

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Schroder.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Christie Leidal	Ron Schuman
Gretchen Dudney	Jim Lamb	Steve Gerard
Dan Schroder		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the November 1, 2016, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

To accommodate audience members here for the Beaver Run Corridor Hearing, we will be switching the Combined Hearing with the Worksession. Otherwise, the November 15, 2016, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Beaver Run Corridor Addition (CK) PL-2016-0526, 611 Village Road

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to add 1,569 square feet of density to create a new enclosed corridor to connect the Bridge / Hub Area of Building 2 to Building 1. The new square footage will also serve as a wedding venue with the existing roof deck. There is not enough density remaining in the approved Master Plan for this proposal; therefore, the project requires a major master plan amendment and density transfer (TDR).

Staff conducted a point analysis attached and found all the Absolute Policies of the Development Code to be met, and no reason to assign positive or negative points to this project under any Relative policies.

The Planning Department recommended approval of the Beaver Run Corridor Addition Master Plan Amendment and TDR transfer located at 611 Village Road, Beaver Run Condominiums (PL-2016-0526) with a passing point analysis of zero (0) points with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Mr. Todd Harris, Chief Engineer for Beaver Run Resort, is present on behalf of Beaver Run.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: I was wondering about the waiver negative points for density increases under 5%. Do we get to a certain point for the total original project when first developed or is it per small project addition? (Mr. Kulick: It is 5% from the original approved master plan and that density. They cannot keep increasing incrementally to stay under 5%.)

Chair Schroder opened the hearing for public comment.

Ms. Elaine Gort, Building 1-Unit 1080 Owner: We live in building one, and anytime we want to go to the other side of the resort, we have to go up and around somewhere icy and unsafe during the winter. I have also noticed that there is no way for anyone who is handicapped to get from building one to the ski slopes. (Mr. Harris: This addition will alleviate those problems.) It was a nightmare to get home when our kids were young and we had to bring them in with strollers and such as well.

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Are you concerned with the materials being used for the roof? (Mr. Kulick: The materials

being used will be the same as those that have been approved for other additions. There is a lot of cement on the building, so I believe they are trying to tweak that a little bit to modernize, but it will be in the same vein as the current aesthetic.) (Mr. Harris: The roof will be a flat roof, so no additional reflective materials or anything like that.) (Mr. Kulick: In terms of visibility from the street level, it's not particularly visible, only from a few locations.)

Mr. Gerard: I also lived in building one in the past, and Ms. Gort explains the situation well. It is unsafe and a bit hectic around there. Another question is concerning snowfall from balconies above, I assume that's being taken care of in the plans? (Mr. Harris: It is.)

Ms. Leidal made a motion to approve the Beaver Run Corridor Addition, PL-2016-0526, 611 Village Road, with the presented point analysis and findings and conditions. Mr. Gerard seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Development Code Amendments (MT)

Mr. Truckey presented. At the May Town Council retreat, the Council requested that Planning staff initiate a process to undertake a comprehensive review of the Development Code. Subsequently, staff formed a Comprehensive Code Amendments Steering Group to help provide guidance on potential code changes. The Steering Group is comprised of three architects (Sonny Neely, Mark Provino, and Matt Stais) along with two Planning Commission members (Christie Matthews-Leidal and Gretchen Dudney) and staff (Peter, Mark and Julia). The Steering Group has met four times in the last few months to make recommendations on Code changes. Staff has been providing regular updates on these meetings to the Planning Commission. The Steering Group has now concluded moving through the first eight policies of the Code.

Staff has prepared a list of proposed Code amendments for these first eight Code policies. The intent of this work session is to discuss these amendments and get any input the Planning Commission has on them. Once we have received that feedback, staff's next step will be to take this first installment of Code amendments to the Town Council for input. Our plan at this time, rather than taking all the amendments at once to Planning Commission and Council, is to take the amendments in several installments so that the amount of information and associated amendment language is more manageable.

Mr. Truckey took the Planning Commission through a series of issues identified in the staff report, along with a review of the proposed Code amendments.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

On policy 5R Architectural Compatibility:

Ms. Leidal: The Steering Committee did not want to put a percentage on amount of natural material required on each building elevation because even if we don't like it, if it meets the percentage, it won't incur negative points.

Mr. Schuman: It also allows for more freedom for the architect and provides the planning commission discretion.

Mr. Schroder: I agree, with the analysis.

Mr. Lamb: As for wear, fiber cement should last longer than cedar siding.

On policy 4R Mass:

Ms. Dudney: The proposed language gives an additional bonus for adding amenities; the architects on the steering committee said just the common areas take 15-20 percent, which does not leave any room for amenities. This is not trying to make bigger buildings, but to provide room for amenities.

Mr. Schroder: So once they go over 30% it will go to Town Council? (Mr. Truckey: Correct, it would need to go as a Development Agreement.) (Ms. Puester: Currently for condos, hotels, inns, and

lodges, the percentage is 25%; the Committee proposes they both are increased to 30%.)

On policy 6R Building Height:

Ms Leidal: So the question is should this (the five foot lobby height exemption) be defined for lobbies? (Mr. Truckey: The question is if you are comfortable with the part in bold that allows an additional 5 feet height in the lobby of multifamily entrances.)

Mr. Schroder: My concern would be the kind of weird stuff that architects might come up with.

Ms. Dudney: The structure (clearstory) in the distillery would still be allowed even if we take this part out. (Mr. Truckey: Yes.)

Mr. Schroder: So this would allow 5 more feet in the first floor? Does it really change anything, because that would be allowed anyway?

Ms. Dudney: I don't have a problem with it; if there aren't abuses, then it's fine.

Mr. Giller: I can't think of any examples. Entrance identity elements are nice in architecture, they can get overdone, but I don't see any issue.

(Mr. Kulick: I can think of places that have used this have been in the lodges in the ski area, to allow for more open areas in the entries.)

Mr. Schuman: I think we can leave it in.

On Policy 2 Land Use Guidelines:

Mr. Schroder: I was wondering about C, and if the strike-out about glare is to address the new restaurant on Peak 7? (Mr. Truckey: Subsequent to this being written, we have a lighting ordinance that deals with these types of issues so it's not needed here.)

Mr. Giller: Is this interior lighting too? (Ms. Puester: We can't regulate interior lighting, but we can regulate that the glass on the windows is non-reflective so you reduce the amount of glare when the sun hits just right. This is in the ridgeline and hillside policy.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: In the past there have been concerns about lighting on the insides of buildings on the hillsides and these were addressed with trees on the hillsides as required in the ridgeline policy that passed a few years ago.)

On Policy 3 Density:

Mr. Schroder: I think that paragraph at the bottom of page nine really helps clarify the density calculations.

Ms. Dudney: Is employee [in Employee Housing] defined? (Mr. Truckey: Yes.)

On Policy 6:

Mr. Giller: Massing is not just the roof, it can be the floors. Also, we have some inconsistencies in language in the step down section. Remove "from" in 2.a.2. (Mr. Truckey: I will adjust that.)

Ms. Leidal: I can't visualize this. Do you get the positive point if you step down little by little or also if you step down a very large amount and then a smaller amount? How many sides of the building? How about in a multi-family structure, how many of them should step down? (Mr. Kulick: It may be helpful to have a diagram in there to illustrate.) (Mr. Truckey: Yes; we could have more illustrations in our code in general.)

Mr. Schroder: Doesn't the word step mean specifically smaller amounts?

Ms. Leidal: Do we want to include balconies in this or outdoor decks? I think we had a project come through with this question. (Mr. Kulick: I'm not sure those would fall under height, but instead under breaking up the façade.)

Mr. Giller: You could have a three-story mass where the floors are not stepped down, but the roof is stepped down, and this should not be awarded a point.

Ms. Dudney: I don't see why this has to be an entire floor though? Could it be half a floor?

Mr. Giller: What we're after is massing, and I don't think we should give points for modest roof tricks, when what we are looking for is cascading of mass which I think includes the actual floor. The book *Pattern Language* has some good information on cascading effects.

Mr. Schuman: It is still up to the architects, we can tell them that we don't like what we see.

Ms. Dudney: I think we need to be more specific with the rules.

Mr. Lamb: The words "may be" are in the language to give us discretion.

Mr. Schuman: Maybe cascading of mass is the right terminology, but I don't think we should be dictating

what exactly the architect is doing.

Mr. Schroder: They can choose not to chase the points.

Ms. Dudney: Mr. Schroder, your point is that we should not be too specific, or we may limit creativity?

Mr. Schroder: Yes.

Mr. Giller: The point is to have human scale, so we don't want the cascading in the back; we want it more in the front.

Ms. Dudney: But what do you think about what Mr. Schuman said, about us having discretion with the words "may be"?

Mr. Giller: It doesn't give us as much guidance down the road or as much as it could. I think of the multi-building developments.

Ms. Leidal: I am still concerned about the multi-building developments. How many of the buildings would need to step down to get the points? (Mr. Truckey: I think the determination on multi-building projects will be up to you as Commissioners when you review the project.)

Ms. Dudney: As long as the "may be" is in the language, future Commissioners will be able to discuss and make decisions as they see fit.

On Policy 6 Building Height:

Ms. Dudney: So we are going to leave the language on the first floor issue?

Ms. Leidal: Since you can still have more than one story over the first floor, I don't think section changes anything, because they could technically already add more on top of that first floor. This is just kind of a weird policy. (Mr. Grosshuesch: The cumulative height is counted that way, but for just a first floor, you are allowed five more feet, which you do not get on the next floor.) So your first floor could be higher than the rest of your building? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It will allow for a taller height on your atrium, I'm not sure how floors line up.)

Mr. Schroder: Does staff like this idea? (Mr. Grosshuesch: It's been in here for years. It is kind of a "wow-factor" thing, I'm not sure that we've ever had problems with this, however.)

Ms. Dudney: I don't see any reason to be changing things unless they're broken. We can always come back and modify if we need to.

Mr. Schroder: I support that.

On Policy 7 Site and Environmental Design:

Mr. Schroder: [On page 15] So is there anything new with retaining walls? (Mr. Truckey: No. We largely left the retaining wall provisions as they are, with the exception that we wanted to make clear that negative points will not be assessed because of height. We also took out the four feet specification; there is nothing magical about four feet except that it requires engineering, which is addressed elsewhere.)

Mr. Giller: [On page 16] Is the word "highly" in highly visible too high a bar?

Ms. Dudney: We felt that should be up to the Planning Commission's discretion. How are we going to define that term?

Mr. Giller: We don't have the discretion unless it is really *highly* visible, maybe we should lower that bar. (Mr. Truckey: We could work on that language, perhaps say visible from public streets.)

Mr. Schroder: I think they're always visible, so it's okay; we need retaining walls in the mountains. (Mr. Truckey: It is up to your discretion when applying the code.)

Ms. Leidal: Regarding excessive site disturbance related to long driveways, some homeowners put the garage all the way around back just because they don't want a tuck under garage and want to park on the same level. Some of these driveways really do deserve the negative points, but staff does have to spend a lot of time on this because of the amounts of points. (Mr. Truckey: The proposal is to change the multiplier so the commission has more point increments to work with: -2, -4, -6, -8, instead of just -4 and -8.)

(Mr. Truckey passed out additional clarifications for the policies.)

Ms. Dudney: So this specification regarding 1,000 square foot equivalent units for commercial is the way it has always been done? (Mr. Truckey: Yes, we are just adding it in more formally.) (Ms.

Puester: It was there as an asterisk before, buried in the code section.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: Maybe we should add an example on how we calculate mass, like we have an example on how we calculate density.) (Ms. Puester: Single family and duplex outside the historic district don't go by these stories, they are just 35 feet, and that is why they are exempted so we should remove the proposed strike out in this one spot. The other strike outs on that in the policy look good.)

Mr. Truckey: Our next Steering Group meeting is December 8th. We will keep you updated as we work, and will bring the next section to you probably around February.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Puester: We had a great turn-out for Dave Pringle's proclamation. At the work session, Town Council discussed ebikes on the Rec Path. (Mr. Truckey: The County has a policy against them, but the Town does not see them as an issue, so for now they will be allowed in the Town, though not in the rest of the County. I think there will more discussion with the bike operators in Town on this. Right now people can take ebikes up to Four Mile Bridge but then they should be turning around as it stops being Town jurisdiction. As of now, the parts of the Rec Path on the National Forest fall under motorized vehicle restrictions.) We had an update on Denison Placer 1. Since we did not receive the grant, the Town is looking at other options and is looking at having primarily a for-sale concept for townhomes and rentals for the apartments. There were previously three apartment buildings, now there are two. The floor plans will be changed to hit a different market in the townhomes, though the unit number remains close to the same. Parking will change from all surface parking to include carports and garages. Last time Planning Commission saw this was in April. It was a Class A Development as it was a different ownership to be LITEC. It would now be a Town Project, the changes are not particularly big, the layout will remain the same, but Planning Commission will see it again. As a Town Project, we will build it and then sell it, similar to the Valley Brook Townhomes. We will probably be seeing this project here again around February. We talked about the McCain Property/Block 11. (Mr. Truckey: Council is talking about not developing all of Block 11 as employee housing, and there is talk over what to do with the parking out there. If some parking remains on Block 11, we probably will not get the housing numbers we want and therefore want to put more on the McCain Property.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We will be looking at the cost tradeoffs associate with these moves as well. Generally for-sale projects put the town in a better financial position than rental projects.)

OTHER MATTERS:

1) Planning Commission Meeting Start Time Resolution (JP)

Ms. Puester presented the resolution to start the Planning Commission meetings at 6 p.m. starting December 2016 until June 2017 when the meeting will start at 5:30 p.m. thereafter.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve Resolution No. 1, Series 2016, amending Rule 5.1 of the "Town of Breckenridge Planning Commission Rules of Procedure (Jan. 2011 Edition)" concerning the starting time of regular meetings of the Planning Commission. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 pm.

Dan Schroder, Chair