

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

### ROLL CALL

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

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With the below changes, the May 15, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

Page 4 “should not receive positive point” should read, “should not receive positive points for foundation since it is required with reclassification”.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 4, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No Comment

### WORK SESSIONS:

#### 1. Block 11 Future Development

A Work Session to get the Planning Commission’s input on a proposal to construct 96 workforce rental apartment units in ten buildings, and a neighborhood community center including lease office and associated parking on approximately 5.2 acres south of the Blue 52 neighborhood of the Block 11 parcel with access from Flora Dora for a Drive. In addition, Flora Dora Drive is proposed to be extended through the development. Ms. Laurie Best, Senior Planner presented the background of the Block 11 development site and housing needs of the community.

Lindsay Newman, Norris Design presented: The Block 11 apartment homes will have their own style but will be compatible with Blue 52. Road layout and pedestrian walkability was a focus of the design. There will be a community center. When considering walkability we looked at existing bus stops and additional bus stops. We are focused on providing pedestrian routes and they will be planned appropriately. We looked for opportunities to connect to the river, bridges, and parks. The river front park is adjacent to Blue 52 and we want to provide a path to it. Safe routes to school is also a priority. Our goal is to keep pedestrians and vehicles separate and make it a straight, direct route to school.

Chad Holtzinger, Shopworks Architecture presented: Some of our priorities for this project in addition to affordable housing was screening parking and achieving walkability. It is a mixed community of unit types sprinkled throughout the site. The design was driven by constructability and budget but also to achieve architectural character and scale. We will use the community center as an appealing entrance to the development. We will be using open front stoops and decks to reduce mass. The connection from internal pocket type parks through to the river and a community courtyard are important. Parking currently is at 165 spots, which exceeds the requirements. 70 spaces are covered parking in carports. The A building type uses roof eaves and dormers to break up the mass. The patios add a nice affect. The gable dormer and cascades softens the edges. The rear elevation has an open walkway. We are still talking about open vs. covered. The material pallet is a mixture of siding materials. We are trying to stick with the Breckenridge Vernacular. I think the scale is good and in proportion. We are using big windows in the living areas to improve livability. Building B is similar but a bit different and has a color scheme of its own. The C and D buildings are three stories. We are using the staircase to erode the height of the building. The stoops make a rich ground plain environment. The grade plain will add

to the richness as well. This drawing gives you a sense of an enclosed rear entrance. We did mock up a full enclosure but it looked big and bulky and didn't fit. The two stories will modulate the Blue 52 units. The community building is a special site that will be visible from the highway. We are thinking it will be a one story building with a community room and property management offices.

Ms. Puester presented the point analysis and questions to the Commission. This project is well below the density and mass allowed on the site-10.4 UPA proposed with up to 20 UPA allowed. Staff is supportive of the design and would like to point out that the buildings along the roadway are 2 stories and provide a comfortable pedestrian level interaction and eyes on the street in relation to the sidewalk. It's a continuation of Blue 52 in that way with a more pedestrian scale-2 stories along the right of way and the larger three storey building in the center with plenty of open space. Staff concerned about the livability of the open staircases on the 3 story buildings. The rear elevations are less detailed but face the parking areas, some which will have some visibility from the street. We have the following questions for the Commission:

1. Are there any Commissioner comments regarding the architecture, site layout, or access/circulation?
2. Does the Commission have any comments on the number of parking spaces provided or layout of the parking areas?
3. Does the Commission find that the ridgeline break shown meets the intent of this policy and does not warrant any negative points under Policy 6/R?
4. Is the Commission comfortable with the design of the external stairways in Building C?
5. Does the Commission support the preliminary point analysis?

*Commission Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Leidal: Can you review the exterior material proposed? Is there wood trim around all the windows? (Mr. Holtzinger: The redish color on the elevations represents corrugated metal siding. Blue is cement board and batten. Fascia elements, trim, and posts are made out of natural wood.) Is there wood trim around the cementitious siding? (Mr. Holtzinger: Correct. Although, the metal has metal trim as wood trim against metal doesn't work well. We are trying to employ devices to break the scale and move the eye around a bit.) Is that subfacia? (Mr. Holtzinger: Yes.)

Mr. Schuman: Is the cold roof proposed to accommodate the steep pitch? (Mr. Holtzinger: Yes. Also to help with snow load and ice. We hope to not have any gutters on the building.) Where is the corrugated metal being used? 25% is a lot. (Mr. Holtzinger: The big red forms shown on the elevations of all the building. There are also some three story elements that use metal but also at the grade plane.)

Mr. Giller: What type of corrugated metal will you use? (Mr. Holtzinger: Rusty tin corrugation.)

Ms. Leidal: What material is the railing? (Mr. Holtzinger: It is made out of metal. Also thinking of using different panels that are somewhat transparent like perforated metal which will screen items on decks.)

Mr. Giller: In regards to the pallet and pictures, is there anything that you do or don't like about that? (Mr. Holtzinger: Single loaded architecture is good on a project like this. Double loaded doesn't fit with a residential neighborhood community well. Using roof lines, balconies, and stoops to break the mass is something I like.) We have seen a project similar- Burling Game in Aspen. They had problems with storage and clutter being outside when we were there. These look better than that. People need a place to put their stuff. Be mindful of that. (Mr. Holtzinger: Worked on some of the Burling Game buildings. In this development each unit has a storage locker available on the porch and on their parking spot.) The overall mass is well conceived, the row of parking on the west side is smart. All the parking goes out two exits. Could you add a third exit right onto Flora Dora there on the western property line to avoid the cars driving past all the units? (Mr. Holtzinger: We started with that plan but public works opted against it because of the curb and pedestrian/auto safety issues. We can ask again and

- see how strong that answer was.)
- Mr. Schuman: Do you lose space using the angle grid of the site layout? (Ms. Newman: We looked at a straight grid and we didn't lose any space with the angled.)
- Ms. Dudney: What is the parking ratio at Blue 52 and how is it working? (Ms. Puester: 2 per unit.) (Ms. Best: Denison Commons is 1.5 per unit. Denison Commons is a closer comparable and it has a similar ratio with 1 bedrooms.) What is the parking reality there? (Eric Komppa, Corum, owner's rep: Parking is full in the mornings and the evenings. Sometimes we do see parking in the dirt lot to the north of the site but never sure whose cars those are.) (Ms. Best: 1.46 at Pinewood II seems to work very well.) So that's our answer.

Public Comments:

Lee Edwards, 1800 Airport Road: There is a need for additional parking for our commercial uses adjacent to this site. What will happen is the commercial uses will use the residential spaces here and cause a problem. You could provide additional parking here for the commercial uses, we know we need it. It is all leveled now and I hope it won't end up that way. There should be some undulation on the property. What is the distance between the parking on the west and on the adjacent commercial property dumpster? (Mr. Holtzinger: It is carport parking on the west near the dumpster with storage in the rear of it so there will not be any snow storage near it). I guess the commercial uses won't use the parking since they will be in carports. Who will use the community center? Is it specific to these 96 units? (Ms. Leidal: Yes staff is saying.) What would happen if you introduced the river corridor into the new proposal? What is this parking for? (Ms. Puester: For the River Park and trail users, it is not proposed with this project but the park.) I am discouraged we put this much asphalt in this development. Leave some gravel parking for now. Don't over build for something we might not need down the road.

*Commission Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Giller: This is a smart design and compliant. I encourage you to consider solid railings and storage to hide people's stuff. Lee's comment about space for another river front park is nice. I like the double vertical hung windows rather than square windows. I support 168 spaces, ok with parking as proposed. #3 I support staff, ridgeline will be negative one point. #4 I think there should be enclosed stairs which are safer, more pleasant and could be designed well. #5 I support.
- Mr. Schroder: It is a good design and I like the off angle layout. I like that the massing is broken up and the use of natural light were possible. Open stairs are not a great deterrent; it gives it less mass. Just be sure to consider the stair placement and where snow will drift and whether it should be enclosed or not. Access and circulation looks good. I like that Flora Dora wraps the site. Looks like you could get speed going around Flora Dora into fraction. Please consider that. (Ms. Puester: We are looking at traffic slowing options for safety with a traffic engineering firm.) For parking you will need 1.5 per code which you have, I'm ok. #5 I support points analysis.
- Mr. Gerard: As far as access and circulation, I am concerned about the west parking lot and circulating past three buildings with kids in the area. I'd rather have cars dump onto Flora Dora from there. I would like to see you revisit how to exit the parking lot. #2 meets parking code. #3 ridgeline proposal does not break up the ridgeline so I would add the negative one point as staff suggests. I am comfortable with the external stairs. I support points with the addition of -1.
- Ms. Dudney: I think you have done a great job on circulation. I am OK with the parking spaces. #3 I am ok with staff's direction. I do prefer the external stairway with metal stairs but please pay attention to the blowing snow and safety. I agree with the point analysis.
- Mr. Schuman: I like the steep roof slopes and cold roof system but you will still end up needing gutters in some places. I like the circulation with incorporating speed bumps internally. Parking I am ok with. There is merit to leaving some areas gravel perhaps. Ridgeline break you should get -1 for that. I like open stairways. To accept the negative point for removing corrugated metal

doesn't seem warranted at this point.

Ms. Leidal: I like building layout. There is not enough break in the roofline and negative points are warranted. I do like the porch. The back (rear elevation) will be seen from various locations and could use more work to break that up more, maybe longer windows would help which has been mentioned. I like the two story buildings. Three stories feel quite tall but they meet the requirements. Stairs should be enclosed for weather and safety. Yes, it will add to the mass but safety is more important. I agree with points analysis with the -1 point on the ridgeline.

## 2. Cultural Resource Surveys – Carl McWilliams

Mr. Carl McWilliams, of Cultural Resource Historians, gave a presentation on recently completed Cultural Resource Surveys of historic properties which was a grant from the State administered by the Breckenridge Heritage Alliance on behalf of the Town.

Mr. McWilliams presented: I have been involved in most of the previous surveys. My business is Cultural Resource Historians. I graduated from CSU. Worked various consulting positions before starting my own business. I have experience working on historic districts in several Colorado mountain towns. I surveyed 35 properties and 53 buildings. It was a mix of new properties and properties not surveyed originally. 21 had been previously surveyed but have had changes since then. The project was funded by a State grant and managed by the Heritage Alliance. I look at each building and write an architectural description. I do an archival history and a physical history. Also, what I call the people history describing who lived there and the buildings uses. I evaluate for national register eligibility and for the state register, if it is contributing or non-contributing, and for local landmarking eligibility. Some additions and alterations have changed their evaluation for contributing to noncontributing. Eligibility is based on significance, (history, person, architecture, potential to yield historic information) and integrity (location, setting, design, material, workmanship, feeling, association) not all have to apply to meet integrity eligibility. I will go through a few resource survey highlights. The Gaymon house was evaluated as national registry eligible. Robert Whyte house is eligible for state registry. The vibe in the Arts District was fantastic and impressive. The Whitehead building is contributing and eligible for landmarking. Blue Front Bakery is eligible for state registry and landmark eligible. The building had been altered but the restoration lead to its eligibility. Noncontributing buildings include the Randall Barn in the Arts District. The false front façade is not within standards and created a false since of history. The Spencer House is noncontributing after the remodel, they removed the bay window and added metal siding. The bay window was a very important part of the architecture and was removed. The massing of the addition is overwhelming. The Newton House was restored and became noncontributing mainly due to the excessive scale and height. The connecting element is recessed but only for a short distance. The addition is highly visible. The overall pattern I observed was a wonderful job of restoring the historic building but then adding the oversized addition. Breckenridge makes its own opinion about what is contributing and doesn't have to agree with the states results. I did some survey work in Telluride which has similar issues with property values and development pressure. I found in Telluride there were a lot of differences between the state and town opinions as well. To change the building status is a formal process and this is certainly not an official change in status. These surveys do not change anything formally in the Town.

### *Commission Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schuman: At what point would there be degradation far enough to recertify? (Mr. McWilliams: I don't know who would want to entertain that reevaluation. I don't think the state would have any interest in doing that. I have only seen it happen when the building has burned down. The national park service will do an analysis for National Landmark Districts, and the park service might step in for those districts.

Ms. Leidal: Did you discuss these changes with anyone at the state? (Mr. McWilliams: Yes. I make and submit a statement to the heritage alliance and to the state. I knew the state would think some of the properties should become noncontributing but I argued for them to be contributing. The state makes the decision as a team and makes the final decision on the eligibility. There is

always a group of buildings on the fence and the process vests the final conclusion in the state. The city has the right to have their own opinion.

Ms. Dudney: Are the property owners aware of the project? (Mr. McWilliams: They were and they will get the results). If a property was landmarked and then became non-contributing there is no effect on the property? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Yes.)

**PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1. Yankee Peddler Building Change of Use and Remodel (CL), 400 S. Main Street, PL-2018-0099

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to change the use of the building from commercial retail to commercial restaurant and to make exterior changes including adding a door and stair to the upper floor, modifying the existing roof, modifying the front door threshold, expanding the brick patio, adding a new walkway and landscaping, and remodeling the interior. There is no additional density proposed with the application.

*Commission Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Giller: Can you speak to the railing of the new stairway? (Mr. LaChance: I believe both the tread and railings are proposed to be painted black. There is a new proposed color scheme in your packet.)

Ms. Leidal: Did staff have concerns with the pavers in the front? It doesn't look like the minimum 40% soft surface requirement has been met. (Mr. LaChance: Currently we are stating in the staff report that the site does not appear to be compliant, and that we need those site calculations to be specified prior to Final Hearing.)

Matt Stais, Architect, Presented:

BGM LLC. owns the Canteen and Robbie's Tavern. They have been around for 20-25 years but they are getting an education on how the planning process works. They thank you for that. The context and landscaping is very important. Our original plan was to do as little as possible but bring it to code. I believe the pavers, concrete curb, and metal railing were put in by the town when they heated the sidewalk to match what was there. Maybe the pavers were for a vendor cart. The front yard is very small. Can we make it like RMU? We need to look to the guidelines for the small front yard. The side yard may be equivalent to a pocket park. We love the cottonwoods and want to keep them. How do we augment them without ruining them? What can we plant that won't compromise the cottonwoods? We are trying to find ways to find positive points for landscaping. We are asking the commission for ideas or suggestions on what would work within the code. The egress stair is required from the second floor. The metal railings are to be flat black to make them disappear. The gable is required because we need to fit a taller door there per code. We would remove a non-historic window and bring back the original siding. We need a few more points somewhere and looking at energy conservation. That seems to be an uphill battle. I hope we can get points from landscaping. Looking forward to your input and continuing the discussion.

*Commission Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schuman: Do all 4 sides have metal siding? (Mr. Stais: Yes.)

Ms. Dudney: Policy 236, does that apply to new construction? Will it apply to this project? (Mr. Giller: The alteration pushed the bay window into the front yard so they lost a lot of the front yard.) (Ms. Leidal: You always want to bring the building into compliance.) (Mr. Schuman: 236 pertains to existing and the new development.) (Mr. Stais: There wasn't much of a yard to begin with. The front steps are strange. The answer may be to lower landscaping along the front and separating the front yard.)

Mr. Schuman: Did the town put the retaining wall there? (Mr. Grosshuesch: We did not put the wall in and the pavers were put in by the vendor cart. We didn't heat the Main Street part of the sidewalk.)

Mr. Schroder: I think staff is being generous saying 50% needs to be retained. The policy uses the wording predominantly. Maybe Matt has it right.

- Ms. Leidal: What is the design of the upstairs door? (Mr. Stais: They will match the other doors.)  
Ms. Dudney: Where will the ADA ramp be? (Mr. Stais: The current ramp is on the north side.)  
Mr. Schroder: Does it need the upstairs to be viable? (Mr. Stais: Oh yes.)

Public Comment

George Ulrich, 412 S. Main: I have neighbor concerns. I lived there during the vendor cart years and they put in the pavers. The side yard is adjacent to where I live and that is where we walk to go to our property. If there is a patio I am concerned about noise and smoking because that is a very tight space.

Mark Gossman, 105 Jefferson: The current use of my property is an office building. We got approval to convert the upstairs to an apartment. I have the same concerns as Mr. Ulrich with noise and space. I am concerned with the back of house operations. We have a nice façade now and to put a restaurant there will add a lot of issues. I don't believe there is much screening available because of the sewer easement. That is a huge concern in degrading the look of my building. Noise from the patio is a deep concern because of lack of space.

*Commission Questions / Comments:*

- Ms. Dudney: I don't see that we have any option in change of use because it is allowed. Commercial is the primary use and residential is secondary. (Mr. Schroder: The commercial would take precedence over residential.)
- Mr. Giller: Safety trumps historic preservation on the egress gable. The design of the proposed railings should be changed to be more compatible.
- Mr. Schroder: We need to agree on the roof and egress before we can accept the change of use. Supportive of the gable roof addition.
- Mr. Giller: We always try to solve non-conforming issues. I would like to see the non-conforming front façade addition removed.
- Ms. Dudney: Can you get rid of the bay window? (Mr. Schroder: That would get them a lot of points.)
- Mr. Giller: I don't think removing the siding comes close to the precedent provided in our packet regarding restoring the front façade.
- Mr. Schuman: It would be interesting to see a report on energy conservation from a licensed engineer.
- Mr. Giller: Maybe you have a reference case just like HERS ratings on residential. (Ms. Puester: They are using a percentage above what they currently have. The engineer will do a current assessment.)
- Mr. Giller: Question #1: Ok.  
Question #2: Need to differentiate the front and side yard.  
Question #3: Egress change is OK.  
Question #4: I need to understand the energy conservation points. I agree with preliminary point analysis, pending the side yard and energy conservation issues.
- Mr. Schroder: Question #1: Ok.  
Question #2: need to get to 50% of green space for front and side. Pavers should go.  
Question #3: I support modifying the roof  
Question #4: As presented, I support points analysis.
- Mr. Gerard: Terrific example of a four square. If there was some way to peel the bay windows off I would.  
Question #1: Change of use qualifies.  
Question #2: No way around the front yard side yard issue. There will be a lot of conflict with neighbors from the patio. Owners should be sensitive to that.  
Question #3: Safety trumps design. Fortunately, it will be in the back of the building. Overall it is a tough fit but I would love to see it work.  
Question #4: I agree with points analysis, pending issues resolved.
- Ms. Dudney: I agree with my fellow commissioners. If you didn't need the second floor you might not need to go through the commission at all.  
Question #1: allowed. need 40% on both.  
Question #2: agree

- Question #3: the roof is allowed.  
Question #4: Agree with points analysis. Urge owners to be sensitive to the neighbors.
- Mr. Schuman: Question #1: Agree  
Question #2: Agree. I ask that you listen to the neighbors. Landscaping with hedges and bushes might help buffer the noise.  
Question #3: Support. It is in the back corner and not that big of a deal.  
Question #4: I support point analysis as is but I am concerned about the wood siding and if it is in bad shape you will be replacing most of it.
- Ms. Leidal: Question #1: I support  
Question #2: This is not meeting policy 236 or 15.  
Question #3: I am OK with egress changes.  
Question #4: I agree pending more information. Please don't forget snow storage for the patio. I would like to see the egress railings be wood. Metal is too contrasting.

### **COMBINED HEARINGS:**

Cucumber Creek Estates Subdivision (JL), PL-2018-0128

Mr. Lott presented a proposal to subdivide a 9.24 acre parcel into six tracts of land. The subdivision is based on a Master Plan that was approved in 2016 for 23 residential units.

Mr. Schuman: Is the note referring to the new tract A or the old tract A? (Mr. Lott: It is the new tract A.)

#### Tom Begley Presented:

We are essentially following the 2016 Master Plan. It is unusual to have this much direction from the Master Plan. Tim has been a great steward of the land allowing the Nordic Center to lease the land. We are proposing that all the trails be formalized with easements. We will be adding in one trail as a connector. We will abandon the trail section that has a trail adjacent to it as you saw on our site visit. We will do some drainage work in that area. The only thing we can't accommodate is the larger landscaped cul-de-sac, to increase it would almost double the size of the current. I feel we meet the Master Plan.

#### Tim Casey Presented:

We have owned this property for 30 years and this is the last piece. It has been a privilege to give the land to the town and help preserve the gulch. We will continue to allow recreational use. Tom is buying this property in phases. In 2016 we did a lot of adjustments to get us to this Master Plan. The trails are an asset and benefit which is why we created the connector trail. It allows the Nordic Center to make a loop without crossing the road. Thank you for your consideration.

#### *Commission Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Giller: I believe we should add a condition.
- Mr. Gerard: I would like to add a condition "The Town and Developer will agree on all final trail easements and locations."
- Ms. Dudney: Because of the good will of the developer for so long I don't think we need to add the condition.
- Mr. Gerard: They have been terrific. But if we get a recorded tract and the trail in use meanders through the tract someone could close off that trail with a fence. If the town sat down with a satellite picture they could specify where the trail is. The ones that would be maintained should be shown. Concern about tree removal for a trail in the tract closest to the Gulch.
- Ms. Leidal: My concern is why have a new trail when there is an existing trail on town property. I would support a condition deleting that public trail in the effort to preserve trees here. (Mr. Begley: All the trails we are talking about are on town property. We are willing to dedicate the easements that the trails will remain there. (Mr. Truckey: The simple way to solve this is to

remove the trail easement facing cucumber gulch.) (Steve West: The trail easement is to the town and the town will decide if they change the trail. The drainage easement needs to stay on.)

Mr. Giller: Is it totally up to the town what to do with the trail. (Mr. Begley: Yes.)

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

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary: No questions.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

---

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair