

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher	Ron Schuman	Dan Schroder
Eric Mamula	Jim Lamb	Gretchen Dudney
Dave Pringle		

Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison, was absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the October 20, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe was absent but sent word that there is a Town Council budget retreat on October 27 if you are interested.

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Denison Placer (JP/LB)

Ms. Best presented. This discussion is slightly different from all the detail in your packet. We have recently learned some additional information regarding CHAFA tax financing and cost saving measures for construction and maintenance than what is in your packet tonight. In addition to the plan in your packet tonight we will also look at a revised site plan which takes some changes into account. This is still a working document and is evolving as we get further in the design and referral process.

Ms. Puester added that there are many similarities between the plan in the packet and the one you will see tonight. The elevations on some of the buildings will be extremely similar and we would like your input. The plans in the packet, Denison Placer housing, is 5.37 acres with 65- two and three bedroom townhome rental units within 60,800 square feet of density (38 residential SFEs) as well as 2,400 square feet of leasing office/maintenance space (2.4 commercial SFEs). The density proposed is approximately 7.08 UPA; under the allowed 20 UPA. A public right of way (Floradora Drive) is being extended with private streets with on-street parking perpendicularly bisecting the ROW. A bus pull off stop and temporary bus turnaround is proposed. There is a large 150 foot sewer easement running diagonally through the property constraining the site. The Breckenridge Sanitation District has given verbal consideration that the easement can be reduced in size. This plan is based on that assumption and will be confirmed as this project undergoes the entitlement process.

We will go over the plan in the packet and then I will turn it over to Coburn Architects to go through the modifications that have been made since the packet was published. As Laurie mentioned, this is going through a LIHTC process and the Council direction has been to be ready for the next application deadline. The purpose of the work session is to see if the Planning Commission is satisfied with the general direction of the project and is comfortable with Staff's initial interpretation of points. To facilitate the discussion, staff has identified key components of the proposal and Policies where points may be warranted.

Staff recommended point totals: Social Community positive 13 (+13) and Placement of Structures negative three (-3) for a total of positive ten (+10) on the plan in your packet.

Staff would like Planning Commission input on the draft point analysis and would also look for any additional comments or concerns before this project moves forward to a preliminary hearing.

1. Did the Commission find that the proposed natural wood accents which include beams, bellyband, trim, and stair railings on the buildings meet the required amount of accent material on the elevations?
2. Was the Commission supportive of the preliminary point analysis?
3. Any potential code concerns with the new plan?

The units we would like your opinion on tonight are those that don't have tuck under parking as that relates to the new plan. We want the Commission reaction on these presented and the proposed exterior material and being mostly cementitious, does it meet our code and past precedent related to natural accent material? Code calls for natural stone or natural wood when using all cementitious siding. All the accent pieces on stairs, railings, window trim, belly bands, post beams, decking will be natural wood.

Staff has no concerns with the building height as it will stay within the 35' to the mean limitation in the LUGs. There will be a lot of grading on this site and over all of Block 11. There will be 50,000 cubic feet of material removed from this portion of the site to relate better with the river and create a better relationship consistent with the vision plan.

(Ms. Dudney: Will the height be at the new grade?) Ms. Puester: Yes, it will be measured from the new grade. Social Community Policy 24 will apply to both sites; +10 points for workforce housing and +3 points for Council Goals. There are streetscaping trees with this plan in terms of landscaping which is a more formal treatment.

(Mr. Mamula: The HOA will be responsible for the private street system?) Ms. Best: The property management company will be. Floradora will be maintained by the Town and is public ROW. This is a maintenance cost issue and one reason you will see some changes on the next reiteration of the plan. This will be a Class A project similar to Pinewood II as we have to have a process that assumes the property is owned by a separate entity. The Town will have control of the site but it won't be owned by the Town. The LLLP will build, own and operate it and in 15 years the property will revert back to the Town.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Is it too preliminary to ask about grading and the relationship with the CMC Property? (Ms. Puester: The grading will tie into the CMC property.)
- Mr. Mamula: We regraded the CMC property before it went in. (Ms. Puester: We don't have any USGS detailed elevations yet, but the grading plan isn't 100% finalized yet.) The C131 page has skier parking and snow storage, but they have 600-700 spaces they use realistically. Are we putting the cart before the horse here? Where are those spaces going? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We are doing the parking transit study where we will look at that issue, and we plan to talk to the ski area about their 200 parking spaces at the base of Peak 8 that are required as well, and then thirdly, we have in process, the McCain master plan that shows 500 spaces and could potentially be used to satisfy the Town's obligation. This will be addressed but we don't know which of these 3 options will come first or how they will end up.) (Ms. Best: This is a 2017 construction project although we will be doing the rock removal in 2016.) This is a Council issue but there is a reality about the number of spaces and I'm worried about the cart before the horse however I understand we want the CHFA funding. (Mr. Grosshuesch: This isn't the project that will cause the squeeze; it is down the road on Block 11.) (Ms. Best: CHFA is very, very competitive and they will evaluate our project against other projects. The tuck under parking is an awesome amenity, but we really don't want to drive cost with extra amenities so the current plan relies on surface parking and we may actually gain a few units.)
- Ms. Dudney: Exterior materials don't include stone because of the economic issue? (Mr. Pete Weber, Coburn Architects: Yes, it is minimal to satisfy the cost per unit.)
- Mr. Schuman: There is no guarantee that you will get CHFA funds. (Ms. Best: If we don't get the 9% tax

credits on this Council will have to decide how to proceed with the project. You can go through multiple rounds of CHFA to eventually get approval)

Mr. Schroder: Could we do this again and again? (Ms. Best: The 15 year tax credit period is how long we need to maintain certain rental rates and insure the credits to our equity investor. It doesn't mean that we can't do other LIHTC projects. Pinewood 2 is a 4% project. Block 11 allows for a variety of different types of projects and we will continue to build based on need and financing options.)

Mr. Pete Weber, Principal of Coburn, presented the newly revised plan:

I think we came up with some changes that reduce the cost but still provide residents with a quality apartments and the community with a project that meets local standards/expectation. The easement stays the same, the boundary moves about 40' to the south. We kept the overall circulation plan the same. Floradora is the street that continues through Block 11 as the main street. Also, we kept the largest building on Airport Road, thinking that the larger buildings should be closer to the existing larger buildings on Airport Road. The main difference is that now all the parking is on the surface. Plowing is easier and project is less expensive. We moved the community building to now be surrounded by park. We now have a total of 70 units as opposed to 65, with the entire being closer to 100 units with the future phase 2. There is a lot of work to be done still that we haven't had time to explore, but our goal is that the architecture and unit types look different to increase the diversity across the site. Also more room to make it look less like a parking lot and more like a street. Also, the corner building as an apartment building will be less costly per unit and will be a better fit to put townhomes more on the interior of the overall site. A lot of work to be done still; we just want your input on this plan on overall layout. (Ms. Puester: It would be a more formalized streetscape on Floradora looking more like row homes similar to what we've seen in Boulder on past field trips and will be on one of the places we are going to on Thursday. Backing up to Airport Road will be more parking lot functions. The visibility into the site from the highway will be the homes.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The cut out on Denison Placer south of the easement is a parking lot and that easement was granted to the building that fronts on Airport Road and this is a constraint.)

Commissioner Questions / Comments (Continued):

Ms. Dudney: I understand that the townhouse will front to Floradora, but do you want it to look like parking from Airport Rd. Should that view be our primary concern? (Ms. Best: I don't think you will see the parking from Airport Road because it will be screened by the existing commercial buildings.)

Mr. Mamula: One of the other things on the master plan was how it looked from the highway. The goal was that it didn't look bad from Highway 9. I like the parking facing the commercial better. It would be nice if you could streetscape next to the buildings with parallel parking next to the townhomes on street, and then more parking on the other side. (Ms. Best: We are shooting for 2 parking spaces per unit. Also, we are looking for ease of plowing.) (Mr. Weber showed another view of how Floradora would look on the overall Block 11 plan.)

Ms. Dudney: Why not do phase 2 at the same time and bring cost down? (Ms. Best: 65-70 units seemed to be the sweet spot on the 9% tax incentive. Phase 2 is the property we will acquire in a land swap from CMC. Our thoughts are to keep phase 2 for a future project possibly with CMC as a partner. Involving CMC in the Phase 1 LIHTC project would create complications relative to LIHTC since units cannot be restricted except based on income.) (Ms. Puester: This second plan I don't think there is a need for as many trash enclosures; we probably see less visual enclosures because it is tighter.)

Mr. Mamula: Any thought about not doing recycling since you are so close to the new recycling center?

Ms. Christopher: Is there street pick up? (Ms. Puester: The Code requires dumpsters for more than 6 units.)

Ms. Dudney: What is the thinking for the little piece designated as snow storage? (Ms. Best: It could be a place for community center.) It could be a place for athletic options. (Ms. Best: The leasing space is set up for community center, including a possible kitchen, multipurpose room.)

- Mr. Pringle: Is it the notion that every parcel has its own community room? (Ms. Best: It is really important for the application to have on-site leasing and on site manager and to have multi-purpose support services. Community rooms look good for the application. They are looking for support services with people who are in this low AMI.) Couldn't you do this with a leasing trailer?
- Mr. Mamula: This is an on-going leasing office since its rental. (Ms. Puester: Thursday on the field trip will be a good opportunity to look at a different project that has a similar feel.) Since it's a rental property there really isn't a HOA but a management company that the town hires and they will charge a fee that won't be able to exceed the AMI? (Ms. Best: Yes, LIHTC will require considerable compliance checks for the duration of the credits) (Mr. Grosshuesch: They will audit you and that is why you want to have a solid rental process. It's very detailed.)
- Ms. Dudney: Do tenants have to qualify every year? (Ms. Best: Yes, but in case the tenants earn more next year I don't think you have to move immediately.)

Commissioner Summary Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: I'm receptive to the architectural design; I'm open to what you've come up with. The parking worries me in terms of the ratio. The proportionate number of spaces between the 4 units and the 5 units is tough point. I understand why no tuck under. I understand this isn't double dipping so I'm ok with the 13 positive points. As for the use of natural materials, I'm ok; if it wasn't this project I probably wouldn't be ok with this little wood. I'm open to seeing the next round.
- Mr. Pringle: The materials are satisfactory; it's how you put them together. I would like to see an upgrade on the architectural materials but I'm sensitive to cost. Now that we are seeing more and more affordable housing, when you drive through other communities it is very easy to pick it out. I would like it to be indistinguishable as much as possible. I'll go with the 13 points although it does feel like a double dip. My biggest concern is the parking lot and thinking that if you live there would you want to have to park fairly far away. I would prefer to see parking closer to the units and reduce the big pool parking and perhaps find a better use to this big space. And perhaps put the leasing building across the street.
- Mr. Lamb: I'm glad we are addressing the 60 AMI and it's good to see a project like this. I think parking will be crucial. I would like to see at least 2 cars per unit. I'm fine with natural wood accents qualifying. I'm fine with the points. My one concern is when you regrade this I'd like to take into consideration the 100 year flood. I just want to bring this up.
- Ms. Christopher: I concur with everything. The parking is important to me as I live in an area where spaces aren't enough during certain periods of the year.
- Mr. Schroder: I like the mixed building elevations but don't give it the cheapest skins just because the target is 60 AMI. Isn't there a percentage of natural material like 25%? (Ms. Puester: It is for non natural such as stucco except for the cementitious siding. A few years ago, the code was revised because there are multiple concerns about wild fire and product longevity, the allowance for cementitious was given with no negative points if natural accents were provided.)
- Ms. Christopher: My opinion is that we need to be setting a precedent for everyone else; I wouldn't want to see so few natural accents here that we wouldn't approve it elsewhere. (Ms. Puester: Will return with examples of similar projects next time for precedent review.)
- Mr. Schuman: The natural wood accents are fine and I like the cementitious longevity and it will be a better looking long standing product. I like what we saw in this version. The parking, I think we need to have 2 parking spaces per unit, but I think the street parking will be a bigger headache for the Town or the Manager because as a property manager I know it is a pain. If you can get the parking closer that would be good. I'm supportive of the point analysis as long as we see the good project. I'm concerned that we are going to rush this through for a

deadline and then we will see it back here for a brand new project. We still want to make sure it is a good project no matter if it is a Town Project or not.

Mr. Pringle: Transportation building should be here.

Mr. Schuman: For example Val d'Isere; there are 3 hour parking spots, and the parking becomes an enforcement issue and some thought has to be given to that on how you make it work. At some point someone has to enforce it, people don't move just because you tell them. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The owners' rep on this project is an apartment manager and that is one their strengths. They will be looking for management design issues as we do this project.)

Mr. Mamula: I like both plans. I would like to be sensitive to the highway view as you come into Town. I'm totally fine with the architectural materials, corrugated metal that runs to the ground needs to be below finish grade. I don't want it to be above grade because it looks terrible like at Main Street Station. I'm fine with the 13 positive points, unless we bust height, I don't see any code issues that we can't get through. There are probably some things you can give back. In the end the big thing will be parking and I think you can solve this.

OTHER:

- 1) Class C Subdivisions Approved for Q3, 2015 (JP) (Memo Only)
- 2) Class D Majors Approved for Q3, 2015 (JP) (Memo Only)

Mr. Truckey: In a couple of weeks we will be holding a public open house on the McCain master plan. Mr. Berry asked that you don't attend this but know that we will be working on a work session on this topic.

Ms. Puester: Be here for bagels at 7:45 am on this Thursday for the field trip to Boulder. We will stop at McCain as we head out.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17pm.

Eric Mamula, Chair