to be addressed.
    6. Color tones were brought up.

7. Jim W. brought up that some subdivisions require differing roof and house colors (as an example).
8. Adobe examples were given as positive design examples in the community.
9. Dumpsters sitting out in the street were given as examples of items which look bad
10. Too many houses on one lot are were also given as an example of excessively high density
11. Examples were given that properties need a yard
12. Utilities are unsightly and need to be required to be underground
13. the four story complexes of the Enclave were given as an example of the “worst thing to ever happen to Minturn”
14. Examples were given of trailers that are too old and not up to code, safety was cited as an issue.
15. The buildings on the drive into town were given as an example that could have been two stories and worked out well.

### Commissioner Comments

- Commercial buildings with historical examples given by Stuart B.:
  - Materials were a long lasting/timeless material
  - The mercantile was noted as a nice building with a typical 10-12 ceiling height, 80% of frontage is glass, architectural detail, high two stories with generous ceiling heights,
  - Stuart B would like to see keeping Minturn to a two story level maximum
  - Minimum sidewalk width needs to be established for new buildings
  - Recommendations were given to not completely pave everything in front of every building
  - Again, need more windows at ground level
  - Molly G building was shown as an example of what not to do. The commercial level is dungeon like and does not invite people into the area.
  - Ironworks building was shown as too much bulk. A set-back plane is recommended
  - Minturn market area needs to be reviewed for future development standards. Ideas need to be presented as to how some of the properties can be preserved when new development comes in.
  - 100-200 block a zero lot line/commercial core
  - Toledo south – smaller properties, more spaced out
  - Stuart B recommends eventually looking into underground parking as a viable solution at a cost of potentially 25k-30k/space
  - Non-repeatable buildings of the recent past:
    1. need to establish what the set back is.
    2. aged parking signs were recommended for certain situations

Lynn T. gave examples of some properties that good and bad for the development of the town

- Stuart B. would like to see that we keep open front porches
- Example: Floyd's house was given to show something that needs to be fixed, the M&M was referenced
- The illegal triplex was shown as a gone-wrong project without all necessary approvals. Too many people living there, not enough parking, density and set-back were all concerns
  - From this it is noted that zoning needs to be tightened for these exact reasons

Tim O. brought photos from the South end of town:

- Different outbuildings on one lot were given as an example of a potential problem, fire trap, safety issues and the need for enforcing building code
  - Tim O. suggests approaching each lot in the future by making it affordable, safe and visually esthetic to the community
- Code requirements need to help people understand the importance to the safety of the complex and this material needs to be readily available to the masses
- Tim O. expressed the #1 priority needs to be to make dwellings safe for the community
- Stuart B recommended potentially the development of smaller projects with partial deed restrictions may be worth looking into in the future
- Stuart B recommended possibly allowing garages on the property line in order to fit everything in.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:24 pm.