

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Vice Chair Giller.

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the changes below, the February 20, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

Page 3, paragraph 1: The comment “Has the HOA or their design review board been notified” should be changed from Mr. Giller to Mr. Gerard.

Page 4, the comment beginning with, “I understand the uniqueness of this lot” should be changed from Mr. Giller to Mr. Gerard.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 6, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- Lee Edwards, historic district property owner presented. How are the Historic preservation comments working so far? (Mr. Giller: We listen and consider.) (Mrs. Puester: We compiled the public comments and took them forward as a memo for work session to the Commission.) May I get a copy of the memo? (Mrs. Puester: Yes.)

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Grosshuesch gave a report on the February 27th Town Council Meeting:

- No Planning Commission call ups
- Broadband – Council took their first look at it. They are going ahead with a cost analysis, how it would be developed in the community, and how to pay for it. We are looking at a 10 – 12 million dollar project. Broadband can increase the number of ISP providers in the area. ISP’s would lease fiber off of the towns broadband. Right now we are looking to run fiber to the house.
- Water PIF ordinance approved on 2nd reading.
- Lionheart was reviewed for a development agreement. There was no motion made and therefore, it was deemed denied.
- Town housing apartment project, third phase of Block 11. Looking at doing the project in-house rather than using a developer.
- New child care committee appointments were approved.
- Parcel on Airport Road proposal, Thaemert property north of Floradora entrance to Block 11, wants to build apartments including some Town owned land (39% town owned) in the project. Would be 39% deed restricted. They will need more building height and density than is allowed by the zoning, therefore a Development Agreement is needed. That proposal was supported by Town Council.

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

Ms. Puester presented a proposal to construct a new public parking structure located partially on the existing Tiger Dredge Lot and partially on the existing F Lot. The structure would provide 406 parking spaces, with a total size of approximately 155,273 square feet with 10,173 square foot of density to include a transit center on South Park Avenue and lobby/restrooms on W. Adams Avenue. There would be a total of 246 surface

parking spaces remaining on the Tiger Dredge and F Lots.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: Will West Adams remain a one way? (Ms. Puester: It is planned as a two-way.)
- Ms. Dudney: Was the traffic study updated? (Ms. Smith: We (a third party Traffic Engineer) completed a new traffic and parking study and the updated study was just submitted to CDOT.) How will cars get into the garage? (Ms. Smith: The same way you enter the Tiger Dredge lot now-through the roundabout, Washington and around the parking area.) What will be the distance between cars? (Ms. Smith: The standard 24 feet drive isle width.) Is the structure on grade with the F Lot? (Ms. Smith: It is one grade below.) Did the original traffic study show the entrance the same way? (Ms. Smith: It did not. It showed it only off of F Lot.) What feedback have you received about the congestion at the intersection by Lone Star Sports? (Ms. Smith: There will be interaction between those cars but it is not a big concern for me or a concern in the study. We are looking at management strategies to not have everyone leave at 4pm. Ideas include incentives such as rate changes for leaving later.) It looks too congested for 650 cars coming out all at once. How would you walk to Peak 9 and the Maggie? (Ms. Smith: We are encouraging them to take the bus to Beaver Run.) Is this structure being built for skiers? (Ms. Smith: Council would not say that. It is for downtown use.) The public thinks the Commission decided to put the structure in this location but that is not the case. However, Council suggested this location based off of specific criteria. Why did they choose this spot? (Ms. Smith: Multiple reasons, one being that we can only build on the land we own.) Why not build on the Gondola Lot? (Mr. Holman: We don't own the Gondola Lots, the ski resort does. We did approach them about selling some of that property to the town but they denied the request. We think this location is better than putting it entirely on F Lot. We have 1½ times the cars moving through F Lot now than there are parking spots because of drop off and pick up of skiers. The new lot will have a system to limit congestion by limiting access to F Lot and there will be no more skier drop off-you will have to pay when you enter the lot. We purposely moved it farther away from Park Ave to discourage pedestrian traffic across Park Ave. Currently the F Lot is full in the day not just of skiers and in the summer it is a very busy lot. Those cars in F lot now remain in the lot when people arrive for event parking at night at the Riverwalk Center so there are no spaces when folk go to events in the evening.) Will skier drop off be at gondola? (Mr. Holman: Yes.)
- Mr. Schuman: Was there talk of sun setting density from F Lot and Tiger Dredge? (Mr. Holman: No.) Will the parking lot be manned? (Ms. Smith: It will mostly be automated but ambassadors will be manning it in the busy hours/morning.) We are giving positive points for screening, but then we are covering it with a lot of landscaping? (Ms. Puester: We won't readily see all the cars inside with the black mesh between the levels which will screen some but you will still see the building.) When it comes to landscaping we often think more is better and it doesn't always work out and have to cut some down when the growth is too large. (Ms. Puester: I wanted to emphasize that it is not wrapped in a faux treatment like we had seen in Boulder.) (Mr. Holman: Most of that landscaping is screening for the people living across Park Avenue. We also like this location because the lots had 25% unused space and the new lot will use that previously unused space.)
- Ms. Dudney: Will there be pedestrian access provided? (Mr. Holman: The roundabouts will provide pedestrian access. The parking structure will be constructed first, the traffic will then be routed through F lot while we build the roundabout.)
- Mr. Giller: When do you expect the project to start? (Mr. Holman: We plan to be in the ground by May. We will lose use of the lot for one full winter. It will be a challenge but we have a great transit system. We will try to use the ice rink and maximize the Airport lot. We will also actively post signage on what lots are open and closed. Traffic is bad, we know that,

but we are making improvements with each project-the heated sidewalks through the Riverwalk Center, the roundabout, will be working on way finding signage next.)
Mr. Schuman: When will the way finding signage be online? (Ms. Smith: It will be presented to Council on the 27th to see if we are moving in the right direction)

Public Comments

Patricia Walker, 56 Wildcat Road: The town has always wanted a central parking structure, we know that. I am opposed to this structure. I suggest that if people get a parking ticket they should get 10% off at a local business. Breckenridge is a charming, beautiful place and I can't imagine having to look at this building from the Riverwalk. It is ugly. You should go back to the drawing board. Something this ugly should not be in the middle of town. Why not use the ice rink, or the gondola lot, work with Vail Resorts. This seems like a done deal and we are stuck with it. I ask that you make it more attractive if it has to be in town.

E. Schodaleo, Peak 9 Inn Village owner: Crossing Park Avenue is a nightmare. There are three police officers manning the intersection during peak times. There are some 3,000 crossings per day and that is the highest number of pedestrian crossings over a state highway in all the state. I believe this structure will reduce some traffic but not to the extent that is stated. Parents will not use the buses to get their kids to ski school. You will be adding buses and that is a negative environmental impact also. With this plan you can't get people to the Maggie area; you are cutting traffic off to the Maggie. You need to address how to get people over to the Village and the Maggie. People will not use a bus to get there. There should be an overpass and the Village is open to working with you.

Lee Edwards: One of the first projects I worked on in town was what to do with the ditch next to F Lot. F Lot was for skier parking, no exceptions. Since then we have gotten over that and we have wonderful thing going in that area. Let's not put this ugly structure there. It looks like a turd in a punch bowl. This is not the proper solution. You should excavate underneath F Lot for a level of parking. Also, why are you constructing the structure before the roundabout? We should not put this structure in this year. You should complete the Park Avenue improvements first. I can live with additional parking in town, but have we not learned anything over the last 25 years? This project needs to be looked at strongly and I look forward to hearing your comments.

Mark Pals, skier and used to own a unit in One Breck Place: I see traffic gets worse every year at F Lot. I like the idea of a lower level below grade and an underpass to the Village. I do not believe people will get on the bus but rather they will walk across Park Avenue and the current traffic issue will get even worse. This definitely affects the view line for the Park Avenue units.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: For the record, the Planning Commission didn't decide to put it here. I don't know why we didn't instead try a lower level underneath F Lot. That question should be posed to Town Council. When considering code I think it looks good for a parking structure. To be efficient, parking structures need to have straight lines. I support the staff analysis and point analysis. I would like to state that Town Council can make this a goal and then add it to the capital improvement plan. These two steps give them 14 positive points and without those points it wouldn't pass. Never the less that is the law.

Mr. Lamb: I believe the issue below F Lot was the river. (Ms. Smith - Yes that is a problem, and keeping F Lot usable for the future.) Flexible zoning passes with 8 points and I support it. I think the project is our best effort and we can make it work. I support the plan.

Mr. Schuman: I believe the plan meets the point analysis. Has to be on land we own. I do worry about landscaping points but I understand that past precedence presides. I like the project and we need it. This may not please everyone in town but it does satisfy the needs in town.

Mr. Gerard: The Planning Commission is here to analyze the building and the town code, not to decide

on a location. Vail owns the Gondola Lots and City Market is privately owned. It isn't a change of use, it is just going to be a bigger parking lot. Parking at the ice rink takes cars all the way through town and causes congestion. I think staff did an excellent job on the points analysis. They gave a fair review and gave points accordingly. Yes, the town has a loaded position but they could build it even if they don't get positive points. I think it is a good analysis and I support the project. Maybe the site wouldn't be my first choice but works.

Mr. Schroder: There is a berm between the F Lot and the Riverwalk and this project will marry the two lots and make the space even more useful. We are here to review the project against the town code. It is a utilitarian building and yes it has straight lines and unnatural material. My job is to review code and it meets code. I agree with the point analysis for the retaining wall.

Mr. Giller: I agree it is a good project. I agree that it applies the development code appropriately. I would like to see a more direct path into the structure. Thank you for the public comments.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

No other matters.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:49 pm.

Mike Giller, Vice Chair