

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chair Schroder.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller Christie Leidal Gretchen Dudney
Jim Lamb Steve Gerard Dan Schroder
Ron Schuman (arrived at 6:38pm)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 3, 2017, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the January 17, 2017, Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Lincoln Avenue Restaurant (CK) PL-2017-0006, 112 Lincoln Avenue

Mr. Kulick presented. Mr. Jon Gunson, Custom Mountain Architects, who is present this evening, is designing a new restaurant building at 112 Lincoln Avenue. The proposed project site is the 2,678 sq. ft. vacant parcel in between the Salt Creek Restaurant and the Blue Front Bakery Building. The proposal is for one, two-story building with a basement containing a total of 2,678 sq. ft. of restaurant space. The recommended density is 1:1 FAR allowing for 2,678 sq. ft. which is being met. The purpose of the work session is to get input from the Planning Commission on the general direction of the project and determine if you are comfortable with Staff's initial interpretation of policies. Staff has identified key components of the proposal and policies needing direction.

Policy 24 (Relative) Social Community: Staff would like feedback on whether sandstone as the primary material and the use of metal cornice and trim detail is acceptable under this policy. Mr. Gunson contends since there are several Town approved buildings within the core commercial area that have used stone or brick as a primary building material, there is precedent for these material applications and therefore this application should not be subjected to negative points under Policy 5/R. Staff believes that since there is clear direction in the Hand Book of Design Standards, that masonry should not be the primary building material.

Staff would like Planning Commission input on the specific policy questions and would also look for any additional code related comments or concerns before this project moves forward to a preliminary hearing.

1. Did the Commission believe Design Standard 225 has been met with the proposed use of sandstone as the primary building material?
2. Did the Commission believe Design Standard 228 has been met in regards to the proposed metal cornice and trim detail?
3. Did the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Did the new Elk Building (next to the Gold Pan) have a limit of how much sandstone should be on the bottom? I believe they wanted more but we said no. (Mr. Mosher: It was limited as this character area is residential. As such any stone was historically used as foundation. It was decided as a commercial use abutting a commercial character area that the stone could be used as an 18-inch tall wainscot.) (Mr. Kulick: That building reduced the amount of stone but it was in a different character area with a residential style.) How did the Planning Commission treat the Rounds Building (137 S. Main St.) and 122 S. Main St. and the use of sandstone there? (Mr. Kulick: The Commissioners were supportive of sandstone on both projects.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: This building also garnered extra discussion amongst the Planning Commission during its review. It was finally allowed.)

- Mr. Giller: What makes this building compatible in Character Area 6, Commercial Core? (Mr. Kulick: Large first-story store front windows, recessed entry, small 2nd story windows, kickplate, transoms, and the building's general ornamentation.) The size and shape of the materials is in question? (Mr. Kulick: Yes. The general form of the building we are comfortable with, now we are looking at the design specifics. The project has come a long way; Mr. Gunson has been very receptive to our comments. The original design was not compatible with priority policies of the Handbook of Design Standards.) (Mr. Gunson: First page of the guidelines for a new building states that new buildings should not be replication of old buildings, and should not be mistaken as an old building. The Centennial Bank building next door, for instance, is seen often by tourists as a historic building even though it isn't. The cornice I am proposing and other features contribute to the streetscape. I designed the proposed building as a modern interpretation that fits in with the neighborhood.)
- Ms. Dudney: Why all stone on the façade? (Mr. Gunson: It is an attractive medium; the stone is indigenous to the area and was used historically.) Do you disagree with the design standard 225? (Mr. Gunson: I don't understand why it is in the guidelines when there are many buildings in town, historic and non-historic, that do not follow the 225 guidelines.) How many negative points is design standard 225 subject to? (Mr. Kulick: Staff would suggest negative three (-3) or negative six (-6) points.)
- Mr. Schroder: I am struggling with the material choice. The plan and shape are sound. Code says to avoid this material but it hasn't been followed in some past approvals. How did that come about? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The Planning Commission allowed it on those buildings after a great deal of deliberation.)
- Ms. Dudney: The issue to me is the use of Sandstone on the second floor; it is not Code compliant.
- Mr. Gerard: How are you going to color the beams? (Mr. Gunson: They will be painted as if it was wood but won't deteriorate as rapidly as wood.)
- Ms. Leidal: It doesn't meet several historic standards; too much sandstone on second floor; cornice and archway is a concern; the solid to void and shape of the windows do not meet historic standards. The building is beautiful though.
- Ms. Dudney: Positive about contemporary elements. Like that it's recognizable as new building. Like cornice; no issue with solid to void. Do prefer to see the lap siding on the upper level.
- Mr. Lamb: Lap siding looks bad. Solid to void: windows inconsistent to neighbors. Don't like it but there is clearly precedent for stone. Like the cornice.

Mr. Schroder opened the worksession to public comment. There was no public comment and the worksession was closed.

Final Commissioner Comments:

- Ms. Dudney: The proposed does not comply with design standard 225 and could be awarded negative points but complies with 228, I like the contemporary details. If negative points are applied to policy 225, take into account the amount of lap siding on the sides of the building. Solid to void and arched windows OK on second story.
- Mr. Lamb: Meets the intent of 225 and 228 but solid to void should be looked at. Arched upper windows are OK.
- Mr. Schuman: Meets the intent of 225 and 228 but solid to void should be looked at. Not all metal detailing is appropriate. Re-visit the cornice and arched opening.
- Ms. Leidal: Nice building but the materials and detailing are not appropriate for this character area. Does not comply with design standards 225 and 228 because of the excessive sandstone and open cornice metal detail. The second story solid to void ratio is a concern.
- Mr. Giller: Combination of materials (masonry, fenestration pattern & open cornice) and its cumulative effect makes the overall building appear too heavy for its size. Use more restraint and refinement and design standards 225 and 228 can be met.

- Mr. Gerard: Precedence doesn't always fit our design standards. Sandstone is suitable trim, but design standard 225 does not allow it on the top floor of the building. The metal as it relates to design standard 228 works and I like the use of the metal but I don't think the open cornice meets that standard.
- Mr. Schroder: It is a beautiful building but our job is to interpret code. 225 is not being met with this much stone. I like the metal but don't think the open cornice meets design standard 228. Additionally, the second story windows are too large to meet the solid to void ratio.
- Mr. Gunson: Mr. Giller did you like the use of metal?
- Mr. Giller: Yes, but it needs refinement as it is designed. Currently the totality of the project is too heavy.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch presented. Council had the non-profit grants award ceremony. Usually 15 or more organizations are recognized at the meeting. Sign Ordinance for signs on public property was approved. The Dipping Station landmarking was approved. Solid waste collection ordinance (require trash companies to dump at the county land fill) was discussed, and pulled from the agenda because one of the haulers pointed out that the landfill is not open on weekends and they have no other place in the County to take it. The watershed protection MOU with the USFS was approved. The Recreation Center renovation and budget was discussed. Development Code amendment changes were reviewed and favorably received. The Code Committee was directed to review snow melt policy. There will be a Town Council retreat on February 14th.

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1) Town of Breckenridge Recreation Center Expansion (CK) PL-2017-0004, 857 Airport Road
Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a Town owned 16,894 sq. ft. indoor tennis center, one additional outdoor tennis court, and add 8,116 sq. ft. of additional floor space within the existing Recreation Center building. Also present were Mr. Scott Reid, Director of Recreation for the Town of Breckenridge, Mr. Randy May, Owner's Representative for the project, and Mr. Chris Kastelic, Sink, Combs Dethlefs, Architects.

Negative points are incurred for:

- Policy 6/R Building Height:
 - Negative six (-5) points as the building height exceeds the land use guidelines, but is no more than one-half (1/2) story over the land use guidelines recommendation.
 - Negative one (-1) point as the building has a continuous ridgeline greater than 50'.
- Policy 5/R Architectural Compatibility: Negative six (-6) points due to the building using 100% non-natural materials on all elevations.

Positive points are awarded for:

- Policy 24/R Community Need: Positive three (+3) points for meeting a Council Goal.
- Policy 20/R Recreation Facilities: Positive six (+6) points for the magnitude of the project and 100% of the project providing expanded public recreation facilities.
- Policy 26/R Infrastructure: Positive four (+4) points for providing recreational facility improvements that are identified under LUD 3's capital improvement needs and in the Town's 2017 Capital Improvement Plan.

This is a Town Project pursuant to the ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013). As a result, the Planning Commission is asked to identify any Development Code policies that the application does not comply with and make a related recommendation to the Town Council.

Planning Staff suggested that the Planning Commission recommend the Town Council approve the Recreation Center Expansion / Remodel and Indoor Tennis Building located at 857 Airport Road, PL-2017-0004, with a passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point and the presented Findings.

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing for public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Proposed parking access from the west? Where is the front door compared to parking? (Mr. Kulick: Explained the front door location planned for the south façade of the building.)

Mr. Schroder: Parking lot; will it be congested? Have we looked at other problem parking lots, such as Rainbow Park? (Mr. Grosshuesch: The design features standard dimensions for a parking lot and shouldn't cause a problem.) (Mr. Reid: The tennis courts have a limited capacity and therefore the lot will rarely will be at capacity.)

Mr. Giller: Should you have more landscaping to help screen a building of that scale? (Mr. Kulick: There is a significant tree buffer along Airport Road along with many mature trees internally that were planted prior to the Rec Center over 35 years ago.)

Ms. Dudney: Where will people be parking? Will they use the regular lot as well? (Mr. Kastelic: Peak hours may see the lot fill but it will be rare. Snow storage stall will be useable in summer.)

Mr. Schuman: Will 18 spots be enough? You will also have people at the playground Parking there.

Mr. Schuman recommended that the Town Council approve the Recreation Center Expansion/Remodel and Indoor Tennis Building, PL-2017-0004, 857 Airport Road, with a passing point analysis of positive one (+1) point and the presented Findings. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

- 1) Class C Subdivisions Approved Q4, 2016 (JP) (Memo Only)
- 2) Class D Majors Approved Q4, 2016 (JP) (Memo Only)

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

No questions.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41pm.

Dan Schroder, Chair