

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Chair Mathews-Leidal.

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the below change, the January 2, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved. Mr. Giller's comment on page 5 should read, "concrete deck is pulled back" not "pulled out."

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the January 16, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

No Comments

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Lionheart BGV Peak 8 Hotel (CK), 1599 Ski Hill Rd.

Mr. Kulick presented a work session and fit test for the construction of a wholly-owned for sale condominium project as well as a four-star luxury hotel containing approximately 150 rooms, common area, and associated amenities.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Does the master plan call for 4 stories or 5 stories? (Mr. Kulick: Recommendations vary between 3.5 to 4.5 stories.) LUD 39 says 5 stories but the Master Plan illustrative documents says 2.5-3.5 stories? (Mr. Kulick: There are varying thresholds in the Master Plan.)

Graham Frank, Breckenridge Grand Vacations, presented:

We would like to recognize the effort by Mr. Kulick, Ms. Puester and Mr. Grosshuesch to get us to this point so quickly after numerous editions of the first concept plan. We really appreciate it. I want to highlight that we came into this project knowing our first pass would be edited and changed to fit the Planning Commission needs and adhere to the interests of the community. We made certain to take into account the neighborhood impact and ski area impact. We were able to complete a traffic study over the Christmas holiday and discovered Ski Hill Road will continue to perform at a level of service D, which is the same as today. We are currently working on a study for Sawmill Road access that will compare the current use vs. proposed use. We brought down the building height with the Sawmill neighborhood in mind and to conform to staff comments. We will provide a parking study in the future to support our parking reduction request and we will also provide employee parking spaces on-site.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: How many employees will there be? (Mr. Frank: We don't have that answer yet.) What is your back-up plan if the 0.85 parking is insufficient? (Mr. Frank: The lower level of the Stables lot is available with 63 spaces. We hope to plan appropriately and not use that lot.)

Mr. Lamb: Will the magic carpet be impacted? (Mr. Frank: No. It will stay the same.)

Mr. Schuman: The employee spots could be available for guests during the busy season. (Mr. Frank: One Ski Hill Place hasn't had parking problems yet and we will be using their data in our study.)

Bill Anderson, Owner of 202 Sawmill Run Rd, commented:

We have always expected something would be built on this property eventually. Our family's priority is to access the ski slopes easily from our property. In one day, I counted 50 people accessing the mountain through this property and would like you to address that access. We have a great view of the other large buildings and all the lights that shine on us, please take into consideration that we can see right through the trees. (Mr. Frank: We are taking all these considerations into account.) Is the building height above the trees or below? (Ms. Leidal: The north/south ridge will be a 2.5 story building. It is difficult to say without elevations.) (Ms. Dudney: Height is a very complicated relationship and calculation between grade and stories and heights. We couldn't say without the elevations. What you think of as a 2 story building could be quite a bit more than that depending on where the grade is taken and measured from. We need to see this plan and elevations to determine the height.)

Jane Hamilton, Owner of 172 Sawmill Run Rd, commented:

I am concerned about skier access. The access has been available for 30 to 40 years. (Ms. Hamilton pointed out where she thinks the skier access is heaviest.) Both Peak 8 Village and Gold Camp use this access in addition to the neighborhood. I counted 44 homes that could use these access cuts in the 4 O'Clock neighborhood. I think you should enhance those cuts and make it part of the plan. On Four O'Clock Road there is a 10 ft. pedestrian easement platted. You could use that for improved access.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: (Confirmed the changes on the new plans were understood correctly. Addressing Matt Stais, Architect.) What are the little buildings? (Mr. Stais: Probably condos. We don't know which will be hotel rooms or condos yet.) What will be in the one story podium? (Mr. Stais: We don't know for certain yet. Two levels of parking on the north, lobby and guest amenities, swimming pools, restaurant, maybe a spa. It really depends on the brand of hotel.) Does the site slope to the east? (Mr. Stais: It slopes up toward the neighbors. There is an opportunity for the podium to tuck under the trees.) Is there a big slope or berm off Ski Hill Road? (Mr. Stais: Yes. We will probably need to have two access points for this size of this project. We are waiting on more detail to help guide those decisions.)

Mr. Kulick: In response to how to review view corridors Mr. Kulick read from the Plan Components section of the Master Plan. *While it is acknowledged that the Fit Test and View Corridors shown on Sheets 5 and 8 are conceptual in nature and that actual locations, configurations and numbers of buildings have not been established by this plan, it is also acknowledged that a substantial deviation having a significant negative impact on the plaza areas, circulation, or views of lifts and the mountains may require a further amendment to the plan.*

Staff asked the Planning Commission answer the following questions:

1. *Is the Commission comfortable with the general building locations and proposed connection above grade to each other as well as the site buffering concept?*
2. *Staff believes the proposed building height can comply with Land Use District 39 and be subordinate in height to the eastern cross gable of One Ski Hill Place. Does the Commission agree?*
3. *Does the Commission have any input regarding the request for a reduction in parking spaces?*
4. *Staff finds circulation may be achievable as proposed, minus the secondary access for deliveries and garbage from Sawmill Run Road. Does the Commission agree?*
5. *Staff finds the commitment to lowering the eastern façade height, by averaging 2.5 stories and breaking-up the buildings, better transitions to the eastern single-family neighborhoods and improves the view corridors as identified by the Sheet 5-Fit Test and Sheet 8 - View Corridor Study. Does the Commission concur?*

6. *Staff finds the proposal's density, broken into multiple building modules, could comply with the Development Plan of the Peak 8 Base section of the Master Plan. Does the Commission agree?*
7. *Does the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design and/or scope?*
8. *Based on the information provided, does the Commission believe there is reasonable possibility the proposal, with up to an additional 60 SFEs of TDRs could pass a point analysis at a future formal review process.*

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Gerard: The site buffering is good. I think you should maintain the trees to buffer. The concept of three buildings is much better than what we first saw (and was pulled from the agenda). Yes, comfortable with #1. #2, I agree and think it can comply but conceptual here only. #3, parking is a crapshoot right now. We need more information. Comparing the parking at One Ski Hill and the new Marriott will be valuable. #4, I am opposed to using Sawmill Run Road for deliveries and garbage. It is a burden on the private residences. The road cannot handle the traffic. #5, breaking up the buildings preserves an identical view corridor as the Master Plan. I think the view will be preserved. I think we can meet density when breaking up the buildings. I am glad to hear you want to preserve the beginner ski area. #8 Yes, there is a reasonable possibility it can pass a point analysis.
- Mr. Schroder: #1 yes I am in support of location with broken up masses. #2, This is barely subordinate to One Ski Hill, building height does meet the Master Plan technically and like stepping. #3, looking forward to your parking study. We cannot expect any reduction in cars over the years. #4, I do not support Sawmill Rd. access. #5, the view corridor meets the master plans. Support. #6, I believe the additional density has the possibility of passing. #7, I have seen you work with the neighbors before and it would be nice to continue those efforts on this project. #8, Yes.
- Mr. Giller: #1, yes, possible but 2 D is so hard to tell. #2, yes. #3, I do not support reduction. The town didn't have parking at that point and the Marriott had a different business model and didn't communicate with their customers. I do not agree with reducing the parking. No room to add any parking here in the future. #4, no. You should stay off Sawmill Rd. #5, massing may work. Need elevations. #6, 84% increase in density is a concern. I do not support this much extra density. Where is the benefit to public for this much? #7 and #8, A well executed plan may be capable of meeting point analysis.
- Mr. Schuman: #1, yes. #2, yes. #3, I do not support a reduction. #4, I do not support. Also, I may not support two curb cuts on Ski Hill Rd. I too think you should get the neighborhood involved on what happens prior to a preliminary hearing. #5, I agree with view corridors at preliminary level. #6, It's hard to tell at this point. I am not committed to an answer. #7, involve the neighbors #8, It may be able to pass points analysis.
- Mr. Lamb: #1, yes but very preliminary, hard to tell. #2, yes. #3, I do not support a reduction of parking. There is so little parking here to begin with, stick with 1:1 ratio. #4, No Sawmill Rd access #5, I support lowering, view corridors is an issue here. #6, I agree. #7&8, I do not support this 84% increase in extra density-would support less than 60 SFEs. If you reduce it, I think the extra parking needed would show up. I also would like to see you address the neighborhood concerns.
- Ms. Dudney: #1, yes. #2, yes. Being subordinate by just one foot is a concern. #3, I support, as long as overflow doesn't spill into the residential area. #4, no Sawmill Rd. access. #5, I am concerned with 2.5 stories not knowing what the finished grade is. #6, view corridors look good. #7, it would have to be a significant public improvement to add 70% more density to the site. I feel it is up to the Town Council to decide. Mr. Anderson's points about lights were well taken as well as the easement through the yards. # 8, yes. It is reasonable to think it could pass.
- Ms. Leidal: #1, no, based on the north/south orientation being 25 feet off the property line. I appreciate the tree buffer but the trees are not guaranteed forever-thinning and some will die. You need a bigger setback. #2, Not enough info. #3, I will defer to the parking study. I do appreciate the idea of

providing employee parking. #4, No Sawmill Rd. access. The road cannot support it. #5, not enough info to make an assessment. I need to see elevations. #6, I don't have enough info. I thank the applicant for their revisions and your promises to adhere to code.

Mr. Gerard: One last note. I thought Mr. Anderson was going to complain about skiers walking through his property but he did not. Not all property owners will have the same reaction. I encourage you to talk to the neighbors about skier access and easements that would work for the entire neighborhood and have your conclusion written and recorded.

Ms. Leidal called for a five minute break at 6:51pm.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch gave a report on the January 9th Town Council Meeting:

- No planning commission call ups.
- Easement was endorsed for a new power line up to the Summit Public Radio antenna station through the Lorium open space on Baldy Mountain.
- Authorized the town manager to enter into a contract to sell 34 Sheppard Circle in Vista Point as a deed restricted affordable housing unit.
- Supported a pay increase for elected officials.
- Hyder will be the general contractor for the parking garage. Breaking ground in June. Plans will be presented at the February 20 Planning Commission meeting. Expected to finish 13 months after breaking ground.
- Reviewed provision for retirees continuing to live in deed restriction workforce housing units.
- Reviewed a concept proposal on Airport Rd, (past CMC, across from the distillery) for an apartment complex with 39% of them being deed restricted units. One half acre of Town owned land would be involved. Council was supportive.
- Retail center with grocery store. Staff was directed to do a fiscal study to see what impacts the Town can anticipate from forecasted growth along the Front Range as well as here. One part of that study would be to determine the demand for additional retail space and for a grocery store.
- Reviewed PIF calculation for small restaurants. Council agreed to create a new category for food and beverage uses that occupy less than 800 square feet at a 2.0 multiplier and left definitions the same. This change would lower the cost of entry into the market.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Village at Breckenridge Master Plan Amendment and Chateaux Hotel Condominium Meeting Room Conversion to Office (CL) PL-2017-0680, 405 Village Rd.

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to amend the 1983 Village at Breckenridge Master Plan to transfer 3.74 SFEs to the Chateaux Condominiums and change the allowed use of the existing common area meeting room in the Chateaux to commercial office for the purpose of an HOA office (The conversion of the existing 284 sq. ft. meeting room, 12 sq. ft. ski closet, and portion of lobby in the Chateaux Building to 402 sq. ft. commercial office). This conversion would include a new storefront window, glass door, and accessible walkway and handrail. The applicant also proposes to transfer 0.2 SFE from Lots 3&4 (Liftside/Peak 9) to Lot 5 (Plaza 1/Antero) in order to provide density for two future 100 sq. ft. vendor carts.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

No Comments or questions.

No public comment.

Mr. Giller made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER MATTERS:

Ms. Puester asked about the Saving Places Conference attendance.

It was noted that the Ski Town Forum is at the same place as last year but a different room and time. Will send out information to those attending.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair