

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Ron Schuman Dan Schroder
Gretchen Dudney Christie Mathews-Leidal Dave Pringle
Jim Lamb and Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison, were absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Christopher: On page 12 of the packet (page 9 of the minutes), on my last comment, please take out the double negative so it reads "I think that there is not enough service commercial" instead. With no other changes, the December 1, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Puester announced that the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building, PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road, has been continued to the January 19th, 2016 meeting at the request of the Applicant. With no other changes, the January 5, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

Ms. Puester welcomed Ms. Christie Mathews-Leidal, who was nominated by the Town Council in December, to the Planning Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1) Cottage 11, Cottages at Shock Hill (CK) PL-2015-0565, 82 Regent Drive

Mr. Pringle: Were there any concerns from staff with Shock Hill? (Mr. Kulick: Things are fine and it is going well, close to the end of the development.) With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe was absent tonight, so no Town Council Report.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Grand Colorado Peak 8 East Building (MM) PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road (*Continued at the request of the Applicant.*)

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Huron Landing (CK) PL-2015-0499, 0143 Huron Road

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a 26-unit affordable workforce housing rental apartment building. All units are proposed as 2 bedroom apartments and range in size from 768 to 947 square feet. There will be 52 surface parking spaces for the project. The trash collection and recycling will be by way of a centralized dumpster enclosure. The exterior materials proposed include: cementitious vertical siding, cementitious lap siding, powder coated corrugated steel base siding, wood post, beams, rails and trim, and an asphalt shingle roof.

Changes since the November 3, 2015, Planning Commission Preliminary Hearing:

1. The architecture of the west elevation of the west building has been modified. The modifications include a break in the wall's plane, utilization of horizontal and vertical siding, new roof elements and additional windows.
2. All proposed grading and drainage improvements are located on-site.
3. The building height was increased from 33'-1" to 35'-4 1/4" (an increase of 2'-3 1/4").
4. Dedicated storage has been redesigned from a common storage area located in the basement of the east building to exterior storage closets that are located in the back of the stairwells adjacent to the

apartments.

Point Analysis (Section 9-1-17-3): Staff believes all absolute policies have been met and that the proposal warrants the following points for a total passing point analysis of positive five (+5) points:

Negative points are incurred for:

- Policy 6/R, Building Height: Negative ten (-10) points as the building height is more than one half (1/2) story over the land use guidelines recommendation, but is no more than one (1) story over the land use guidelines recommendation.
- Policy 7/R, Site and Environmental Design: Negative four (-4) points for a retaining wall over 4 feet in height.
- Policy 9/R, Placement of Structures: Negative three (-3) points for not meeting the relative rear setback of 15 feet.

Positive points are awarded for:

- Policy 6/R, Building Height: Positive one (+1) point for providing an interesting roof form that steps down at the edges.
- Policy 16/R, Internal Circulation: Positive three (+3) points for installation of a recreation path adjacent to Huron Road and the sidewalk that borders the parking lot.
- Policy 20/R, Recreation Facilities: Positive three (+3) points for the Flume Trail easement from Huron Road.
- Policy 24/R, Employee Housing: Positive ten (+10) points and positive three (+3) points for meeting a Council goal.
- Policy 33/R, Energy Conservation: Positive two (+2) points for achieving a HERS score below 80.

Staff Recommendation: The Applicants and Agent have worked closely with Staff to address the concerns of the Planning Commission and Staff to achieve the result of this report. Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission find the changes to the western façade of the west building meet Policy 5/A?
2. Did the Commission support awarding positive three (+3) points for the trail easement to Huron Road under Policy 20/R?

Planning Staff recommended the approval of the presented Point Analysis for Huron Landing, PL-2015-0499, 0143 Huron Road, showing a passing score of positive five (+5) points. Staff has added a new condition #11 to address the existing overhead electric line which is to be undergrounded per the Town's Overhead Utility undergrounding program.

Planning Staff recommended the approval of Huron Landing, PL-2015-0499, 0143 Huron Road, with the presented findings and conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Is the lot owner who was concerned about the Flume trail impacting her private property in the Highlands aware of what the Town did after the last meeting? (Mr. Kulick: I'm not sure, Scott has been handling this but the work was done right after the last meeting.)

Ms. Dudney: The newly installed fence along the Lower Flume Trail is very obvious.

Mr. Pringle: The trail was already established there, yes? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, it was established but we wanted to be proactive and address her concerns on the section of existing trail that is between the proposal and her property. Anytime you have a nice public amenity like this, it is possible that it could be abused with people parking near the amenity. You want nice recreational amenities but there is always the possibility that the public makes it a nuisance. Property managers need to actively manage the parking which is a never ending task.)

Mr. Schuman: I think that it is irresponsible of the staff to put the responsibility of the parking problems on

- the property manager. (Mr. Kulick: I think the Applicant stated previously that it would be the property manager to manage the rental property.)
- Ms. Leidal: Did you want to bring up the new condition? (Mr. Kulick: There is currently an overhead utility line that runs across a portion of the site. Eventually the plan is for this to go underground. Per Policy 28A utility lines are required to go underground. Within Policy 28 there is a provision to pay a fee in lieu, so we would like to hold the money to bury the line. Staff added a condition reflecting this decision, Condition #11, with the subsequent conditions changing in number.) (Ms. Puester: Read the new Condition #11 into the record: "The Town of Breckenridge shall underground the overhead electric utility line on the property when the property has been identified for utility undergrounding as part of the Town's ongoing Overall Utility Undergrounding project.")
- Ms. Dudney: Is the money escrowed? (Ms. Puester: Yes, the Town has an account for these projects of undergrounding; part is paid through a Town utilities tax on Xcel electrical accounts and in the past, part has been paid by the Town.)
- Mr. Schroder: Is this plan for undergrounding contemplating burying the overhead utilities near the recreation center along (Airport Rd) on properties that are within the County's jurisdiction but appear to be Breckenridge? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We collect 1% tax on the utility bills; as the Town accrues enough money then the Town will undertake various projects. The plan is to do the entire town over time.) (Mr. Kulick: This is similar to the open space tax, fees in lieu. This is a little different because we want the whole Town to be done over time.)

Applicant presentation:

Mr. Matt Stais, Matt Stais Architects: I want to run through the comments we heard on November 3. Sidewalks and crosswalks were discussed but those are external to our property. We won't be able to extend the sidewalk to Highway 9 with this project. We will extend the rec path a little bit to the adjacent driveway to the storage units. We support extending the sidewalks, but that is a much larger proposal that is beyond the scope of this project. We also heard last time that the western building's end facade needed some work, so we reduced the scale and made it more interesting and broken up, one clean roof on the lowest level, corner window groupings, and unit decks are smaller which make the roof above the unit deck pulled back with more variation. The owner storage was another issue we've redesigned. We relocated the storage from the basement to the landings of the stairs. This helps with cost and building efficiency. We eliminated the electrical metering downstairs and moved it to the dumpster. We have added an outside bike storage area that can accommodate 2-3 bike racks. We've been trying to make this both work for the tenant and alleviates the needs for a basement. We heard a lot of comments of working with the neighbors, worked on the view from Highlands Lot 13 (vacant lot) we've tucked the buildings into the forest with the photo depicted. The existing view from Highlands Lot 14 showed the proposed building massing and is below the tree height. We showed a view from the lower flume trail, where the building massing fits in with the trees. Landscaping, we heard comments from neighbors to reveg the trail on the Kennington property. We won't be able to landscape on someone else's property, we want to put the landscaping on our property, but there are opportunities for the Kennington residents to work with the trail crew on reveg. As for the parking and the property manager having to police it, I think that is important for Ms. Laurie Best and the management, not the architect and planners to develop a parking management program for the property. As for building height, we reconfigured the floors to allow for better insulation and sound proofing. We are taking negative ten (-10) points for building height; which only happens on a couple points on the eastern building that is tucked into the hillside and is away from the road; the rest of the building is below.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Talk to me about the success of the project. Things that work well for long term residents, maybe there is a place you could incorporate outside barbeques rather than hibachi's on individual decks. (Mr. Stais: I have had this conversation with Red, White and Blue Fire. Nobody wants people grilling on the decks. We do have a potential space for a grill in the

community area. But this is dependent on the client.) This isn't going to be a building for guests; it is going to be place for long term residents. (Ms. Puester: We can pass your suggestion onto Ms. Best and Don for discussion.) (Mr. Stais: This leads to other questions like who will be operating it, what fuel will be used?)

Mr. Schuman: I have a property that has 2 grills that has a 30 minute timer on each grill; it would be nice to do, but it is something that the operator can take on.

Mr. Schroder: On page 40, it reflects off-site grading, on the west side and on the east side. (Ms. Puester: This is for connecting the rec path to the adjacent properties.) (Mr. Don Leinweber: There are presently two gaps in the easement, on the eastern end and the western end, need very short pieces for this easement. So there is still some off site negotiations on easements for the rec path.)

Ms. Puester: Before we start on Commissioner comment, I would like to put this on the record. Ms. Leidal has reviewed the previous staff reports and the previous meeting minutes on this project for preparation of this evening. Ms. Leidal can you please confirm this for the record?

Ms. Leidal: I have reviewed the work session, previous staff reports and previous meeting minutes and I'm prepared to work on this issue tonight.

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

Commissioner Final Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I think this project has come a long way and the applicants have been open to our comments and they have made this a better project. I applaud the changes to the storage and I'm in favor of the point analysis.

Ms. Dudney: I agree with Mr. Pringle. I think that the west elevation is an improvement; it is a great looking project. I'm in favor of the point analysis.

Ms. Leidal: I agree too and I appreciate the changes architect has made based on the public comments and the concerns of the Commissioners. I support this project and the point analysis.

Mr. Schroder: The western façade is a great change. I support positive three (+3) points for the easement and I support passing with positive five (+5) points. I also like the 2 spots for parking per unit.

Mr. Schuman: I too support the entire project. I think it could have foregone this process, but I think it is a better project because it went through it.

Ms. Christopher: I echo my other fellow Commissioners and I too appreciate the process that the Applicant, Staff, neighbors and the Town went through to make this a good project. I agree with the point analysis.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for Huron Landing, PL-2015-0499, 0143 Huron Road, showing a passing point analysis of positive five (+5) points. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve Huron Landing, PL-2015-0499, 0143 Huron Road, with the findings and conditions presented this evening, including the new Condition # 11. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

2) Fifth Amended Master Plan Delaware Flats Planning Area 3A (West Braddock) (CK) PL-2015-0543, Shores Lane

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to amend the current Master Plan for Delaware Flats Planning Area 3 A's "Parcel A" to allow for the development of clustered single-family and duplex units with the remaining 30 SFEs of density. The current master plan has this area designated for "duplex residential". There are no other

substantive changes with this master plan amendment beyond the change of unit type. The Applicants have provided a conceptual site plan that demonstrates how 22 clustered single-family and 8 duplex homes could be accommodated on the site.

Staff welcomed any comments from the Commission. Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Fifth Amended Master Plan Delaware Flats Planning Area 3A (West Braddock), PL-2015-0543, Shores Lane, with the presented findings and conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: In looking at the development code, I didn't have clustered single family as part of the list. 1,600 square feet is like duplex; it is in the 3A chart that I'm looking at. (Mr. Mosher: A cluster single family does not have a 5,000 square foot cap before being required to provide employee housing.) Does this project have more than 5 units per acre? If so, should there be a limitation 1,600 square feet? I'm not sure if clustered is a new definition that I can't find in the Code.
- Mr. Pringle: Are we trading apples for apples? (Mr. Mosher: What is probably going to happen is that they don't build this out as is originally presented because of the minimum 20-foot setbacks between units. The cluster single-family homes will need to be spread out with the density dispersed over the site. There is no limitation that says they have to be 1,600 square feet per SFE, if your concern is "how big are they going to be"?)
- Ms. Dudney: My concern is that there is going to be unlimited density for 1,600 square feet? (Mr. Mosher: I don't think the code identifies a set square footage per SFE for clustered single-family, but the mechanics will be self governing because they don't have the land mass and they are limited by the building height too. The original approval for the duplexes was less than 5 units per acre.) There might be less than 5 units per acre. This is a less intense use. (Mr. Mosher: Under Policy 5, excessive similarity or dissimilarity, the cookie cutter look will be scrutinized in the planning process as they come through individually for permits.)
- Mr. Pringle: I think it is better to be upfront with what the limit is on density. I would prefer to start with a position on how much square footage you will be building on. (Mr. Mosher: If you come in again and we suddenly see a 6,000 square foot house it won't look right with the other homes in the subdivision.) I think they just have to pass point analysis.
- Mr. Dudney: What if we say that it can't exceed the limitation of density?
- Ms. Leidal: When they put density on this site, was there a 1,600 square foot multiplier for the duplex? (Mr. Mosher: The initial plan had 60 SFE of duplexes with no limitation. To limit the density now would mean a complete re-visit to the master plan. All of the duplexes are at 4,999 or less to avoid the negative points associated under Policy 24/R for employee housing requirement. The notation of the duplex is just a footprint.) (Ms. Puester: And setbacks and building height).
- Ms. Dudney: But when you say the 4,999 or less that doesn't comply with 5 units per acre? (Mr. Mosher: They don't have a limitation of 1,600 square feet right now.)
- Mr. Schroder: Is this a master plan consideration or is this a decision as each property comes through? (Mr. Mosher: They want a master plan decision. We haven't been working under the 1,600 square feet as the original plan came in.) (Mr. Kulick: Need to clarify. The "Parcel A" bubble has 56 SFEs on 15 acres of land which equates to less than 5 units per acre and therefore has no size limitations. Sorry for the confusion.)
- Ms. Dudney: I understand now that they had no limitation and that the entire site is 15 acres.

The applicant had no comments to add.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: I'm fine with this project; I like the diversity in the housing stock so that it isn't all duplexes.
Mr. Pringle: I agree.
Mr. Schuman: I also support it.
Mr. Schroder: I also support it.
Ms. Leidal: I like the mixed use and I support it.
Ms. Christopher: I also like the mixed use and I support this project.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve that the point analysis showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve the Fifth Amended Master Plan Delaware Flats Planning Area 3A (West Braddock), PL-2015-0543, Shores Lane, with the presented findings and conditions. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (6-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Puester: I have a couple of other matters:

- The Saving Places Conference is coming up in early February, please contact me with questions. February 3-6 in Denver and the conference code is CPI2016 and there is a code for the conference hotel. Are any of you planning on going? (Ms. Dudney, Ms. Christopher, Mr. Schuman, Ms. Leidal and Mr. Schroder indicated that they were interested in going for one day.) (Mr. Schroder asked about the expectations from Town on continuing education for Planning Commissioners.) To maintain our CLG certification they do look for information on who went to which conferences and sessions on historic preservation. They do ask us that and we do need to report it annually. We would like to get people to at least a day of these types of conferences. If you could aim to attend one every other year that would be great. You can go any one of the days for just one day if you can.
- The ski town forum is on Wednesday afternoon and we'll be presenting again, probably related to housing and the pressures of short term renting on the historic district.
- I want to introduce our new Planner II. Chapin LaChance is the new planner and he will be presenting before you shortly hopefully. Welcome Chapin.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.

Kate Christopher, Chair