

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 pm

ROLL CALL

Ron Schuman Dan Schroder Gretchen Dudney
Mike Giller Dave Pringle arrived at 7:12pm

Jim Lamb and Christie Mathews-Leidal were absent.
There was no Town Council Liaison present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

- 1) Shock Hill Cottages #4 (CK) PL-2016-0097, 24 Regent Drive

With no requests for call up, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

OTHER DECISIONS:

1) Marriott Residence Inn Signage (MM) PL-2016-0080, 600 South Ridge Street
Mr. Mosher presented an application to install a major identification sign in excess of 20-square feet on the building façade facing Main Street (State Highway 9). The 8 square feet of extra area requested requires the Planning Commission's concurrence. With over 230 linear feet of building frontage, this project is allowed 151 square feet of total sign area; however, the Sign Code typically limits the size of sign space on a building façade to a maximum of 20 square feet. With the specific criteria being met for the major identification sign for the Marriott Residence Inn at 28 square feet, Staff believes the proposed 8 square feet of additional sign area could be permitted.

Did the Commission support this proposal to exceed the 20 square foot sign limitation for a hotel per Section 8-2-13 of the Code?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Who is not in favor?

Ms. Dudney: It is fine with me.

Mr. Schroder: No sign shall exceed 20 square feet unless certain criteria are met. It is our job to apply the code. Section B says: We could allow an excess of 20 sq. ft., "if it is necessary to." What does "necessary" exactly mean? It is really arbitrary. I am good with the sign, knowing that it is on one wall. I would support it. (Ms. Puester: You're right it is very fuzzy. However, I interpret it to mean that they are not asking for an excessive amount over the 20 square feet in terms of what is needed to see the sign.)

Mr. Giller: Commented on point-source lighting. (Mr. Mosher: It is under the eaves and fully shielded.)

Mr. Schuman: For that façade, I think it works well. We support at a vote of 4-0.

The four Commissioners present all showed full support for the extra sign area of the Marriott Residence Inn, application PL-2016-0080, 600 South Ridge Street.

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Breckenridge Water Treatment Plan (MM)

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal for a Town Project of a new water treatment facility, support building and pump station on Tract 1 of the McCain Master Plan area. The Planning Commission reviewed the McCain Master Plan Modification at a work session on November 3, 2015 and at a Town Project Public Hearing on December 1, 2015. The Commission also visited the site as part of their fall field trip. At the December 1st hearing the Planning Commission unanimously recommended that the Town Council approve the McCain Master Plan Modification. On December 8, 2015 the Town Council held a Town Project Public Hearing and approved the McCain Master Plan Modification. The Plan Modification amended the previous 2012 McCain Master Plan, which provided general land use guidance for the McCain property. The 2015 Plan Modification identified specific uses for a total 13 different land use tracts on the McCain Property. Tract 1 is the area proposed to be developed under this application, under the Town Project process.

The choice of Tract 1 for the water treatment plant was determined by several factors. Given the Town Council's desired groundbreaking timeline of spring 2017, it was preferable to utilize a site that was already graded and ready for final site preparation. Tract 1 fits this well as the site is generally flat and contains an existing business. Most of the other tracts on McCain include large areas of undulating terrain and would require extensive grading in order to prepare for development. Another key location factor considered was proximity to Highway 9. Location near Highway 9 was preferable to limit the cost of extending water lines: 1) running from the pump back near Lake Dillon to the property, and 2) running across the highway and uphill through Silver Shekel and the Highlands to the Highlands water tank.

This worksession is to introduce the initial program and conceptual architecture massing and forms associated with the McCain Water Treatment Plant Buildings. The placement and building forms are a function of the many machines inside. We are seeking Planning Commission input on the general site layout, massing, architecture and possible finishes.

Staff believes this facility will be an important entry component to anyone arriving (or leaving) along this portion of Highway 9. The desire is to create a modern building that still respects the history and heritage of this portion of Summit County and the Town of Breckenridge. Though the Planning Commission reviews submittals based only on the Development Code, extra input is appreciated as this development goes forward. It is anticipated that, following this worksession, a formal Town Project Submittal will be presented for your review.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I have a question on the timing. As we saw with some of the housing projects, is this going to be pushed along quickly? (Mr. Mosher: The schedule is tight. There has to be a lot of digging for the site too. I am not sure of the exact dates. But, the architecture can be visited while the project is underway.) Ok; just for our expectations of when we should expect to see it? (Ms. Sara Clark, HDR Inc.: We plan on starting in spring, 2017.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Marc Hogan and Mr. Tyler Mikolajczak, bhh Partners; Ms. Sara Clark, Mr. Matt McFadden and Mr. Jeff Glover from HDR, Inc.

We have several alignments, we are not sure yet how we are getting into the exact distribution layout. The plant itself is being built for a number of reasons. There was a feasibility assessment and money from State revolving fund. The plan is to be online and fully operational late 2018, 2019. 30% design by mid-June, 100% by next January. Town is hiring a contractor soon. There is a tight budget so we want to contain the costs. We would appreciate you thinking about the budget in your comments. You will see the external views tonight, not the inside.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Are the buildings placed on the land for more of an aesthetic point of view? (Ms. Clark: We developed a way to make the most efficient use of the footprint, the building, the budget, the

- site grading and gravity flow.)
- Mr. Hogan: (Mr. Hogan gave a presentation on the design of the buildings.) We have a great team. We have had a lot of site visits at other various water plants. We looked at the iconic image of Baker's Tank on Boreas Pass. We would like to interpret this in a modern way. We look at historic forms and how we can interpret that into modern architecture. We have respected the 150' setback. Blending tank provides raw water to treatment tank. We have designed the buildings to house the treatment functions. We will have a residual tank and a storage tank below grade.
- Ms. Dudney: It doesn't have a mountain feel. I need to understand your constraints. Are the windows functional? (Mr. Hogan: They are functional. The clearstory windows face south and bring in natural lighting to the large building.) Talk to me about the windows and doors. You don't want to have windows on the ground floor? (Mr. Hogan: We have not studied the exact window locations. We have primarily looked at the forms. We have referenced buildings that are products of their time with this design.) How about the clearstory element; is there a need for that to be so long? (Mr. Hogan: We have not determined that yet exactly. We too are looking at traditional forms.) Will that have negative points because of the long roofline? (Mr. Mosher: Yes; negative one (-1) point.) (Mr. Hogan: We want to make the main building look like it has been added on to over time. We like to look at regionalism. We have purposely turned things at angles to give a sense of history to the overall site.) Does it have to be a high security area? (HDR Inc.: Yes.)
- Mr. Schroder: Is there a most prominent face? (Mr. Hogan: Yes; that facing Highway 9.) I am glad to know that the fence is in the back and would not hide all of that. The building itself acts as the fence towards the front. (Mr. Hogan: Many design constraints regarding the multiple utilities. We are still in design phase. Looking to reducing height and footprint and save some area as much as possible.)
- Mr. Pringle: What about height for water tanks and clearance? (HDR Inc.: There is a flow process with gravity, and we are looking at the constraints and impacts to sinking some of the machinery lower in the grade.) What would it look like if you did not try to connect the buildings? It looks odd. (Mr. Hogan: For the administration building, we can build with normal stick-frame construction. For the other buildings, code related construction and moisture constraints require processing the building with steel frame-ability and concrete to segregate the uses.) (Ms. Clark: As for the meeting room, we were asked by the Town to provide space for on-site training and meeting space to share cost of the required annual training with the surrounding municipalities. The other facilities in the Upper Blue don't really have offices, just minimal spaces required for facilities.) How is chlorine delivered? (Ms. Clark: They would like to keep using gas. It is the most cost effective.) How much residual are we talking about here? (Ms. Clark: They will be treating all the solids from all the other water treatment plants in town at this location, removing the water and hauling the dry material for disposal.) It is more complicated. Had we known this is what we are talking about with the Master Plan review, we had maybe given more attention for this site location with the master plan. It's a big facility.
- Mr. Giller: I think your roofing forms are a bit complicated. Needs consistency in the slopes. I wonder about massing. I think northeast elevation could have a stepping setback; perhaps 8'? I would spend some time on your roof. Second general comment: are there opportunities for negative spaces outside the building to be used? Opportunities for storage or equipment? (Mr. Hogan: We do have an employee courtyard in this area.)
- Ms. Dudney: Are you actually going to have trucks parked there? Is there any reason to screen trucks? (Mr. Hogan: I don't think we will have trucks parked in front, only in fenced area.) (Mr. Moser: additional detail on landscaping will be presented with attention to screening some parts of the site.)
- Mr. Schroder: The height of the building was the one thing that struck me, but we have discussed that. Over time we keep saying, here comes the new entrance to town. We have many. Maybe this is the

new entrance to Town a little further north. The old BBC looks quite nice as it is. If we could have some demonstration north of Breckenridge with massing and details; whatever we can do to break up the industrial look would be great. Do we ever look at the other buildings around a particular area and try to blend new in with what is existing? Do we look for any thread along this way? Everything that is out there has a different story and materials, a “fishing village” at Welk, the BBC, the fire station.

Ms. Dudney: What is the building area? (Mr. Hogan: All total: 20,000 sq. ft. 75% is in processing building.)

Mr. Giller: Does the Master Plan establish an alignment? (Mr. Hogan: The layout is a function of multiple constraints. Residual building is aligned for truck movement. We like the fact that it caught the sun and opened to the view.)

Mr. Schuman: I know we have certain functions here, and I appreciate the insight you gave us into just how the processes work. This is a work session so, quickly, I remember going through the same questions when we looked at the BBC, which looks like it has been there a long time and it fits. So, I feel good about where this is going. The one thing that I am curious about is why you have so many flat roofs. That is not real typical. We get a bunch of snow up here, so it is something to think about.

Mr. Pringle: What about the main roof alignment? (Mr. Hogan: The reason it faces this way is for solar, both the panels and clerestory. But we could look at turning it 90 degrees. We are really after solar efficiencies. I think there are some good comments here.) I would like to see a more unified architectural style. Let’s not try to hide it. I would prefer to see less height and more unification.

Ms. Dudney: I like the multiple-building look. I don’t know what it is going to look like until we see materials, but I think materials can help break up the mass. I agree that the roofs could be stepped down somewhat.

Mr. Schroder: I like the pictures in the packet of the old wooden buildings, with the heavy timbers.

Mr. Pringle: I would support anything you could do to add visual interest. More robust structurally.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) McAdoo Corner Lot 5 Mixed Use (MM) PL-2016-0048, 209 South Ridge Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a new, mixed-use building of a restaurant and an apartment. The total allowed density is subject to the McAdoo Corner Master Plan. Since points were assigned under certain Development Code policies with the McAdoo Master Plan, it affects all point assignments associated with future development on this subdivision. For example, no new positive points may be awarded for landscaping or historic preservation and the above ground density is allowed to be no greater than 12 UPA.

A previous development permit for a restaurant on Lot 5 had been approved and later renewed on August 7, 2012 (PC#2009009) but has expired. This application has a new design specifically addressing the revised Policy 80A of the Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts.

Maintaining materials on historic buildings is clearly addressed in the South End Residential Historic District Character Area #3 with Priority Policy 165 and in the Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation areas with Priority Policy 146. They are both aimed at preserving the materials on historic structures. However, Section 5.0 - Design Standards for New Construction specifically states “New designs that respect the general characteristics of the historic buildings including their basic scale, form, and materials are likely to be compatible”. Staff believes the primary façade of this building represents new construction with a non-residential use. The steel columns are articulated to represent the general characteristics of historic columns in the Historic District.

Based on direction from the Commission, the project may need to remove the steel columns, channels and guardrails in order to meet Priority Policy 163, an Absolute Policy. Or, the Commission may find that this policy

is not applicable since this is a new building. One negative point and one positive points have been suggested under policy 33/R related to the snow melted areas. Staff anticipates a passing point analysis at the next hearing.

Staff believes this proposal is off to a solid start and represents proper new construction infill for the Historic District. Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission support the design of the 14-foot long connector for this building?
2. Did the Commission believe the design and material of the proposed steel columns, channels and guardrails for this building do not relate to Priority Policy 165?
3. The historic structures to the north are one-story buildings. The historic building across Ridge Street (Twist Restaurant) is a full two stories tall. Staff believes the proposed building fits in the historic context of the block and Character Area. Did the Commission concur?

Pending any substantial changes, Staff suggests this application return for a final hearing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Priority policy 165: Does this relate to new structures? Is that policy relevant? (Mr. Mosher: We want to be careful with establishing precedent here. We are respecting historic forms and details with those materials; this may not be applicable because it is a new building.) Priority Policy 63: It does relate to currently existing historic structures? (Mr. Mosher: Historic buildings.)

Mr. Pringle: The most important thing is to get the general forms, mass and scale right, so we can protect the character of historic downtown. The reason the Lincoln Mall looks the way it does is because the Park Service encouraged us to go more contemporary. This has changed over time. Now, some new buildings are mistaken for old.

Mr. Giller: The first thing we look for in infill is compatibility in scale, mass, etc. It is now more about compatibility. It's about the "second-look". If you look closely, you can tell the difference.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Jeremy Fischer, Applicant, and Ms. Janet Sutterley, Architect for the Applicant:

Ms. Sutterley: This has come along quite a bit since the first time it was here. We reduced mass in the rear and height has come down in the front. I put 882 sq. ft. of the available density in the basement. We want to make the basement as big as we could. The metal detailing is very subtle and minimal with metal columns and bases. The primary material would be cedar horizontal lap siding. The secondary would be cedar vertical siding. On the rear building, we would have dark rough sawn oiled finish for base, and vertical siding on the top part. We would have corrugated metal for connector, and some on low pitch roof areas. The basement would be mostly kitchen. There is an overall amount of landscaping required for McAdoo Corner in the master plan. We noted that the trees on the survey from 2004 have now grown, so we may want to remove some of our new landscaping. We have proposed up to 500 sq. ft. of heated space. (Mr. Fischer: quite a bit of snow has been stacked up in a few locations previously. Quite a bit of snow will get pushed towards the end of the alley.) (Mr. Mosher: It was reviewed with the Master Plan and had been ok.) (Mr. Giller: So, with a kitchen going in the basement, can you get your mechanical stacks off the front elevation?) We are going to have a whole fenced area for mechanical equipment in the connector area out of public view. (Mr. Giller: The only place the railing is proposed is the deck on the southwest corner, correct?) Yes.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment.

Ms. Jan Radosevich, 213.5 South Ridge Street: Snow stacking is a concern along the portion of the alley. No snow gets stacked towards Washington Street. Snow melting these sidewalks will not melt large stacks of snow will it? If it does that would be great.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: I do support the connector. I really like the steel columns. I am fine with the height.

Mr. Pringle: I support the 14-foot connector. One issue I have with the metal materials is that I hate to have it used as precedent for all buildings, because we get that a lot. Maybe it works fine in this application, but I don't know that we want to see it repeated or mutated on other projects in the Town. I am cautious about supporting it, but think it should be allowed in this application. I think the height is OK. The only other comment I have is for a lot of buildings is that in order to get distinction, we throw too many materials at them and it gets too cute and too much...and I wonder if we could go softer and achieve what the Code wants.

Mr. Schroder: I support the connector. I support the steel elements. I do not have any concern over Priority Policy 165 being applicable given that this is a new building. The height of the building fits with the area.

Mr. Giller: The massing and scaling is ok. It is ok to interpret modern materials with new materials. I think the priority policy was referring to something else. The proposed design fits the historic context and is compatible.

Mr. Schuman: I support the connector. I support the metal but I have some concern about precedents. We don't have a point analysis, at least a preliminary point analysis, and a material board. It feels like we are trying to slide this through. I don't look at it that way. I am concerned about your comment about eliminating trees; there is no good tree plan here. I think the Snowstack needs to be flushed out more; it has to be considered. You were going to put a railing on the drawings, and you have not done that. We are not seeing an incomplete application here as submitted. I am disappointed in what we are seeing and that there are number of questions still out there that we need to flush out before final. As it is suggested we will be reviewing a whole lot of new information at final then.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Gondola Lots Development Master Plan (MM) PL-2016-0003, 320 and 350 North Park Avenue

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to renew the existing development permit (PC#2009010) for three years. No changes are proposed. A master plan had been approved for the north and south parking lots surrounding the town gondola terminal with a condo-hotel, townhomes, commercial uses, mixed use building, a new skier service / transit facilities, and two parking structures. The proposal also includes development on portions Wellington parking lot and the East Sawmill parking lot, plus modifications to the Blue River, all of which are owned by the Town of Breckenridge. This proposal includes the transfer of 93 SFEs of density from the Gold Rush parking lot to the north and south gondola parking lots. A reduced parking requirement of 1 space per 1 Condo-Hotel unit is allowed per an approved Development Agreement with the Town Council (Reception #934609; Expires May 27, 2023).

The Applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission renew the existing Development Permit for three years. This is the second request for an extension of this permit. During review of an application like this, the Commission should focus on any Code changes that have been adopted subsequent to the previous permit approval. In this case, Staff has found that the only relevant code issue that would affect this application is under Policy 24/R, Social Community, as it relates to Town Council Goals.

All master plans are required to be reviewed on a point analysis, and shall comply with all absolute policies, obtain a score of zero or more with respect to all relative policies, and comply with all other applicable development policies of the town in effect at the time of the master plan application. One of the issues with reviewing a master plan relates to the timing of the assignment of points. While some elements of the master plan warrant the allocation of points during the master plan review, other elements may not warrant point allocations until development permit review. The following points are recommended at this time:

Policy 6 (Building Height)	-20 points for buildings up to 5 stories.
Policy 16 (Internal Circulation)	+3 points for good vehicle and pedestrian circulation.
Policy 18 (Parking-View)	+4 points for providing parking underground or in a structure.
Policy 18 (Parking-Joint Facilities)	+1 point for making parking available to the public.
Policy 18 (Parking-Shared Access)	+1 point for shared driveway access.
Policy 24 (Social Community - Employee Housing)	+8 points for providing 8.51% of density as employee housing.
Policy 24 (Social Community)	+3 points for Council Goals, environmental sustainability.
Policy 25 (Transit)	+4 points for improved Transit circulation, improved facilities and reduced vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

The result is a passing score of positive four (+4) points.

This application was advertised as a Combined Preliminary and Final Hearing, and, as such, it may be approved by the Commission at this hearing. Since there have been no Code changes in the past three years that would affect this project, Staff has no concerns. There are still several issues that have not been finalized in this application, which have been included as Conditions of Approval. These issues are primarily business issues (i.e. property lines, ownership and construction of public amenities, loss of parking, and construction of the river improvements, etc.) that are not addressed in the Development Code, and need to be approved by Town Council.

Mr. Mosher pointed out that four of the Conditions that are in the packet had been fulfilled already. He presented a new copy of the Findings and Conditions with the four Conditions removed and the rest renumbered.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Does the transportation plan relate to the current Transportation plan that we have been discussing recently? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, in a global sense. The transit center redesign is solid in acceptance. I'm not sure where the discussions lie now.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: The transit component is very relevant. They want to keep the number of on-site parking spaces in compliance with the Parking Agreement with VRDC.) Would the consultants recommend a different location for the parking? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The consultants are looking very long term.) The ski area needs to be participating. (Mr. Grosshuesch: They are.) The other comment is that plan. Town to incentivize to work with the owners of town center. More synergistic.

Mr. Steve West, Attorney for the Applicant: I don't think you actually see the application. We think this is a much better jumping off point. I went to the first public parking/transportation meeting. We really think it is important to keep this plan in effect, so that we can massage it in the future based on comments from the parking/transportation studies. The biggest reason we think it should be extended is that it can be used and modified versus going back to the old Land Use District density regulations.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: This seems straightforward. Three years is requested. Is that the maximum? (Ms. Puester: That is the normal time period we use.

Mr. Schroder: I support the extension for 3 years.

Mr. Pringle: I support the extension.

Ms. Dudney: I support the extension. The idea of double dipping and Council goals and when the plans come in for a Master Plan, they get points again. This has always confused me. (Mr. Mosher: The Findings and Conditions have already been modified. Please reference the packet I handed out to each of you this evening.)

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Gondola Lots Development Master Plan, PL-2016-0003, 320 and 350 North Park Avenue, showing a passing score of positive four (+4) points. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Gondola Lots Development Master Plan, PL-2016-0003, 320 and 350 North Park Avenue, with the Staff presented replacement Findings and Conditions. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

2) Peak 8 Ski Hill Road Reconstruction and PMA Variance (MM) PL-2016-0082, 1627 Ski Hill Road
Mr. Mosher presented. In association with the Sixth Amendment to the Amended Peak 7 & 8 Master Plan (PL-2015-0444) and the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building (PL-2015-0215), a portion of Ski Hill Road (between One Ski Hill Place and Ski Watch Drive) is to be re-graded to an overall even slope (from 2.8 ~ 13% to 5.25%) to improve vehicular safety and vehicular access to the new base area developments. The work will include a temporary re-alignment of a portion of Ski Hill Road to the west to allow the following:

1. Temporary relocation of the bus loading zone;
2. The relocation of the existing storm sewer, sanitary sewer, water lines, and utility trench;
3. Construct a new retaining wall, concrete pan, guardrail, along the east side of Ski Hill Road within the PMA and PMA setbacks;
4. Relocation of one of the Breck Connect Gondola Towers; and,
5. The finished reconstruction of Ski Hill Road and associated improvements.

The development area is within the Cucumber Gulch Preventative Management Area (PMA) established by the Cucumber Gulch Preserve Overlay Protection District Ordinance. (No. 9 Series 2000 which is also enforced under the Development Code Policy 2, Absolute, Land Use Guidelines). During construction, all activity will be monitored as directed by the Ordinance.

Staff finds no reason to assign positive or negative points under any Relative policies of the Development Code. Staff finds that the project meets all Absolute polices, with the exception of Policy 2/A-Land Use as it relates to the Cucumber Gulch Overlay Protection District, for which this variance is requested.

Staff finds that the proposal meets the requirements for a variance from the Preventive Management Area of the Cucumber Gulch Overlay Protection District, and recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Ski Hill Road at Peak 8 Reconstruction Cucumber Gulch Preserve Preventative Maintenance Area (PMA) Variance (PL-2016-0082) along with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: It starts this summer? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.)

Mr. Schroder: Have we thought about the timing about moving a gondola tower and the impacts to the Peak 8 fun park? (Mr. Mosher: That might be a better question for the applicant.)

Mr. Schuman: Who is the main enforcement person? (Mr. Mosher: Ms. Shannon Smith, Town Engineer, and Mr. Tom Daugherty, Breckenridge Director of Public Works with work with an on-site agent and consultant.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Don Leinweber, Civil Insight LLC (Engineer): This represents the final piece of a Master Plan that is a decade or so old. What is new is the findings of Geo-Tech. The existing fill materials under the road were never properly compacted or placed. The new soils will get properly compressed. We

will install settlement plates and realign the road in a temporary condition while the roadway is compacted. We will work closely with the ski resort and Town. As for the Gondola tower; the concrete pad will be poured for the tower this summer, but the actual relocation of the tower will not occur until later in shoulder season so as not to impact activities. If we can't get the settlements to occur, the Town could accept a construction lift of pavement. That pavement would come out in 2017 and that area would get the final paving. Short term drop-off is scheduled to be paved as well.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: Will the temporary alignment be paved? (Mr. Leinweber: Yes.)
- Mr. Schuman: Are you confident that you are going to get all the compaction before the snow comes next winter? (Mr. Leinweber: Yes. We are still fine tuning re-routing pedestrians through the area safely.)
- Mr. Schroder: What is the timing on the new gondola tower? (Mr. Leinweber: The concrete for it will be poured but the tower will not be placed until after the construction.) (Mr. Jeff Zimmerman, Breckenridge Ski Resort: Did you get your question answered, in regards to the tower?) Yes, just wanted to make sure there was still flow up there since people can't drop off in vehicles for the Fun Park.

Mr. Schuman opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Giller: A very well coordinated plan. My experience is that sediment management is very important. Your question about monitoring is very relevant.
- Mr. Schroder: I support the variance.
- Mr. Pringle: I support the variance, and am eager to see what the retaining wall will look like. Good luck.
- Ms. Dudney: I support the variance. Good luck.
- Mr. Schuman: I support the variance. My concern is that the Town is getting the best value, and that the PMA area is protected.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Ski Hill Road at Peak 8 Reconstruction Cucumber Gulch Preserve Preventative Maintenance Area (PMA) Variance, PL-2016-0082, along with the presented Findings and Conditions. Mr. Schroder seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (5-0).

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35pm.

Ron Schuman, Chair