

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Ron Schuman Dan Schroder
Jim Lamb Gretchen Dudney Christie Mathews-Leidal
Dave Pringle arrived at 7: 04 pm
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Leidal: Please change the sentence on page 5 of the minutes. My sentence was incomplete. It says “when they put density on this site.” Please add “was there a 1,600 square foot multiplier for the duplex?” to finish the sentence.

Mr. Pringle noted at the end of the meeting that his statement on page 2 of the minutes ended with the initial question. It appears that there is an extra parenthesis in the middle of Mr. Kulick’s statement, making it appear Mr. Pringle continued. Please remove the extra parenthesis as the comment is all attributable to Mr. Kulick.

With no other changes, the January 5, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the January 19, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1) Mendez Addition (CK) PL-2015-0526; 211 North Gold Flake Terrace

With no requests for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Ok, so a couple of things in our last meeting. We have taken steps to get marijuana licensing authority attached to the responsibilities of the liquor authority. It will take a little work with Tim Berry for the Liquor Licensing Authority to learn all of the ins and outs of marijuana licensing. It will take some time, but it makes a lot of sense. It is the best place to have it reside. It had previously been up to Tim Gagen all by himself.
- Also, we are making good progress on an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Summit County moving forward with Huron Landing (26 rental units on County Road 450). Planning on breaking ground in the spring.
- We are going to take a look at the Welcome Center again. It has had some updates but has not had that once over look to determine what can be done to help our visitors over the next 10 years. Holistic looks. How to make that truly one stop shopping for people to come in and find out about what they can do in Breckenridge as far as arts, open space etc. This is exciting and good timing.
- Also, we had the call up hearing on the Peak 7 & 8 Amended Master Plan where the 200 parking spaces are going to be. That was quickly explained and with that, it only took a few moments to move forward. It is back in your court this evening. (Mr. Pringle: Are you comfortable with the parking deck at the stables lot?) There are places in several spots. (Mr. Mosher: Surface lots at Peak 7 all accounted for.) (Mr. Mike Dudick, Breckenridge Grand Vacations: Any shortfall will be made up on the admin site. 68 turned into 65 at construction; adding the extra required spaces at the admin site.) (Mr. Mosher: Ski areas keep the parking at two locations.)

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Grand Colorado Peak 8 East Building (MM) PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road

Mr. Mosher presented the final hearing proposal to construct a 105 unit (units may be combined into 2 and 4 bedroom lock-offs) interval ownership resort condominium at the base of Peak 8 ski area with associated amenities, surface and underground parking. Additional off-site parking is proposed at the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 Building (under construction to the west) and over the existing Stables Parking Lot to the north. Reconstruction of the portion of Ski Hill Road right of way fronting this development and the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 (currently under construction) is also proposed with this application. This permit would approve the architecture for the Stables Parking Lot and the retaining wall associated with the reconstruction of Ski Hill Road. A separate permit that includes PMA variances for these improvements will be reviewed separately. The parking structures will come back another time.

The Town Council approved a Development Agreement for this proposal on July 14, 2015. The 6th Amendment to the Amended Peak 7 & 8 Master Plan was approved by Town Council on January 12, 2016. Separate permits will be processed to create a resubdivision for this property and to review any extensions or updates to the existing Sprung Structures. Density and mass are below what was allowed with the Development Agreement.

Changes since the September 15, 2015 Planning Commission 2nd Preliminary Hearing

1. The bus lane was moved away from gondola to increase safety clearances.
2. The pedestrian area was enlarged at the transit plaza (at the garden level).
3. The transit plaza grading was adjusted to eliminate steps within plaza.
4. A freestanding pedestrian shelter was added at bus waiting area.
5. A guard shack was added at BSR short term parking to control access.
6. The octagonal building form (at the plaza level) was reduced in size.
7. The plaza was enlarged between the gondola terminal and edge of snow area.
8. The location of BSR guest services, coffee shop and BGV amenities were adjusted.
9. The fire table at the plaza was relocated to enhance pedestrian circulation.
10. Stone chimney elements were added to east side of building.
11. The maximum building height was increased from 68'-1" to 71'-9 1/8" (an increase of 3-8 1/8").
12. A Condition of Approval requiring a striped lighted pedestrian crosswalk at the Stables Parking Lot across Ski Hill Road has been added.
13. Timing for the removal of the temporary structures at the base area has been added as a Condition of Approval.
14. There is 3,500 square feet of deed restricted employee housing proposed within the Upper Blue Basin.

Point Analysis (Section 9-1-17-3): At this final review, staff has found the following:

Negative sixteen (-16) points are incurred for:

- Policy 6/R, Building Height: Negative ten (-10) for exceeding the recommended height by more than one-half story (68'-1")
- Policy 33/R, Energy Conservation: Negative three (-3) for heating all outdoor drives and plazas
- Policy 33/R, Energy Conservation: Negative three (-3) for three exterior gas fireplace pits

Positive twenty eight (+28) points are awarded for:

- Policy 6/R, Building Height: Positive one (+1) for providing density within the roof forms
- Policy 6/R, Building Height: Positive one (+1) for providing roof forms stepping down at edges
- Policy 15/R, Refuse: Positive one (+1) for having the refuse and recycling located inside the primary building
- Policy 18/R, Parking: Positive two (+2) for locating roughly 50% of the parking out of public view
- Policy 20/R, Recreational Facilities: Positive six (+6) for providing public use Ice Skating Rink

- Policy 22/R, Landscaping: Positive two (+2) for meeting the landscaping requirements for positive points
- Policy 24/R, Social Community: Positive six (+6) for greatly exceeding the required amenities
- Policy 25/R, Transit: Positive four (+4) for permanent, year-round, motorized transit system for use by residents and guests
- Policy 33/R, Energy Conservation – Renewable Energy Sources: Positive five (+5) for providing a 45% annual overall building energy savings compared to the baseline system

This shows a total passing score of positive twelve (+12) points

Staff received comment from public on traffic issues in front of sprung structures. No parking sign and delivery trucks and vehicles stopped in front creating one lane of traffic. Staff will review this issue in greater detail with the update to Ski Hill Road. Extra parking on site and off site. Some surface parking. 200 parking spaces agreement has been approved via the master plan as Ms. Wolfe noted in her update. Restrictions on passholders fees etc. No negative points on employee housing as the Applicant is providing slightly above the requirement. Infrastructure raising Ski Hill Road: digging up sewer and water. Everybody looking forward to this happening as it was part of the original master plan. All ski area functions can be relocated to this building (kids castle, sprung structures, etc.). All of those buildings will come down and be encompassed in this new building.

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. Staff is showing negative ten (-10) points for the height overage, positive one (+1) point for placing density in the roof forms and positive one (+1) point for the building forms stepping down at the edges. Did the Commission agree with the two positive points?
2. Would the Commission support awarding positive two (+2) points for the proposed landscaping?
3. Would the Commission support awarding positive six (+6) points for the added amenities for this proposal?
4. The Applicants are seeking positive six (+6) points for the Ice Skating Rink. This has been reflected in the presented Point Analysis. Did the Commission concur?

The Planning Staff recommended approval of the presented Point Analysis for the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building, PL-2015-0215, showing a passing score of positive twelve (+12) points.

The Planning Staff recommended approval of the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building, PL-2015-0215, with the presented findings and conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: With respect to parking 200 spaces, are they going to be for any day skier? (Mr. Mosher: Defined as “winter recreational visitor”. Essentially passholders; you can get a pass, you can pay there will be some fee or parking pass associated with using the parking.) Are they going to be viable for the public? How will people know which specific spaces are available? (Mr. Mosher: Not just certain spaces in each lot; all of the spaces in the identified lots at Peak 7 and 8 are for this use.) All are available for day skiers? (Mr. Mosher: “winter recreational visitor”. Ski Area has about 6 extra identified at Crystal Peak Lodge or the Administration Lot.) That is part of the master plan? (Mr. Mosher: Yes. Part of the master plan. We don’t want to see 200 vehicles going up Ski Hill Road at once as free parking.)
- Ms. Dudney: On the skating rink, could you talk about rationale of 3 versus 6 points? (Mr. Mosher: The Applicant will address that.) All of precedents are three points and they are Town properties. (Mr. Mosher: The Nordic Center Lodge is precedent for private property. Let the Applicants do their presentation.)

Mr. Schuman: No questions. I am satisfied with the parking.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Mike Dudick, Breckenridge Grand Vacations, and Mr. Matthew Stais, Matthew A. Stais Architects:

Mr. Dudick: Spaces in front of One Ski Hill Place; these don't count. These over here (indicated on plan) are operational, for check in. 21 at gondola turn station, 66 and 61 in deck, will not be free at any point, should not be free at is it is the most expensive real estate in town. Uphill skier parking is free prior to 8:30am. (Ms. Christopher: Do they have to leave at a certain time?) Yes, they do; at 8:30am. More clarity for you: we are very close to the 200 spaces with the various lots. Working with Rick Holman and Tim Berry, we feel we have accomplished what was required by the parking agreement and the Master Plan: of the 2,500 spaces, 200 are at the base of Peaks 7 and 8. Having some clarity on these agreements is a good thing. (Mr. Pringle: We save a lot of arguments for later.) Yes, it saves personal interpretation going on later.

Mr. Dudick showed and noted that the PowerPoint was mostly for the benefit of Ms. Leidal. Mr. Stais will pick up anything I butcher. We received positive twelve (+12) points via the staff report. Employee housing: we were negative ten (-10). We helped create some of the employee housing issues in town. I didn't feel comfortable coming in at positive two (+2) passing points with the housing impacts our company creates. Basically it cost us \$12,000 per employee housing point to get us from negative ten (-10) to zero (0). What we have agreed to do is to get 3,500 square feet of employee housing and deed restrict it. We are not going hoping to buy two Baldy Mountain Townhomes and then flip them. I would rather write a check to the Housing Authority to have a development that is more meaningful. The right thing for us to do is to get the employee housing points to zero (0). I wanted to set an example for other developers. This is voluntary but necessary. I have another pontification on energy. I want to thank Mr. Mosher noting that the heating of public surfaces for safety of the public is zero (0) points. Thank you. Policy consideration: maybe there should be a proportion relevant to the square footage of the building not a flat base number. The amount of private heated space for this development is less than 3% of the total. Building height: Showed difference between mass of previously approved 804 building and this building tonight looking down from the ski area. The new building is stepped back quite a bit improving the view corridor to the slopes. Showed the stepping back of the buildings from Ski Hill Road view as well. Landscaping: We think we deserve positive two (+2). Current Grand Colorado at Peak 8 (under construction) building received positive two (+2). The east building is 30% smaller, but we have similar amount (scope and count) of landscaping as on the first building and larger sizes. Amenities and social community: I call these "guest experience". We are not building a new lobby. That is the other building. Pools, hot tubs, media labs, computer areas: add and to maintain and preserve extra elbow room and keeping the extra space as promised to our guests. Guest experience amenities are proportionate; six times greater than required by code. Required 2,107 square feet and building over 13,000. Ice Rink: Precedent is Stephen C. West, but this is highly more visible to the public. At the Stephen C. West, you have to know where you are going. Even though ours is smaller, it has higher visual and social impact. Pinewood 2 got positive three (+3) points for a single track trail. Our rink will be open to public in winter months with nominal charges. After 5pm, new Stables Lot will be open to public to access the public skating lot at no charge. (Ms. Christopher: Will it be lit?) Yes. Not open in the summer time; waste of energy. Schedule: We have had a tumultuous 3 months in our company as you all know. We have to step back and see what is practical. We still have many things unsettled personally and within the company that still have to get settled. Most practical: building Ski Hill Road this summer. Building demo and mass excavation spring, summer and fall of 2017. Decking of stables lot summer of 2017. Road is a huge project. Here is private company building a public right of way. We will go vertical in spring of 2018. Identical to what we did for Grand Colorado Peak 8. Same thing, just kicking back a year. (Mr. Stais: One thing about Ski Hill Road, it will enable that to be done before building starts which changes the access point to create much more safety.) (Ms. Dudney: Grand Colorado Peak 8 timing?) 1st phase this November. Amenities next spring. Final phase 2018. (Mr. Stais: We want to have road substantially complete.) It's a big project. A lot of gear underneath that road that is 50 years old. (Ms. Dudney: That will take a year?) Planning that it will take a summer. Not a

long run but complicated to get it done. Get goofy knob fixed to make it safer. Town staff asked for crosswalk installed, striped and lit. We agreed. Showed view of construction with existing this past summer, sprung structure during construction and removal of spring structure.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Are we to draw any distinction in here where you mentioned visitor amenities skier dropoff lockers for visitors, day visitors and guests who are registered in hotels or in your units, is that fair, is there a distinction there? (Mr. Dudick: You can buy a time share and use it or deposit and go to Hawaii or put in rental pool. There might be visitors from the rental pool. A large population uses our property. Anybody that secures a unit is a guest of Grand Colorado and can use the amenities.) "Visitor" is highlighted in parts of the staff report. The day visitor that will come for the day to use amenities, is that guest registered to stay? (Mr. Dudick: There can be a day visitor to come use the ice rink. They would have to be an owner or a paid user of a unit with me to use the spa, other amenities etc. A visitor can mean a person using the ice rink or a person renting to stay at the building to use the amenities.) In the report we talk about "visitor" amenities. Then we talk about pool, theater being "guest" amenities; is there a distinction between the two? (Mr. Dudick: If you are using the amenities inside the unit, you would need to pay BGV for access.)
- Ms. Puester: I want to put on the record regarding Ms. Mathews-Leidal. Christie, you have read the past minutes and listened to the meeting recording?
- Ms. Leidal: Yes, I read both staff reports listened to the audio of the previous hearings regarding this application.

Ms. Christopher opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Richard Himmelstein, 19 Peak Eight Court: If you look at the Grand Colorado West between the two buildings that is my house there. Regarding the 200 parking spaces: Applicant needs that number; I know that 200 was just an arbitrary number. I have cars that come in my circle and wait to pick up people. If I could wave a magic wand I would say put all the 200 parking spaces at one location so many different locations will cause cars to circle around looking for spots. Recommend Planning staff talk to Council and reduce the amount. I think they can.

Where my house is, lots of people walk from Ski Watch. They often walk 4 to 5 abreast across our road. There is probably double the steepness of Ski Hill Road on Ski Watch Drive. Cars slide there all the time and it's really chaotic. I was very surprised when they moved the road and there was no sidewalk planned for there. Not sure if this is the right forum to request a new sidewalk along Ski Watch Drive for us. There is no access through the Grand Colorado building so I think it is important to have a sidewalk along Ski Watch drive for us. The original Master Plan showed a statement/entry sign at Ski Hill Road before One Ski Hill Place, but no one has moved forward with a statement sign to let people know that they have arrived at the base of Peak 8. I think it is time for that statement sign since we will now have more density and mass than what was originally approved on the original Master Plan. Ice rink: Originally thought positive three (+3) was appropriate for the rink, but now I agree with Mr. Dudick about the ambiance and they should get positive six (+6) points. I disagree with positive six (+6) points for amenities inside as those are for their guests only. One Ski Hill was a different animal; owners from Timber Trail, Crystal Peak, Mountain Thunder, Grand Lodge at Peak 7, they all shared the amenities and it is quasi-public. One question for Mr. Stais: I wanted to confirm that everything for Grand Colorado East and Grand Colorado West meets the Master Plan. Want to get confirmation for that issue. Thank you for your time. (Ms. Dudney: On the statement sign, I am not clear what you mean. - Mr. Stais showed a general location on a map.) We now are approving more mass and density than ever was planned, I am requesting that the statement sign be added and approved now; there's more activity, more people. (Ms. Dudney: There is confusion.) No; the statement sign is just that you have arrived at Peak 8. It adds to the ambiance; you have arrived at your destination.

There was no further public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: I would like to, with respect to “visitor” or “guest”, it comes back to the parking issue of who is the parking going to be available for, the “winter recreation visitor”? 68 spaces on both decks for “winter recreation visitor”, is that correct? It says “pedestrian” access. On page 31, it says “guests that park on lower level directed to upper level to cross Ski Hill Road”. Distinction between “guests” if guests can park in Stables Lot; are those going to be allowed to park in the lot? (Mr. Mosher: Both.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: There is no restriction on those parking spaces as far as guest, they can park there and pay any associated fee. When someone pays to park in the Gondola Lots, we don’t check to see where they are going from the lot. The same will be true in these lots.) If there are guests that stay at the hotel, are they parking on the lower lot? Then we don’t have those spaces for the general public?) (Mr. Dudick: The upper deck can have Grand Colorado guests; the lower deck is the ski area. Right now it is employee only; next season it will be open to guests.) Guests of hotel and visitors; the report says guests are we going to put guests of the hotel into the public lot? (Mr. Dudick: My understanding is their lower lot is for close in paid guests.) (Ms. Puester: All of this has been clarified and approved in the parking agreement and Master Plan with the Town Council.) (Mr. Stephen C. West: We have an agreement with Town. 200 spaces are for “winter recreation visitors”. Both One Ski Hill Place and Grand Colorado East have plenty of excess spaces for those uses associated with their uses. The Stables Lot is for “winter recreation visitors”, not reserved for those staying at the condo/hotels.) (Mr. Mosher: This is spelled out very clearly in the Master Plan. Recommend you read that Master Plan and contact me with any questions.)
- Mr. Lamb: All the points: I am fine with the negative ten (-10) and positive one (+1), positive one (+1) for building height. Fine with positive points for landscaping. Positive six (+6) for amenities; I support strong precedent like skating rink idea. Good project hard to argue with the final score of positive twelve (+12) points.
- Mr. Schuman: I Agree with Mr. Lamb on all those points. This is a really good example for developers to see.
- Ms. Leidal: I agree with Staff’s interpretation on height and roof form stepping down. I support positive two (+2) for landscaping. You did it at the last hotel; would you consider 50 % of aspens to be multi stem? I support positive six (+6) points for amenities. On the skating rink, I would support positive three (+3) as I compare it to the existing ice rink. It’s not open year round; and we don’t want it to be. I see it more as an amenity for your guest instead of people going up there.
- Ms. Dudney: Negative ten (-10) I understand and support the added positive; I support positive one (+1) and positive one (+1) for stepping down; no negative points for parapet length. I agree with positive two (+2) for landscaping. I do support positive six (+6) for amenities, but I understand Mr. Himmelstein’s’ concerns. I wish the amenities were public amenities not just the guest but understand the precedent with the Code. Positive six (+6) for skating; looking for rationale on impact.
- Mr. Pringle: Size on skating rink? (Mr. Stais: 40’ x 70’.) Thank you, Mr. Dudick, and all your team for how you are approaching mitigating the employee housing need. The private sector creates a lot of the impact and I applaud you for stepping up. It is not the public’s job. I agree with negative three (-3) points on energy conservation; goes a long way for safety on there. I agree with negative ten (-10) points for height and two positive (+2) points for roof form density and stepping down. I don’t believe negative points should be assessed for parapet length; there is enough relief; agree with staff report. Positive two (+2) for landscape if there is place for additional positive points this would be it. Positive six (+6) for added amenities: Ms. Dudney is absolutely correct, there should be more for public precedence for positive

six (+6). You have enough to pass. Getting a lot of points for rink and you are assuming responsibility for running the rink from here on out. Ok with positive six (+6) points. In favor with change on Findings and Conditions that Staff passed out and thank you to Mr. West for clarifying on the parking.

Mr. Schroder: I agree with point analysis presented by staff.

Ms. Christopher: I agree with 1, 2 and 3 and amended Findings and Conditions. I would agree with Ms. Leidal on positive three (+3) for skating rink as it is only used a portion of year and not used as much as indoor. Thank you for strong project and for working on the employee housing.

Mr. Pringle: Mr. Stais, excellent building. This is really starting to come together wonderfully. I can't wait to see the ensuing buildings come down in the future. They did it right thank you guys.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Grand Colorado Peak 8 East Building, PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road, showing a passing point analysis of positive twelve (+12) points. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve the Grand Colorado Peak 8 East Building, PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road, with the corrected findings and conditions presented at this evening's meeting. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

- 1) Class C Subdivisions Approved for Q4, 2015 (JP) (Memo Only)
- 2) Class D Majors Approved for Q4, 2015 (JP) (Memo Only)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22pm.

Kate Christopher, Chair