

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		
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 19, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Kulick announced that the Hester Fence Variance, PL-2016-0014, 432 Golden Age Drive, had been continued to the February 16, 2016, Planning Commission Meeting.

With no other changes, the February 2, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Important upcoming meetings: Town is having a Housing Summit, February 11, with a gathering of business leaders. Workforce housing has been crunched especially this season so the purpose is to meet with business leaders to better understand the characteristics of the crunch and brainstorm ideas. We've invited business leaders to come and participate. This meeting is open to everybody; there will be participants (business leaders) and then it's open to observation by the public.
- On February 18 will be the first opportunity for DTJ Design and Nelson Niegard to report their observations on parking and transit over the holidays, between Christmas and New Years. They had boots on the ground during this time and it will be really interesting to have them engage the Council and task force. There will be two meetings at the Community Center; one at 7:30-9:30am and another around 5-7pm.
- We solidified our Town Council 2016 Goals and Objectives: 1. Parking and transit comprehensive development plan; 2. Workforce housing; 3. Expansion of recreation facilities and amenities (roof over second sheet of ice at Ice Rink); 4. Childcare and early learning centers; 5. Riverwalk guest experience (improving the lobby); 6. Water sustainability and treatment plant, 7. Ongoing sustainability and environment; 8. Public engagement (recent Town Hall meeting at which the hottest topic was transit); 9. Redevelopment of City Market (talking to City Market expansion and Parkway Center); 10. Human Resources and talent management of staff (continue to recognize and reward employees).
- (Mr. Schroder: There was a conversation overheard at the ice rink in which the plan to put the roof on the ice rink was perhaps something more like a second story with workout room?) During public comment there was some banter back and forth but it was all just ideas. There was a roomful of young folks during public comment regarding covering at the ice rink, covering the outdoor tennis courts and repurposing the current covered tennis courts, possibly covering the outdoor courts and connect it to the Rec Center to use for sports training. Those items are not in the plans right now and I'm sure you may hear some additional public comment. We plan on installing the roof over the outdoor rink and having this constructed this summer. We plan for this to be simple roofing so that this rink is a lot more dependable. (Mr. Schuman: Will the potential dryland training compete with private enterprise facilities like Woodward?) The community was asking for this, but we are not planning on this now. This is still way too early to make any decisions, this will be discussed a lot more at future Town Council meetings. (Mr. Pringle: I suggest initiating conversations with other

Town Councils and County entities to become part of the conversation and brainstorm how to address these types of facilities.) Mayor Warner has addressed with the Mayors and Commissioners meeting. Also, a field house has been discussed but we decided it wasn't time to do this yet. Breckenridge does have a fabulous Rec Center and we know we can do some fabulous things to improve it.

OTHER ITEM:

Ms. Christopher announced that she has put in her two week notice as she has accepted a position in Kansas and that she will be resigning from the Planning Commission. The February 16 meeting will be her last meeting.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Marvel House Restoration, Addition and Landmarking (MM) PL-2015-0328, 318 North Main Street
Mr. Mosher presented the final hearing proposal to restore portions of the historic Marvel House (renovate some non-compliant additions and restore the remaining portions), add a full basement with separate living unit, connect a new residence to the back of the historic house and build a new separate garage (with an accessory apartment above along the alley and to seek local landmark designation from the Town Council. The property will be re-subdivided under a separate application.

Changes since the November 17, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting

1. The Engineering Department has included a waiver allowing more than one driveway cut for this property.
2. A color material board was included in the report for this meeting.

The parking strip off the alley exceeds the number of driveways cuts that are allowed per the Section of the Code above. Staff has consulted the Streets and Engineering Department and they have no concerns with the additional curb cut. A waiver from this provision has been granted by the Engineering Department and is included with this report.

Staff found that:

1. The granting of the variance, exception or waiver of condition will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or injurious to other property as the property is accessed from two rights of way, Main Street and the Main Street Alley.
2. The conditions upon which the request is based are unique to the property for which the relief is sought and are not applicable generally to other property as the property will have both commercial uses accessed from Main Street and residential use accessed from the alley. The Town supports keeping traffic of the two uses separated.
3. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations is carried out as the multiple driveway cuts help facilitate the restoration of a historic structure.
4. The relief sought will not in any manner vary the provisions of the development code, town master plan or other town law, except that those documents may be amended in the manner prescribed by law the second driveway cut does not create an additional burden for current snow removal operations.

A special finding has been added. Staff asked for Commission support for this waiver.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): Staff showed that all absolute policies have been met and the final point analysis as:

Relative Policy 24, The Social Community: Negative ten (-10) points for moving the Marvel House 10 feet west and 3 feet south; Positive six (+6) points for the restoration plans.

Relative Policy 22, Landscaping: Positive two (+2) points for the proposed landscaping.
Relative Policy 33, Energy Conservation: Positive two (+2) points for the two HERS index scores.

The result is a passing score of zero (0) points.

The applicant and agent have worked closely with Staff and responded well to Commission direction to bring this final review to you. Staff had only one question for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission support granting a waiver under Section 9-3-16: Relief Procedures of the Town Code for this application to allow 2 driveway cuts for the property located at 218 North Main Street, Lot 16 Snider Addition?

Staff recommended the Planning Commission endorse the attached Point Analysis for the Marvel House Addition, Restoration, and Landmarking, PL-2015-0328, 318 North Main Street, showing a passing score of zero (0) points.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Marvel House Addition, Restoration, and Landmarking, PL-2015-0328, 318 North Main Street with the attached Findings and Conditions.

Staff suggested the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark the Marvel House based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: With respect to the waiver, it is really two accesses off Main Street and the alley? (Mr. Mosher: It is identifying the two access points off the alley. The Code limits properties to one access per lot. There is an existing access on to Main Street. The waiver is for the two driveway cuts and that they are less than 30-feet apart on the alley.)

Applicant Presentation: Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect:
I just want to clarify the paint colors are less pink and more “tan-ish”. Nothing more to add further.

Ms. Christopher opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Sam Riggs, 320 North Main:

I live on the lot to the north. I have concerns about the historic shed that is up front and the only access we have to that is through a gate facing south to the applicant’s property. Someone repaired the gate and screwed it shut. Also, there is playground material with gravel that blocks the door and it is hard to get to this storage. Also, drainage is an issue here. In addition, Comcast will need to relocate a buried cable. Then the water line goes around the south side of our cabin as well as this property and I just want to make sure they are aware of this as they proceed with construction.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Has the owner agreed to allow access to the shed? (Mr. Mosher: The shed covers both property lines and town right of way. So maybe we can clean this up separately.)

Mr. Schroder: I think we should allow the neighbors to have access to this. (Mr. Mosher: This would be a whole separate application.)

Mr. Lamb: I agree that moving the building for negative ten (-10) points is punitive, but I support this.

Mr. Pringle: I concur; I appreciate all the work with staff and this is a good project. Please work with Mr. Riggs to address his concerns. I don’t think the waiver is necessary, but it is what it is.

- Ms. Dudney: I support the waiver and I support the project.
Ms. Leidal: I reviewed the two previous hearings and reviewed the project notes. I support the project and the waiver.
Mr. Schuman: I also support the waiver and the project and I thank the applicant for your patience with this process.
Mr. Schroder: I support what is presented to us with all the findings and conditions.
Ms. Christopher: I concur with all of the other Commissioners and approve this project.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Marvel House Addition, Restoration and Landmarking, PL-2015-0328, 318 North Main Street, showing a passing point analysis of zero (0) points. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Marvel House Addition, Restoration and Landmarking, PL-2015-0328, 318 North Main Street, with the presented findings and conditions with the addition of the new Condition 26 regarding a landscape covenant presented during the meeting by Mr. Mosher. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to recommend the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark the Marvel House based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Denison Placer Housing Phase 1 (JP) PL-2016-0011, 107 Denison Placer Road/TBD Floradora Drive
Ms. Puester presented a Class A preliminary hearing proposal to construct 66 workforce rental townhome and apartment units (43 single family equivalents) in fifteen buildings, a neighborhood community center, including lease office and associated parking, on approximately 4.5 acres of the northernmost section of the Block 11 parcel with access from Denison Placer Road and Floradora Drive. In addition, Floradora Drive is proposed to be extended through the development from Airport Road. A material and color sample board was also presented.

Point Analysis (Section: 9-1-17-3): Staff has prepared a preliminary point analysis with a recommended passing score of positive fifteen (+15) points.

Negative Points recommended:

- Policy 6/R, Building Height: (-1) for an unbroken roof ridge exceeding 50' in length on Building C.
- Policy 9/R, Placement of Structures: (-6) for the front and rear relative setbacks not being met.

Positive Points recommended:

- Policy 16/R, Internal Circulation: (+6) for providing sidewalks which connect to the existing sidewalk along Airport Road, sidewalk and Rec path which connects the residential to the proposed bus stops and future development on Block 11.
- Policy 24/R, Social Community: (+10) for 100% workforce housing.
- Policy 24/R, Social Community: (+6) for meeting a Council goal of providing workforce housing.

Preliminary Point Analysis recommended:

- Total (+15)

Staff Recommendation

1. Did the Planning Commission agree with Staff's preliminary point analysis?
2. Did the Planning Commission have any concerns regarding the function of the snow storage?
3. Did the Commission like the landscape plan proposed?

4. Were there any Commissioner comments regarding the architecture?
5. Did the Commission support the positive six (+6) points for the sidewalks and recreational path under Internal Circulation, Policy 16/R?
6. Did the Planning Commission have other concerns or comments on the proposal?

The Planning Department believes that Denison Placer Phase 1, PL-2016-0011, located at 107 Denison Placer Road, Lot A-1, Runway Subdivision, with a preliminary passing point analysis of positive fifteen (+15) points and addressing remaining staff and any Planning Commission concerns, is ready to be scheduled for a Final Hearing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: How many apartment units are in the apartment building? Is there one storage unit per apartment? (Ms. Puester: There is one storage unit for all 66 units.)
- Mr. Schuman: Is the community room open to public? (Ms. Puester: I'll let the applicants address this.)
- Ms. Dudney: The unbroken roof line is where? (Ms. Puester: There is not a 50' roof line in this phase; correction, Building C which there are three of has a 52-foot long ridge.) On page 50 of staff report, correction under one of the precedent cases for Huron that had positive three (+3) points not positive six (+6), on page 24 of the Huron report. You didn't explain why the design changed so much from the last time we saw it at work session in October. (Ms. Puester: The first design had tuck under parking and created some awkward surface parking and flow through the site.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The design was also too expensive and would not be competitive for the LIHTC application, which could be up to \$9 million for the project). Did you want the townhomes to have a frontage on Flora Dora? (Ms. Puester: That was still the concept; a row home look similar to one of the developments we saw on the Planning Commission field trip.) Where is the rec path? Where are the fences for the townhouses? (Ms. Puester: Rec path runs along the west side of Flora Dora. The fences are on the back of the houses along Flora Dora and on the front side if the homes are internal facing (west sides of homes). There is the paved road section, then the 10' rec path in the right of way, and then private property with a 5' for snow storage in the front yard of the townhomes.) Does this work? Won't the snow be pushed right up into the houses with 5' spacing?
- Mr. Schuman: Landscape will help buffer. (Ms. Puester: There is 10' from the steps to the Rec Path. This has been reviewed by public works regarding snow removal, rec path, sidewalk and proposed road and they were comfortable with this proposal.)
- Ms. Dudney: You are asking for positive six (+6) points for the sidewalk and the rec path? (Ms. Puester: The positive six (+6) points are recommended for the 5' sidewalk on the east of Flora Dora and the connection to the existing Airport Road sidewalk which ends before this project. The 10' asphalt rec path and the meandering sidewalks that are running throughout the project between buildings and connecting the parking lots and the residences. Also, the sidewalk will be connected to Airport Road. There will be sidewalks connecting this neighborhood to CMC on the north and Upper Blue Elementary to the south as well as along Airport.) What about Wellington for precedence for positive six (+6) points? (Mr. Mosher: There aren't any sidewalks in Wellington. The master plan from Lincoln Park got 3 points for sidewalk along the ROW.)
- Ms. Leidal: Which is rec path versus sidewalk? (Ms. Puester: The rec path runs on the western side of Flora Dora and the sidewalk is on the eastern side of Flora Dora. We think the rec path will continue all the way down in Block 11 to connect all the neighborhoods within Block 11. This will be an important connection for kids to the elementary school. This is a project that many kids will live here as well as people attending CMC.)
- Mr. Pringle: I thought we would have a few more hearings rather than to go straight to final. This seems a little overwhelming for a one hearing project. (Ms. Puester: This is a preliminary hearing and this is not final; you will see it at another hearing for final. Also, this is not being taken

as a Town project since it is so large. We also took it as a work session in October, so three times.) I am not sold on the architecture. It's too similar. I'm concerned we will see this all down Block 11 when it was supposed to be more split. It was a completely different design in October and now we have a point analysis already. (Ms. Puester: We wanted to get your opinion on the point analysis and any other concerns that the project team can address before going to a final. This is a class A and it has still a final hearing to go.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Pete Weber, Coburn Architects, Project Architect:

As we got into the process, it became clear that this was the beginning of Block 11 and not a stand alone project and also it is more dense. We want to maintain variety but also have some repetition in models to keep costs down. The floor plans have a huge amount of repetition in the interior but the buildings look different on the exterior and different colors. With setbacks and fences we wanted to include some private space for everyone and this is further defined by the fences. In some cases this is front yards and sometimes back yards for the townhome units. The setbacks were closer to Flora Dora so that they could have more space to the back as well as street presence. The big changes from last October's worksession are the tuck under parking was not affordable and caused an issue for the grant application. We have one storage space per unit that is not within your unit plus there is a good amount of internal storage in each person's unit. The Community Building has storage units for all the townhome projects. One building of the apartments has the storage for all both of the two apartment buildings. (Mr. Pringle: Have you tried this before for other projects (storage outside of building)?) Yes, we have done this and find that people are using this storage for their seasonal storage and their internal unit spaces such as closets etc for your typical storage that you use often. (Mr. Pringle: Community Room Use?) I don't know if we know how this will be used, primarily for the residents I expect. But it is possible that it could be used for the outside community. (Mr. Schuman: I think good meeting room space being available to the community as a whole is helpful.)

Eric Komppa, Corum Real Estate:

Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 will be managed out of the Community Building. That way both projects could use the Community Room. We have seen this space as being good to use for the residents for birthday parties, etc at no fee except for a deposit, meetings, classes. (Ms. Dudney: I need a little more rationale for positive six (+6) points for the sidewalks and the rec path. It seems like a lot. This is a big project so it should be a lot of sidewalks and Rec paths. Why is this different from other projects that received positive three (+3) points?)

Elena Scott, Norris Design:

One of the main drivers is to set up Flora Dora Drive to be set up as a great pedestrian area that would take residents from park, rec centers, community room. We wanted to look at the width of the sidewalks; a lot of people have strollers and more than one dog. In the Town of Breckenridge, Wellington Road has a 10' sidewalk up from Town, which is great for people. So we wanted the same here but we wanted circulation on both sides of the road. We also wanted to think about the internal walkways and connections for the residents. We wanted it to be a great walkable area that connects to the other parks and river system nearby. We wanted a solid pedestrian area in Block 11. (Ms. Dudney: You think it is more circulation that Wellington and Lincoln Park?) (Ms. Puester: I think it will keep kids on the rec paths riding bikes whereas we've heard many Wellington have to bike on the streets; their sidewalks are only in the greens internal to the site, not on the road. Two major pedestrian connections on both sides of the road; one is a 10' rec path. Flora Dora will be a really important connection to get kids to the elementary school and the park.) (Ms. Dudney: I don't want to give people points for something they have to do anyway.) (Ms. Puester: Paths are not a code requirement. You don't have to agree with the positive six (+6) points, they have plenty of points here to pass, but precedent-wise, when I looked at Huron Landing and other precedents this seems so much more of an extensive system. To me this was such a more massive effort compared to Huron and Pinewood projects that received positive three (+3) points.) (Mr. Schuman: There are a lot of operational costs of this building, will it run as a profit? This is a question for Mr. Komppa.)

Mr. Komppa: Our initial financial analysis based on what we have at Pinewood Village now; there are two aspects: rent and operational and the rents will be based on rent tax credits. We are fully intending on making this project be cash flow positive and not just break even. (Mr. Schuman: There is a lot more going on here for plowing and management.) You are correct; the internal lots will have plowing expense. (Mr. Pringle: It seems that the architecture, it looks rather stark on the doorways to the entrances for example. These aren't formalized entryways. Are we cutting corners so much to cut costs that we are sacrificing architecture? It reminds me when you drive into Alma or Fairplay and I thought we work very hard with our affordable housing projects so that there won't be a stark change between them and the other projects we see. Is there something more we can do?) (Ms. Dudney: Page 69-70 of the project, I agree that it does seem so minimalist. Maybe it is the doors.) (Mr. Pringle: The windows on the side elevations, don't seem appropriate.)

Mr. Weber: On the side windows, these buildings are close together so for privacy we are trying to keep the windows small and just provide light. (Mr. Pringle: We would require a lot more from other applicants than we are now.)

Ms. Christopher opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. David Axelrod, 52 Snowstorm Circle, owner of the Broken Compass Brewery: We are interested in parcel right next to parcel 3. I have a question, are you going to move Flora Dora and will that take away access to the lot we are looking into? We believe that there is an easement that CMC owns that runs parallel to the lot that blocks access to this parcel. (Mr. Grossheusch: The parcel has frontage on Airport Road for access.)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I agree with point analysis right now. I like the idea of snow storage, I think it will work. There is an awful lot here to absorb. The architecture, I like this a lot better this time than we saw the first time. I think it looks much better now. I'm ok with positive three (+3) points with the sidewalks/rec path, but down the road I might be open to more. I think the storage for every unit will work. I think this a huge improvement from the work session.

Mr. Schroder: I think it is very pleasing and is obviously a multifamily project. I support the preliminary point analysis and I support the positive six (+6) points for the circulation. I support the positive six (+6) points because they are completing all the sidewalks and not waiting for the next guy to finish the sidewalks. I do wonder if we are going to be asked to approve positive six (+6) points again and again. Is this the new standard now? Especially with high density and cars and bikes and people is why I would support positive six (+6) points. Snow storage does seem a bit tight, even though I don't know a lot about snow storage. I like the architecture and the number of different looks. This makes it look like it has vitality. I don't have any concerns.

Ms. Leidal: Snow storage, it looks tight and labor intensive but as long as management company can make it work I'm fine with it. Positive six (+6) points for sidewalks and rec paths, I'm struggling with this. If we award positive six (+6) points, I want to make sure it is for both the rec path and the internal circulation, I don't want to double dip for internal circulation, maybe we separate it out like positive three (+3) for circulation and positive three (+3) for recreation so not to set precedent. Architecture, I like the variety of buildings. I hear the other Commissioner concerns with the architecture; it might be the size of the overhangs and the trim relative to the building size.

Ms. Dudney: I like the design and I like Ms. Leidal's idea of splitting it out for circulation and recreation. I'm ok with the snow storage. The Huron precedent needs to be fixed unless I'm missing something. I like the plan, the change in architecture, varying building types but like B1 and

B2 more than C and D, parking, the change to Flora Dora. The less expansive roof forms are more appealing to me (not C and D). I think it is much better than the one we saw in October.

Mr. Pringle: I'm not sure if I agree with the point analysis. I think the positive six (+6) points for circulation are too much; I think positive three (+3) points is the precedent. I don't want to give positive six (+6) points for internal circulation. The snow storage is a formula, if it doesn't snow it works, if it does snow you have to deal with that. I think the architecture looks a little stark. Beef up the entries. I don't want one of the primary developments that people see when they come to town to be disappointing. There is a whole lot of density here. I don't want to sacrifice project architecture and density to satisfy AMI need. The idea of the community center sounds good, but is every one of the parcels going to have its own. It is pretty much half storage, half management company; could this be incorporated more in a whole Block 11 Community Center? I'm not persuaded that having a storage unit on the other side of the development is something that people want. I think the storage should be within the unit only.

Mr. Lamb: I like the fact that it is under density, adequate parking and over landscaped. I am worried about positive six (+6) points for the circulation; I'm more in favor of positive three (+3) right now. I think the architecture is well broken up and looks more like Valley Brook. I think it is going in a good direction.

Ms. Christopher: I too support this project. I am concerned with the positive six (+6) points; I support just positive three (+3) or could have them split up. I am ok with snow storage. The architecture could use some massaging, but generally really like it.

Ms. Leidal: I wanted to note for the record that I did review the October 20th work session before this meeting so that's why I'm able to comment on this.

Ms. Dudney: To the community center, I am assuming that there is some market study that you need this, but if there is some way to have storage in the units; that is far better. But if the community center is not really used, they take money to keep it up and looking good.

2) Denison Placer Housing Phase 2 (JP) PL-2016-0012, 107 Denison Placer Road

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to construct 30 workforce rental apartments (13 Single Family Equivalents) in three buildings on approximately 1.05 acres in the southern section of Tract D with access from Denison Placer Road. A material and color sample board was also presented.

The 1.05 acres which is the subject of this report is a portion of the 16 acres of the Colorado Mountain College (CMC) property known as Tract D. The Town is currently working with CMC on a land trade, which would allocated this 1.05 acre piece of property to the south of Tract D to the Town. The town-owned 1.05 acre (Tract C, to the northeast of Tract D) would be conveyed to CMC.

Point Analysis (Section 9-1-17-3): Staff has prepared a preliminary point analysis with a recommended positive fifteen (+15) points.

Negative Points recommended:

- Policy 9/R, Placement of Structures: (-3) for the front relative setback not being met.
- Policy 6/R, Building Height: (-1) for the roofline of both buildings exceeding fifty feet (50').

Positive Points recommended:

- Policy 16/R, Internal Circulation: (+3) for providing sidewalk which connect to the Phase 1 sidewalk.
- Policy 24/R, Social Community: (+10) for 100% workforce housing.
- Policy 24/R, Social Community: (+6) for meeting a Council goal of providing workforce housing.

Preliminary Point Analysis recommended:

- Total (+15)

Staff Recommendation

1. Did the Planning Commission agree with Staff's preliminary point analysis?
2. Did the Commission have concerns with the first floor storage area on the left elevation of Building F2 not being broken up?
3. Did the Planning Commission have other concerns or comments on the proposal?

The Planning Department believes that Denison Placer Phase 2, PL-2016-0012, located at 107 Denison Placer Road, Tract D, Runway Subdivision, with a preliminary passing point analysis of positive fifteen (+15) points and addressing remaining staff concerns, is ready to be scheduled for a Final Hearing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Lamb: The landscaping seems pretty generous why no positive points? (Ms. Puester: The landscaping code says to get positive points; the sizes need to be increased.)
- Ms. Dudney: What is the unit breakdown? (Ms. Puester: There are 20 studios and 10 one bedrooms in three buildings. Also, this is not part of the LIHTC application which phase 1 is part of the LIHTC application and hence the community room with that application.) (Mr. Eric Weber, Coburn Architects, Applicant: We designed and thought about this as a single project with Phase 1 and reads as one continuous project when you are on the ground even though there are different parcels. We want to make sure people still can get to Oxbow Park for example.)
- Ms. Leidal: Is this trash enclosure to the east? (Mr. Komppa: Yes.)
- Mr. Schuman: Will the path be soft path? (Ms. Elena Scott: We think it will be soft.) Again, if this is subject to snow removal this will be a maintenance issue. (Ms. Puester: The sidewalk along Denison and Flora Dora is concrete.)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: Because of the unit mix, the parking seems to work. I think you succeeded in integrating it with Phase I. I am supportive.
- Mr. Pringle: It seems that building 3 is very vertical; I'm wondering if that is ok. I have the same concerns with the architecture that I had with phase I. I thought that the Block 11 master plan was to build in a lot of diversity, but now it seems that both of these parcels will be matching. I didn't think the monolithic look was the game plan. I thought it would be more organic. The overflow parking lot, we building these things in satisfying the parking requirement; however, there isn't enough parking. If it is a studio unit, there is likely to have 2 people and not enough parking. Maybe we aren't really satisfying the parking requirement. I think this dribbles out throughout all of these projects in town that we do. I'm happy to have the storage in the F2 building and I'm not sure if this is helpful to all not being integrated into their unit.
- Mr. Lamb: I agree with the staff's preliminary point analysis. I agree with Mr. Pringle's comments about not having enough parking even though it meets code. I'd like to see more parking. I'm ok with the architecture.
- Mr. Schroder: I agree with the point analysis. I don't have any problem with the pedestrian arcade and the look.
- Mr. Schuman: I don't know if I agree with the point analysis with the internal circulation, I'm not sure if the soft path internally meets with the sidewalks. I don't know if that warrants positive three (+3) points.
- Ms. Dudney: There are more paths than just internal there are sidewalks too.
- Mr. Schuman: I don't know if I agree with it right now on getting the positive points. I like the idea of the

first floor storage area. I like the west elevation with the arcade. I want to echo the comments on the diversity in the look on Block 11. I would assume that we will see some diversity down the road. I think the parking works here, but with Wellington Neighborhood being the big example of a project that wasn't built with enough parking. I think you have enough parking here, but as we continue to build this out, I think there might be creative ways for people parking here and getting on a bus to go skiing. We need to look at it as we continue to build out.

Ms. Leidal: I agree with preliminary point analysis. In regard with the first floor storage area, I think that the roof breaks it up. I echo the concerns with the parking, we have technically met code but I don't think there is enough. I reviewed the October 20th work session, minutes, etc.

Ms. Christopher: The Phase I had a lot more internal circulation. If we were leaning on positive three (+3) on that one, then maybe this one doesn't get any points. I am fine with the first floor storage area. I also echo concerns with not enough parking.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

- 1) Hester Fence Variance (CK) PL-2016-0014, 432 Golden Age Drive (*Continued to the February 16, 2016, Planning Commission Meeting.*)

OTHER BUSINESS:

Ms. Puester: The Saving Places Conference starts tomorrow. I think most everyone is coming for at least a day. I emailed out dinner reservations and my cell phone. Mr. Lamb is coming down on Thursday, staff presents on Wednesday, but if anyone else is coming Thursday he can carpool.

Mr. Pringle: We looked at two projects that had 18 buildings and felt we didn't spend enough time reviewing these and the plans for each building. (Mr. Grossheuch: The camera is broken so they didn't roll out physical plans but had the overhead presentation.) I think we need to spend a little bit more time on this big project. (Mr. Grossheusch: We are trying to work with a tight deadline on this LIHTC project. We are giving you three looks, but we are trying to stay competitive and we have to get this project with the CHAFA deadlines, we got an estimate for \$19 million with a \$13 million tax credit opportunity.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair