

**Town of Minturn
Planning Commission Agenda
February 10, 2010**

**Work Session – 6:15 p.m.
Regular Session - 7:00 p.m.
Minturn Town Hall – 302 Pine Street**

Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Stuart Brummett called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. Other Commissioners present included Lael Engstrom, Lynn Teach, Tim Osborne, and Michael Gallagher.

Approval of Agenda Items

Motion by Michael G., second by Lynn T., to approve the agenda; all voted in favor.

Approval of Minutes – Minutes from January 13, 2010
Minutes from January 27, 2010

Stuart B. would like to see properties referenced by their street address in the January 27, 2010 meeting and all further meetings. 623 Boulder Street cited as an example from the January 27, 2010 meeting.

Motion by Michael G., second by Lynn T., to approve the minutes of January 13, 2010 as amended; all voted in favor.

Motion by Lynn T., second by Lael E., to approve the minutes of January 27, 2010 as presented; all voted in favor, Michael G. and Tim O. abstain.

Public Comment – No members of the public were present

Action Items:

None

Discussion Items

1. Land Use Code Revisions (Minturn Municipal Code Chapter 16)

- Review draft of new lighting standards – MMC 16-17-180
 - Section D: add the word “exterior”
 - 4th bullet (regarding flood lighting) lights must be shielded in compliance with the full cut off fixture

- Clarification requested regarding single family home lighting plan approvals vs. commercial lighting plan approval. For commercial projects the Planning Commission shall review all lighting plans at the front end of the project.
- Horizontal image requested for illustration 1
- Light trespass illustration will be correct if “middle line” is taken out and a bulb is shown.
- Chris C. recommended the Commission consider the review of construction lighting during evening hours.
- Stuart B. asked if construction lighting would be exempted from the guidelines. Chris. C stated that it would not and it would need to comply with the proposed regs.
- Discuss proposed revisions to current snow storage requirements – MMC 16-16-130
 - Stuart B. would like to see designated storage set back at 5' rather than 6' (in reference to section 1 of MMC16-16-130)
 - Regarding driveways: add provision that says requirement can be decreased to 10% snow storage if the driveway is snow melted
 - Front yards are allowed to be used for snow storage as long as the storage area is adjacent to the impervious surface.
 - Stuart B. recommended that on site plans a snow removal strategy be included
 - Tim O. gave an example at 1012 and 1012 ½ Main Street with a common drive where snowmelt would be a significant advantage
 - Chris C. to check the guide standards for engineering and see if percentages of maximum slopes of driveways is addressed and if snowmelt is required. Example Vail's code allows up to 8% slope without snowmelt.
 - Lael E. asked if this would be a topic for multi family properties, but not be a discussion for single family properties
 - Chris C. is hopeful to keep implemented code requirements as simple and easy to understand as possible
 - Lynn T. discussed that the section stating: “Shall not exceed 4 feet” may be difficult on some lots, but Chris C. explained that this is in reference to driveways and areas requiring clear lines of sight for safety
 - Stuart B. commented that a 5' width setback may be difficult to achieve for some commercial properties and recommended that sidewalks where commercial buildings have no setback, in commercially zoned spaces, are permitted to have less than 20% snow storage, but no less than 5% snow storage, and must have snow removal
- Michael G. requested the Commission consider that we do away with chapter 16 and adopt another municipality's code and “Minturnize” it. He encourages

that instead of trying to “tweak” a poorly written section of code created mainly for Battle Mountain, and continually try to fix/improve it, the Commission start from a better first draft and improve from an improved starting point. Michael G. sites the Eagle County Code as a good example.

- Stuart B. asked how this could work and how the idea would be received by other leaders in the community
- Michael G. gave a brief explanation of how the approval process can work and result in a positive outcome for everyone. Including proper compliances, staff findings, Commission findings, Council findings and then move for approval. He feels we can reasonably have a code that we like and then fill in the blanks as necessary
- Direction given to Chris C. to review sections of code from other municipalities and give recommendation of framework best to be used
- Chris C. discussed that the framework for most town codes are essentially the same and are adjusted/amended as needed
- Stuart B. agrees that reviewing the Eagle County code as well as a few others is a good idea.
- Tim O. stated that there are many positive green building practices being encouraged in other municipal codes that Minturn may be able to take advantage of.
- Stuart B. and Michael G. both suggest possibly using another municipal PUD code as a starting point as the section of the Minturn code referencing PUD is inadequate
- Michael G. volunteered to start the process of rewriting Chapter 16
- Stuart B. would like to see the Commission work through a few sections of Chapter 16 at each meeting after
- Lael E. believes that Michael G., with his knowledge and experience, has the ability to initiate a rough draft of code to bring to the Commission for further review and editing. She believes this may help to expedite the process
- Michael G. agreed to move forward with this direction but reiterated that whatever he puts together is to be used as a starting point for further input and changes. Minutes of the most previous meeting to be referenced for a starting point.

Commissioner Comments

Adjournment

Motion by Lael E., second by Tim O., to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m.