

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

### ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Christie Leidal	Ron Schuman
Jim Lamb	Dan Schroder	
Gretchen Dudney	Steve Gerard (arrived 6:05pm)	

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Leidal: My comment on page 4 should read "I have a client that may wish to do the same type of application."

With no other changes, the February 7, 2017, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the February 21, 2017, Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### WORKSESSIONS:

1) Alpine Rock Permit Extension for PC#2012056 (CK)

Mr. Kulick presented. Alpine Rock is currently in the fourth year of a five year lease with the Town of Breckenridge (June 17, 2013-June 17, 2018) for a portion of the McCain parcel. Alpine Rock has a development permit that allows the processing and sale of aggregate material. Processing includes crushing and washing of material from on and off site, as well as asphalt and concrete manufacturing. Based on both the Town's plans for the McCain property and Alpine Rock's planned operations, Alpine Rock plans to operate through the fall of 2017 in support of the Iron Springs project and then cease operations and vacate the property in January, 2018.

Alpine Rock's current Class B Development Permit was approved by the Town Council on May 13, 2014 for a period of three years. Their permit will expire approximately seven months prior to their planned termination of operations in January 2018. In lieu of proceeding with a another three year renewal, which necessitates a Class B review, the Alpine Rock and the Town's Public Works staff, who manage the land lease, are requesting to extend the permit administratively.

Due to the proposed limited duration of the extension of 12 months of this permit, which staff has not received any concerns from the public on, Staff is requesting feedback from the Commission on an administrative extension to their current permit. If the Planning Commission gives staff direction for an administrative review, staff will include a condition of approval for the permit to expire on May 13, 2018, which would give Alpine Rock several extra months of permit life beyond their planned cessation of operations in January of that year. Staff will be happy to answer any questions related to this proposal.

Mr. Schroder opened the Worksession to public comment. There was no public comment.

#### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: Do they need to reclaim the site? (Mr. Kulick: Public Works takes the lead on clean up and will do any remediation that the site needs. They are currently in compliance with discharge permits and we don't see any major issues.) (Ms. Puester: It is worked into their lease as to what they are responsible for and what the Town will be responsible for.)

Mr. Schroder: Could the lease be extended for an additional three years? (Mr. Kulick: Neither of the parties desires to extend lease beyond its current term at this time.)

Ms. Leidal: What are the public notice requirements, or what class is it? (Mr. Kulick: Class D. They had a formalized review twice a year at the beginning of the project but recently they haven't had

- any review and they haven't had any problem or citizen complaints.)
- Mr. Gerard: How is Alpine Rock's work coordinated with Summit County's Swan River reclamation project that is also producing aggregate materials for the Iron Springs project? (Mr. Kulick: I am not sure about the inner workings of the Iron Springs project management but I would assume they coordinated.)
- Mr. Schuman: Good use of staff time and easy.
- Mr. Lamb: Extension is a good idea.
- Ms. Dudney: I agree.
- Ms. Leidel: I agree.
- Mr. Gerard: It doesn't require full approval; I agree with staff.
- Mr. Schroder: I support.
- Mr. Giller: I agree with staff.

### **TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:**

Mr. Grosshuesch presented.

- At budget retreat, the meeting began with the Council reviewing the financial report for the Town.
- The next discussion item pertained to plans transportation and parking projects. Council directed the staff to hold off on planning for pedestrian improvements beyond those associated with the Riverwalk Center connection to the 4 O'Clock roundabout.
- Council requested a feasibility study for a surface gondola that would serve in town destinations. Transit is experiencing an increase in ridership. Council directed staff to look into the possibility of our bus fleet becoming all electric buses. Regarding parking, Council established a goal for 750 new parking spaces in town, 50% of which would be located at the ice arena. Council authorized staff to proceed with design engineering on two roundabouts, South Park and Main and Village and Park Avenue.
- Broadband: Council asked for a feasibility study.
- Council Goals:
  - Housing: Council established a goal to create 150 beds in 2019.
  - Council supports recreation field house; somewhere in the County.
  - Child Care: Not looking for additional tax revenue funding at this time.
  - Asked to remove lobby project at Riverwalk Center and go forward with ticket office upgrade.
  - Public engagement: Have bi-annual town meeting with public question/answer session.
  - Sustainability: Cost analysis on how to get the town departments to 100% renewable. Would like us to look at a way to increase the recycle rate.
  - Public Works: Increase the bus barn space.

(Mr. Schroder: Were these prioritized and are there expectations and timelines? It seems like a large work load.) Yes, there were. (Ms. Puester: Commented on the time frame of projects.)

### **TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:**

1) Riverwalk Pedestrian Improvements (CL) PL-2017-0028, 150 West Adams Avenue

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to install 7,253 sq. ft. of heated walkways and concrete pavers, a 105 sq. ft. boiler building, retaining walls, storm sewer, landscaping, improved lighting, and a sculpture at 150 West Adams Avenue adjacent to the Riverwalk Center. Mr. Chris McGinnis, Civil Engineer II for the Town of Breckenridge, and Ms. Jennifer Cram, Director of Public Programs and Engagement, Breckenridge Creative Arts, were also present for the presentation.

Mr. LaChance noted that there was a change to the point analysis as presented in the Staff Report. The updated point analysis was as follows:

*Staff recommends that the Planning Commission assess positive three (+3) points for improved internal circulation / accessibility under Policy 16/R, negative two (-2) points under Policy 7/R for development to replace a significant tree stand, and positive one (+1) point under Policy 43/R for the installation of public art, resulting in a total point recommendation of positive two (+2) points. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed heated walkways and hardscape are required for the safety and welfare of the general public and does not recommend that the Town Council assess any negative points under Policy 33/R.*

This is a Town Project pursuant to the ordinance amending the Town Projects Process (Council Bill No. 1, Series 2013). Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Town Council of the Riverwalk Pedestrian Improvements, PL-2017-0028, located at 150 West Adams Avenue with a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points with the presented Findings.

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

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Schuman: The heated plaza area seems sizable for no negative points. How large will it be? (Mr. LaChance: 7,000+ square feet.)
- Mr. Giller: Landings and ADA requirement? (Mr. McGinnis: Landings are not required; the grade is below five percent per ADA.)
- Ms. Leidal: You are losing parking spaces, but do will we still have a sufficient 24 foot travel; lane at the Riverwalk Center? (Mr. McGinnis responded yes.)
- Mr. Schroder: Why lose 5 parking spaces if we are looking to add parking spaces? (Mr. LaChance: The original staff report for the Development Permit for the Riverwalk Center shows that, although the required spaces for the Riverwalk Center were designated to be at the Tiger Dredge lot, there is extra parking available at the F-Lot parking lot. Yes, there is one remaining space beyond what is required for the Riverwalk Center.) Is the boiler placement within a foot of the property line? (Mr. LaChance: It is in the Right of Way. I have spoken with the Engineering Department about this and have been informed that this is OK because there are other recent Town installations of boiler buildings in other Rights of Way.) (Mr. McGinnis: It needs to be that close for it to work properly.)
- Mr. Giller: Have you looked at the direction of travel and 2% grade on the plaza for compliance with ADA for accessibility? I would recommend double-checking that. (Mr. McGinnis: Grade is at 1-2% cross slope for drainage.)
- Ms. Dudney: I support staff recommendations.
- Mr. Lamb: The space is 20 years old and it is time for this. It is good for public safety. The Town is using energy whether it is snowmelted or equipment is brought in to haul it. I approve.
- Mr. Schuman: Good layout. To be consistent between town and private projects, it should have gotten negative points for energy use of heated sidewalks. The Theobald building received negative points for heated sidewalks.
- Mr. Gerard: Agree with zero (0) points. Public area needs to be clear for safety and it is focal point of town. Good update.
- Mr. Giller: Good project. I caution you to check grading. Follow ADA carefully.
- Ms. Leidal: I support. I feel there is precedent under Policy 33/R F (1) a., which says zero (0) points can be assigned for heating walkways for public safety concerns, so I support zero (0) points.
- Mr. Schroder: I appreciate the updates on tree buffers. I support staff recommendations.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to recommend the Town Council approve the Riverwalk Pedestrian Improvements, PL-2017-0028, 150 West Adams Avenue, with a passing point analysis of positive two (+2) points and the presented findings. Mr. Lamb seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2) Denison Placer (JP) PL-2017-0014, 107 Denison Placer Road / TBD Flora Dora Drive / 1900 Airport Road

Ms. Leidal: I have a client interested in a portion of the property, the overflow parking lot. This may be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Lamb: I believe Ms. Leidal will be impartial.

Mr. Schroder: Will you make any money off of this? (Ms. Leidal: I will be paid to put together the application. I would step down if necessary.)

Ms. Dudney: I have no problem.

Mr. Gerard: I see no real financial gain in the results of the project.

Ms. Dudney: It could be a problem if consultant is recommending design or density but I don't see it being a problem in this case.

Mr. Schuman: I support having Ms. Leidal stay.

Mr. Schroder: I support having Ms. Leidal stay. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Ultimately it is up to the Planning Commission to make the call.) We would resoundingly like to keep Ms. Leidal. Thank you for bringing it up.

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to construct 58 workforce for sale townhomes (13-one bedrooms, 37-two bedrooms, and 8-three bedrooms) and 18 one bedroom workforce rental apartment units (53 single family equivalents or SFEs) in 19 buildings on six acres of the northernmost undeveloped section of the Block 11 parcel with access from Denison Placer Road and Flora Dora Drive. Primary changes from the initial development approval include unit count, unit types, architecture and parking.

Ms. Danielle Lynn and Mr. Pete Weber from Coburn Development, Architects for the project, were also present.

Changes From Approved Plans (from Denison Placer 1 and Overflow Parking Lot Site Plans)

The site configuration remains largely unchanged. The roadway, property boundaries and the building footprints remain primarily in the same locations with some minor adjustments. The following major changes have been made to the Denison Phase 1 and Overflow Parking Lot plans which were approved by the Planning Commission April 5, 2016. (No change has been made to DP2).

Site Plan and Civil Plan

- The number of units has increased from 66 to 76, however because the plan now includes 1 bedroom units, the actual number of bedrooms has decreased from 138 down to 129.
- The overflow parking lot on D3 to the north of Flora Dora Drive has been replaced with 6 townhomes units in 2 buildings (Building Type E).
- Surface parking spaces throughout the site have been reduced from 133 spaces to 108. Enclosed parking spaces are new to the plan and include 39 spaces in townhomes garages and 3 carport parking spaces. Previously all parking provided was surface parking. Overall, the parking space count has increased.
- The property line has moved approximately 50 feet to the south into Block 11, incorporating Walker Street and a new Parcel D4
- D4 will be for open space, snow storage and regional detention.
- The community center building and tot lot have been removed and replaced with two townhome buildings, Building Type A1. (The community center was a requirement of the LIHTC application).
- Three trash enclosures serve the development with the exception of the D3 parcel (previously overflow lot) which will have individual roll away containers. Two of the trash enclosures provide attached storage units for property owners.

### Architecture

- Architecture in general has been revisited to provide for more variation and articulation especially on the side and front elevations.
- Additional building types have been added for more variation throughout the site.
- The two apartment buildings now consist of one bedroom units instead of two bedroom units.
- There are 33 units with tuck under garages, reducing the previous surface parking count.
- A new carport with three parking spaces, storage space and trash enclosure near Oxbow Park.
- Each unit has an attached garage for additional storage or has been provided a separate storage unit

### Landscaping

- A new snow storage plan is reflective of the overall site plan changes.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend the Town Council approve the Denison Placer 1 Master Plan and Site Plan Modification, PL-2017-0014, located at 107 Denison Placer Road / TBD Flora Dora Drive / 1900 Airport Road, Lot A-1, and Tract E, Runway Subdivision, and Lot 2C, Block 10, Resubdivision Plat of the Common Area of Rock Pile Ranch Condominium, resulting in positive four (+4) points and the presented Findings and Conditions.

### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Dudney: Is Walker St a Town ROW or Private (Ms. Puester: For now it is private to be maintained by the HOA, but it is sized to be dedicated when/if there is another housing project served by this road.)

Mr. Schroder: The Denison Placer and Coyne Valley recreation path would make their way around the river. Will they work on connecting these other recreation paths? (Ms. Puester: The goal is to create connectivity from this neighborhood to other trails and to the Rec Path.)

Ms. Laurie Best, Senior Planner for the Town of Breckenridge and Project Manager: The road south of the neighborhood will likely be dedicated Town Right of Way once it actually connects to a future project. The parcel on the north side of Flora Dora which is D3 was a remnant parcel, identified for parking because it was not a reasonable location for a handful of isolated apartments. With the conversion to Townhome project, it became a viable site for six units. We are in conversation with the owner to the north to incorporate and reconfigure those townhomes into their project, so likely to see a modification to this plan when and if they submit their plan. As part of the reworking of this plan from the LIHTC plan, we generally kept the buildings in the previously approved locations because infrastructure is in at those locations, but we replaced the community building, which we no longer need with some townhomes and we added a Tract D4 on the south for regional detention and also as overflow snow storage to serve this project as well as the next housing project to the south. Given the tight site, it makes sense to have that overflow to accommodate big snow years. (Mr. Schroder: Will D4 remain a detention pond as development expands?) Yes. It will remain and serve the entire area once it is developed.

### *Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Leidal: What is the height of building F3 on page 30?

Ms. Dudney: It shows 35 feet. (Ms. Lynn: It is 35 feet to the mean.)

Mr. Giller: How many have garages? (Mr. Weber: 39 have garages.)

Mr. Schuman: What is D4 used for? Private or public use? (Ms. Puester: Snow storage, open space and detention for this development and future development.) How many individual trash receptacles? Concerned about tight space. (Ms. Puester: Six units will have their own roll aways on the last phase to the north of Flora Dora.) (Ms. Lynn: Presented about overall site plan layout.)

Ms. Leidal: Will the parking spaces be assigned in the carport in front of the storage? (Ms. Best: Yes.

- Parking and storage space will be assigned.)
- Ms. Dudney: Who will snow plow and clear access to storage? (Ms. Lynn: The HOA, but note the storage area is an enclosed area.) Where do visitors park? (Ms. Lynn: It is included in the units 2 spaces. Haven't gotten into details about assigning parking. There are surface spaces and on street spaces available. We do exceed code requirements.) (Ms. Best: Some spaces can be reserved for visitor parking but assigning spaces reduces the efficiency; overall I think we are providing enough parking.)
- Mr. Lamb: I think 3 bedroom units will be occupied by families and need 2 spots.
- Ms. Leidal: What is the material of the garage doors and the trash bins? (Mr. Weber: Painted. Composite of some type on garage doors, possibly painted metal.)
- Ms. Dudney: Will there be one person in a one bedroom? (Ms. Best: That hasn't been decided. Parking will be managed by the HOA.) (Mr. Weber: Based on our experience there will be sufficient space available.) (Mr. Weber: Presented about architecture.) Will the storage be a single level and where is the entrance? (Ms. Lynn: Single level. (Showed storage space on the plan.)
- Ms. Leidal: Any problems with the corrugated material? Does it stain the concrete? Can you remove the stain from the concrete? (Mr. Weber: You cannot.)
- Mr. Schroder: Are you suggesting another color scheme for the type E buildings on D3 or keeping it the same? (Mr. Weber: As the architects, we recommend keeping both buildings the same as they act as one building. They are so close together.)
- Mr. Schuman: What is the width of the alley? Is the street width standard? (Ms. Lynn: McGee is 26 feet. The alley is 24 feet with a pan on one side.)
- Mr. Giller: Are the railings on the balcony panels? (Mr. Weber: Yes, they are panels to increase the screening.)
- Ms. Dudney: Are the windows balanced? Why no windows on the back and at kitchen sink in A-1 building? Also have concerns with C1 second level facing the street and D2 on one of the garage units, windows should be to the exterior. (Ms. Lynn: Those units have a side view and there are sliding glass doors but we can look at adding a window above the kitchen sink where possible such as the middle units as you mentioned C1 building. The floor plan does not allow another window on the second level right now, but we can look at rearranging the bathroom floor plan to see if it's possible. D2: Can't change windows on the side of that one garage because of townhome property line per building code.) Are these fee simple townhouses or condos? (Mr. Weber: Fee simple townhomes.)
- Mr. Schuman: How many street lights do you have? I am concerned about enough lighting. (Ms. Puester: Three street lights. 13 private pole lights. It meets the town standards.) The carport looks forced and doesn't belong. Do you need it? (Ms. Elena Scott, Norris Designs, Consultant to the Project: Yes. We wanted to provide covered assigned parking for those units adjacent to the park also to make the parking that is private and right up against the park look private. It also helps to incorporate that building with the trash and storage units.)
- Mr. Giller: Lost points on tot lot. Will we replace that loss? (Ms. Puester: There actually were no points assigned previously for the tot lot as it was not opened to the public. We do have points for the 10 foot wide recreation path which provides good access to the river corridor, future adjacent housing and Oxbow Park. Oxbow is across the street and will provide a recreation amenity.) Possible to add site furnishing on site, maybe west of apartment buildings? (Mr. Weber: Site is very tight but we may be able to include by the A1 buildings and Flora Dora although it would be close to the road. Also perhaps by the apartments. In general the site has good access to recreational amenities and the townhomes have yards and porches.)
- Mr. Schuman: What will be at Oxbow Park? (Ms. Scott: Playground, shelter, bathroom. We didn't design it but it has good amenities for the residents.)
- Mr. Gerard: In regard to the two apartment buildings, are they the same color? (Ms. Puester: They are the same color and we are asking for Commission input.)

Mr. Schroder opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Lee Edwards: Confirming there are 76 total units and 164 parking spaces. (Mr. Schroder: Yes.) What are the phases? Who has ownership of the three buildings under construction on the adjacent lot? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Town currently owns them but they could be sold.) This is not the best planning effort. The area you chose doesn't seem to be the best. Airport Road is mixed residential and industrial. It is not good to introduce strictly residential. Lost small parking area with the overflow parking lot to two residential structures here and if other businesses on Airport Road grow; the commercial owners will run short of parking. We need that parking for overflow. You need to address that we need more parking in the area. I have a business on Airport Road. Are we paving over the valley floor? We don't need all these hard surfaces that need ongoing maintenance. People walk all over the place. No need for all the hard edges. Architecture is getting better and more interesting. Please consider beefier posts though. I am unimpressed with the location for workforce housing. It should be concentrated on County Road 450.)

There was no further comment and the hearing was closed.

Staff Questions for Commission:

1. Did the Commission agree that the D1 and D2 building types should have snow guards and a roof overhang at the unit adjacent to the two car garage to prevent large amounts of snow shed?
2. Did the Commission find that building type E should have another color palette for the second building?
3. Would the Commission prefer a darker color palette and second color scheme for building type F3 (apartment buildings)?

*Commissioner Final Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Lamb: I like the project. The colors are good on building E. Much needed employee housing. Recommend snow fencing on building types D1 and D2, and don't love if you have to use heat tape. Supports project.
- Mr. Schuman: Supports project and point analysis. To answer the questions asked by staff, 1) no, 2) no, 3) no.
- Mr. Giller: Roofs look better, like the tuck unders in A2 and D2. Support project and point analysis. 1) yes, 2) either, 3) yes.
- Mr. Gerard: Supports project and point analysis. 1) yes, would be better than heat tape, 2) halfway there, 3) yes but 2 colors on building F3.
- Ms. Leidal: Make sure you have F3 at 35 feet to the mean or less. Agree with Mr. Edwards that posts look too thin and should beef those up. Concerned with the meal used higher on the elevations as it will stain the sidewalk. Think carport spaces should be assigned. Supports project and point analysis. 1) yes, 2) no, 3) yes.
- Ms. Dudney: Support project and point analysis. 1) yes, 2) in between, 3) yes for 2 different colors. Also beef up columns.
- Mr. Schroder: Support project and point analysis. 1) yes, 2) no, 3) yes.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve the Denison Placer 1 Master Plan and Site Plan Modification, PL-2017-0014, located at 107 Denison Placer Road / TBD Flora Dora Drive / 1900 Airport Road, Lot A-1 and Tract E, Runway Subdivision, and Lot 2C, Block 10, Resubdivision Plat of the Common Area of Rock Pile Ranch Condominium, showing a passing point analysis of positive four (+4) points, with the presented findings and conditions. Remove condition number 5. Mr. Giller seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05pm.

---

Dan Schroder, Chair