

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	Ron Schuman
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard	
Dan Schroder	Gretchen Dudney	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the June 4, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 19, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Denison Apartments (CK), PL-2018-0206, 1910 Airport Road

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct two apartment buildings with 16 one bedroom and 16 two bedroom apartments, totaling 26,632 sq. ft. The buildings are sited on 1.2742 acres and will feature 16 deed restricted employee apartments and 16 market rate apartments that have a short-term rental restriction.

Applicant is Kenny Thaemert, and the architect is Mike Shultz.

Ms. Leidal disclosed she was involved in a previous application with a previous applicant at this parcel. The commission had no concerns.

Commission Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Can you talk about snow stack? (Mr. Kulick: There is adequate snow storage which equates to 27% of the paved surface area.)

Ms. Leidal: I believe there are public snow storage areas that are adjacent to the parking areas. Can you double-check that before the next hearing? (Mr. Kulick: Yes.) And I wanted to ask about the separation of the parking area from Denison Placer Road. (Mr. Shultz: It's about 12 feet on one side and 8 feet on the other).

Mr. Schuman: What's the short term rental restriction? (Mr. Thaemert: No less than 3 months.) Will the transit shelter be part of the development agreement? (Chris: I believe the Town will place the easement on the property prior to the land transfer.)

Ms. Leidal: The staff report says the parking lot is 9 feet north of the property line. (Mr. Kulick: The parking is covered in terms of site buffering.) (Ms. Puester: When separation less than 5 feet we are looking at negative points for site buffering.)

Mr. Giller: Can you speak more to the architectural guidelines in terms of contemporary look? (Mr. Kulick: The design standards are not mandatory and recommend a "Breckenridge Vernacular" design that feature gabled roof pitches and board and batten or lapped siding. Mr. Kulick showed a color rendering of the building.

Ms. Dudney: The design is similar to other structures on Continental court.

Mr. Schroder: I agree with Gretchen, it's similar.

Mr. Giller: What else would we see on Block 11 that's similar? (Mr. Kulick: That would be up to the discretion of a future applicant.)

Ms. Dudney: What else is left that is part of the Block 11 plan? (Ms. Puester: There's a little over 18 acres

left to develop, all town owned.)
Mr. Lamb: I think it's dangerous to speculate and we should focus on what's in front of us. (Mr. Truckey: I wanted to remind that the last proposal on this site was very contemporary as well and the commission was comfortable with it.) (Mr. Kulick: We felt that we should note the design standards in the staff report and point analysis so there was a precedent cited for not meeting those standards.)

Mr. Thaemert Presented:

To touch on some of those items; we feel the site is a transition zone. The previous design for this site was contemporary and the commission was positive toward it; that's why we did it that way. There are some natural materials on the building although not substantial. We increased the landscaping in a subsequent revision. I appreciate your consideration.

Ms. Dudney: You'd like to see the -2 points removed for more landscaping in the future? (Mr. Thaemert: Yes)

The hearing was opened to public comment: No comments and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Schroder: In Steamboat Springs there are a number of buildings that are brightly colored. I was concerned about this project heading this way. I thought we were deviating a great deal but when I got to the colors in the packet I was positively refreshed.

Mr. Lamb: There are a lot of non-natural materials but it is consistent with the neighborhood look. This would never fly in the Historic district but it fits perfectly out there. It's nice to see some differences. I'm glad the building height is as it is, because the area becomes a lake in the spring. The trees, I always like more vegetation. I think extending the internal sidewalks to the bus stop is a great idea. I think the point analysis is spot on.

Ms. Dudney: The positive points under Policy 24/R for Council Goals are warranted because workforce housing is so important. We need the housing. I think it's a great project and I like the contemporary look. Many single family homes are moving to this look as well.

Mr. Schuman: The -2 points are warranted under 22/R. I do support the staff recommendation concerning the walkways. The preliminary point analysis I support. I don't necessarily agree that more landscaping is better. I do think this is a good use of the Town Council goals for more workforce housing.

Mr. Giller: Number one yes, a small hit for small trees. 2, 3 Agree. 4, it's a good project.

Mr. Schroder: Trees yes, walkways I like the comment about waiting to see where residents are walking. The West edge of the south building would need a walk around. The point analysis is good and I concur that it's a nice project and fits in the district that it's in. I think it's adding flavor to our town.

Mr. Gerard: I agree with -2 points for landscaping. I think you need to connect the walkways to the external sidewalks because the tenants will create trails. I agree with the point analysis. I think the building looks a lot like the iron works building and it's continuing a look that's already there. Gretchen's observations are correct and the look of homes is going toward a more contemporary look. Meets the need and looks good.

Ms. Leidal: Good looking project. I agree with point analysis. I also agree to connect the sidewalks to the street. Good project and looking forward to seeing the final.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Resolution Amending the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure

Ms. Puester reviewed the resolution, regarding two changes: The first is regarding Rule 5.1 regarding the date, time and place of the meeting. This allows the Planning Commission to reschedule a meeting with one vote versus doing two separate motions. The second change is to Rule 29, Continuance of a Hearing, in order to clarify what "good cause for continuance" means. It also allows to continue the hearing prior to the

meeting date.

Ms. Leidal: I think the changes are good and make sense.

Opened for public comment: No comments.

Mr. Giller made a motion to approve Resolution 1, Series 2018, a Resolution Amending the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure. Seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Town Council Summary

Ms. Puester: At the Block 11 Work Session Council gave direction to remove the community center and replace it with micro units in the plans. The open staircase that staff and some Commissioners had concerns about was given a head nod to remain open.

Ms. Dudney: What's the school that's mentioned for McCain? (Mr. Truckey: We are doing a land swap with the school district where they receive a parcel on McCain as a potential school site and the Town receives land just north of Upper Blue Elementary.)

Mr. Schuman: What kind of micro units on Block 11?

Mr. Giller: What's the size of a micro unit? (Ms. Puester: They are working on the plans now, likely 350-400 square feet.)

Mr. Gerard: I recall the architect saying they would get at least 8 more micro units. (Mr. Grosshuesch: There's code issues with enclosing the hallways they are still working on.)

Ms. Dudney: Is a micro unit smaller than a studio? (Ms. Puester: Yes.) Aren't they doing micro units in Frisco? (Ms. Puester: Yes but they are not deed restricted.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:24 pm.

Christie Mathews-Leidal, Chair