

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Giller.

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal
Mike Giller
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb
Steve Gerard
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman—arrived at 5:52

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the January 2, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Julia requested adding one item regarding the second April PC meeting and PC agreed. With no other changes, the January 15, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Village at Breckenridge Plaza Art (CL), 655 S. Park Ave, PL-2018-0609

With no call ups, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Sign Code

Ms. Puester presented an overview of proposed code modifications in regards to signage on private property. A recent Supreme Court decision has prompted municipalities across the country to rewrite their sign code to eliminate content related references, and staff has been working with the Town Attorney to make modifications that keep key concepts similar to what exists today rather than making substantive changes to a Sign Code that staff believes is generally working well for the community and for property owners. The memo points out the primary changes. Ms. Puester reviewed the primary changes with the Commission, and asked for comments and questions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: The renderings are a great addition. Helps explain signs well.

Mr. Giller: Real estate signs state owner or licensed agent or property owner. Add property management company.

Mr. Gerard: Prohibited signs, balloons are often used to mark an event, what is intent? Will this be an issue with weddings? (Ms. Puester: It is geared toward a commercial transaction; businesses. You need a permit for a permanent sign rather than balloons out at your business every weekend for example as an attention getting device.) Balloons at a storefront are not necessary. Signs on private property regulating actions in ROW? (Ms. Puester: That is proposed as prohibited. It is a new item.) So you couldn't have a sign that says no parking in the right of way? That is good to have in here. In the section for parked vehicles not to be used as signs, should say something about delivery vehicles being exempt. (Ms. Puester: Can add that. This is not intended to regulate delivery vehicles or if your home or office personal vehicles is parked at your home at night with your business

name wrapped on it.)
Mr. Lamb: Santa on Fatty's ok? (Ms. Puester: That falls under holiday decorations.)
Ms. Leidal: I thought it was very well done, thank you.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. East Peak 8 Hotel, 1599 Ski Hill Rd, PL-2018-0576

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a hotel and condominium project consisting of 58 for sale condominiums and a four star, 137 guest room hotel. The project also includes amenity spaces, back of house support spaces, common areas, a restaurant, bar, commercial kitchen, pool and spa, ski lockers, and outdoor dining and seating. The PC reviewed a conceptual fit test for this project last summer, prior to approval of Development Agreement by the Town Council.

Per master plan, ends of Peak 8 site should be smaller than buildings to the middle. Overall density of this structure is more than Ski Hill Place. However, the East Peak 8 Hotel is broken into three different modules, none of which is as large than Ski Hill Place. Staff requests PC input if they agree with staff interpretation.

View corridors shown and we believe it meets the intent of the master plan.

Building height: 62 feet allowed from finished grade. Finished grade has been determined and noted in staff report. 73' 10" proposed and warrants -10 points per code because more than 1/2 story above recommended but less than one story higher than Code. Staff looking for PC input on whether they agree with the height measurement methodology.

Master plan requires buildings on the edges to be subordinate in height to One Ski Hill Place, the middle building in master plan. In the development agreement the applicants agreed to not exceed USGS height of the east cross gable of One Ski Hill Place building.

Longest unbroken ridgeline exceeds 50' and thus warrants -1 point under Policy 6/R.

The project steps down nicely on east adjacent to the Four O'clock neighborhood and on the north side by Ski Hill Road. However, the building does not step down on the west adjacent to One Ski Hill Place so no positive or negative points are recommended.

Buffering: Most sides have good landscaping and buffering. However, western elevation adjacent to One Ski Hill Place has little buffering and so we recommend -4 points under Policy 7/R.

Retaining walls: 10 over 4' tall so -4 points recommended, one is 19 feet tall along the right of way. Total -8 under Policy 7R.

39,000 sq. ft. snowmelt so -3 points is the maximum point allocation here.

Trash incorporated into principal structure, +1 points.

Circulation: No access off Sawmill Road, which will reduce traffic in that neighborhood. Two entrances off Ski Hill Road. One for guests and one for delivery and loading on west. Skier access easement is provided for neighbors between main bldg. and townhomes. +3 points recommended under Policy 16/R for providing public access.

Parking: A surplus of parking is provided on site. Applicant responded to the Town Council's desire for more parking. Hotel includes a large restaurant and bar and parking meets this and beyond. Altogether, they have a surplus of 242 spaces over what's required per the master plan. Two competing goals: discourage traffic on

Ski Hill Road but also provide adequate parking. We feel they cancel out and thus no positive or negative points are recommended for excess parking under Policy 16/R.

Open space provided exceeds the Code requirements of Policy 21/R.

Landscaping: 140 Evergreens and 180 deciduous trees. Good job buffering along all property sides except to the west. Would like PC input on whether this landscaping plan deserves +2 points under Policy 22/R for an above average landscaping plan.

Policy 24R: Employee housing is beyond 10% and should be awarded +10 points. Over 20,000 sq. ft. of amenities provided so +6 points recommended.

25R: shuttle service will guaranteed in perpetuity via a covenant so +4 points recommended.

33R all walkways and driveways are snow melted so -3 points are warranted. Also, the project proposes 3 outdoor fire pits so -1 point for each. Total of -6 points are recommended under Policy 33R.

Overall preliminary point analysis +5 (+30 points and -25 points) We have some questions at the end of the report for the Commission:

1. Does the Commission believe the design, which breaks the project up into 3 modules, meets the intent of the Development Plan of the Peak 8 Base section of the Master Plan as it relates to density and the Plan Components section of the Peak 8 Base section of the Master Plan as it relates to view corridors?
2. Does the Commission agree with the height measurement methodology and analysis?
3. Does the Commission have any initial comments pertaining to architecture?
4. Would the Commission support awarding positive two (+2) points for providing significant onsite parking beyond the required minimum?
5. Does the Commission support awarding positive two (+2) points for providing above average landscaping?
6. Does the Commission agree with the remaining points in the Preliminary Point Analysis?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: Landscaping is in the tight area next to One Ski Hill Place? (Mr. Kulick: Yes.)

Ms. Leidal: You mentioned that additional shuttles required if ADT exceeds 1,600. How will it be counted? (Mr. Kulick: There will be counters on the garage doors.) Is proposed easement just for Four O'clock people or is it public? In the past we've awarded positive points for public easements. (Mr. Kulick: Need to look into it a little further. Yes, should only be positive points if public.)

Mr. Gerard: The easements should be shown on drawings. The one that abuts the development in Four O'Clock subdivision should be looked into further. (Mr. Kulick: We will make sure they are shown on the plans next time and it is clear who is entitled to access.)

Mr. Giller: December meeting talked about architecture a lot when we approved removing "rustic" from the master plan and changed to "transitional (between rustic and contemporary)". Then we stressed that this should not be contemporary as it is shown here. (Mr. Kulick: Found the design to be transitional since it utilizes natural materials found in rustic designs such as stone bases, gabled roof forms, natural stained wood. Some traditional elements but more modern take on them.) Mr. Giller: I think the proportions are very contemporary, large masses of glass under gables and the forms. No information on the materials so hard to tell there. (Mr. Kulick: This is similar to what they presented to the Town Council during the development agreement process.)

Mike Dudick, Applicant, presented:

First, I wanted to thank the staff for a great job. We started in fall 2017 and went through long process; March of last year we couldn't get a vote on the development agreement. With revisions, we received a 7-0 vote from Council. Did the fit test with Planning Commission on 58 additional units. Then received a development agreement with Council. We will have 137 keys for a 4-Star hotel, and about 50 condos that will have lock off units with them. The lock offs will be appointed similar to hotel rooms. There are a lot of economic benefits associated with this development agreement. For workforce housing, 20,000 sq. ft. will be deed restricted, and we are committed to new housing projects across from the distillery, which includes another 48 beds beyond the 20,000 sq. ft. that are net new to the community. The BOEC will get 1,500 square feet and have the ability to move vans into building and then take elevators to get directly to the snow. Compared to what they have to do today, this is easy access. Cucumber Gulch; \$125,000 cash at CO of the building and \$2 per paid guest night will go to preservation of the Gulch. We did a voluntary restriction on the height, which I don't know if it's ever been done before. One thing from the Fit Test was for us to work with neighbors. They have ski access, and we've also abandoned Sawmill Run Road. It's been a problem for neighbors for decades because access to the Admin building has been through the residential neighborhood. Hardscape needed on west side for deliveries and trash, so no delivery needed on Sawmill. Ski easement is for perpetual access for neighbors to get from the ski resort to their neighborhood.

Traffic safeguards were a big deal when we did the development agreement. There will be laser trip counters in and out of the garage. We needed to install the counters inside the garage because we can't control what's happening outside the building. We plan to be at less than 2 vehicular trips per day per vehicle. Guests will use shuttle and leave rental cars parked for the day. And the project is well in excess of the required parking.

Sarah Broughton, Architect, Presented:

The architecture is inspired by history and place, and also in response to the master plan, Breckenridge, and Peak 8. Camps and mining era buildings that talked to clustering of different scale buildings with varying roofs and roof forms. Also iconic alpine architecture that has evolved into transitional mountain style, bridges between traditional and modern. Natural materials; stone and wood, that is warm and aesthetically pleasing. We have Grand Colorado on one end, and One Ski Hill Place, so bookending should be transitional. We had multiple community outreach meetings. Very lively. Some of the main feedback we heard was an overall thanks for being transparent and including people in process. There was a lot of positive feedback on the architecture. Concerns were mainly traffic, and that was addressed in development agreement.

Mr. Dudick:

These were open houses for the community. We feel that this process has been the most complete out of all the building processes. The view corridors; PC saw red arrows (Mr. Dudick pointed out on plans) and they are maintained today. Showed elevations with floors that were eliminated before they ever came to PC to help with stepping down of roof forms. Extensive landscaping proposed around buildings. Breaking up of building mass, it's shown in 3 pods. In aggregate this project is larger than One Ski Hill Place but no individual pod is larger than One Ski Hill Place. Architecture: in their view it's moving to less rustic than One Ski Hill Place to transition out of rustic. We are here to listen to what you have and react in the next drawings.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: Is it a public deck? (Mr. Dudick: Yes with a restaurant open to the public.)
- Mr. Schuman: Do you have panoramic photo/view of this building in comparison to the BGV buildings and One Ski Hill Place-long street view? (Mr. Dudick: No, but will bring it back to next meeting. The goal is to get design elements to work for next meeting. Want to get what this body wants.)
- Mr. Giller: Would you consider different types of railing and materials? (Mr. Dudick: Yes want to get there. We need to determine it's not contemporary.)

Public Comment:

Richard Himmelstein, I have a house at 19 Peak 8 Court and a condo at One Ski Hill Place. I just had some comments. I guess some of my biggest concerns are the truck loading. Right now if you really look at how One Ski Hill access is, it's got an arc to it, and it's really difficult for truck drivers to line up, especially new truck drivers, and sometimes doing it multiple times creates a real traffic jam, and when I look at their loading docks coming in, you've got the arc of Ski Hill Road, and they've got an arc proposed here in their driveway, and I think it's going to be a problem so I just wanted to mention that issue. A couple of other issues I want to mention; I strongly recommend that we really get sidewalk circulation in the plan; I was really disappointed with Grand Colorado 1 and 2 because there's no sidewalk installed along Ski Watch Drive, and Ski Watch Drive is quite steep, and usually snow packed, and lots of people are walking along that road; not only people from the gondola but to Ski Watch Condos; Ski Watch Condos has a lot of tenants and also Grand Colorado has a lot of dog walkers and they're all on that road. Sooner or later someone is going to get injured. Another issue I wanted to mention is that there's a lot of dog waste. And I know everyone cares about Cucumber Gulch but I just think that it's another thing you guys should focus on in Planning at this point is sidewalk circulation and also dog waste because, especially time share owners, they don't seem to pick it up. I believe the Planning department said this building measures out at 72 ft. and I believe the staff report for One Ski Hill including the cupola was at 76 feet so I'm really kind of surprised that the building steps down that much from the cupola if there's only a 4 foot difference. One of my biggest issues, and I've brought it before planning before and I've wrote a letter to the mayor and Town Council, is traffic. Our traffic has gotten terrible on Ski Hill road, the past high season traffic was backed up to the Nordic Center all the way down to Park Avenue and that's before the 804 building, or what the Grand Colorado calls their number three building, even opens. And when I see how much density is being put on this site, I think we really need to figure out the infrastructure because it's really become a nightmare. One other thing I wanted to mention is the Master Plan shows this site as 3 much smaller buildings than One Ski Hill Place, and it shows those buildings as 35 feet in height and this is obviously significantly larger. One other thing on the Master Plan is it does show an entry sign, "Welcome to the Base of Peak 8", and wanted to see if that could be incorporated into this plan at this time as well. Does anyone have any questions for me? Thank you.

Jane Hamilton, I am one of the neighbors: If the restaurant is open to public, are you also opening the spa and the workout facility to the public? (Mr. Dudick: The spa.) Just personally, I've had the opportunity to meet with BGV, specifically Mike and Graham, on several occasions and they've been a delight to work with. I'm just one neighbor, so I'll speak for myself, that they've been great to work with.

Steven Kneller, property owner at Crystal Peak lodge on Peak 7 and HOA board member, and a former owner at One Ski Hill Place. I've known Graham and some of these folks for quite some time. I commend them for the work they've done on this project. It's pretty remarkable to see it coming together. But I do echo Richard's concern about traffic and loading on Ski Hill Road. I know that's not Planning Commission directly, but the number of times coming up that road and encountering significant traffic, trucks trying to back into those driveways, the construction sites, everything else, trying to get into Crystal Peak; I wonder if there's anything that can be done through you folks or Town Council to try to address the traffic flow. I know they're working on shuttle busses to bring guests up and down during peak times but I know some of the busses from Crystal Peak take a long time to get down into town which is going to discourage people from using them. Ski Hill Road being a fairly narrow, two lane road, and a lot of truck traffic deliveries being brought up there creates an ongoing problem that is not going to get any better with this development, particularly during the construction period but even post-construction with deliveries being brought up for the large restaurants and everything else. Again, I don't know what can be done; there's not much room to put in a turning lane or anything like that there, I think when you're addressing the design for that access point, careful consideration for how those trucks are going to get in and out of there and make the turn to come back down, they need a little room. In the drawings, I'm not sure you've really got enough room there right now and I think that needs to be looked into very hard. Because there's times coming up that hill where you just

want to turn around and leave.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Ms. Leidal: Is a sidewalk required along Ski Hill Road in the master plan? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, it is required so no points are awarded.) Would a turning radius template help demonstrate if turn from Ski Hill Road can work? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, we'll check with Engineering.) Was there traffic study done? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, an intense study was done early on during the development agreement phase.) (Ms. Puester: Graham, was the additional parking now being proposed since then figured into that original traffic study?) (Mr. Graham Frank: The study considered all density in the master plan, proposed additional density and build out along Ski Hill Road.)
- Mr. Lamb: I like this a lot better than what we saw a year ago. Project broken up well into modules and meets master plan. Height measurement methodology is fine. Architecture, concerned but like it, railings and guard rails, need more details. We'll take a good look at next meeting. Kind of like the transition they are doing. Look at more details next meeting. Supports +2 points for parking and +2 landscaping but is so close to One Ski Hill Place it's more important to buffer on other areas and support +2. It has come a long way. Question 6, yes.
- Mr. Schroder: Yes, the design breaks into modules. Intent of master plan met by smaller modules. View corridors maintained for most part. One arrow overlapped roof at OSHP. Height measurement seems appropriate. Architecture, sees Breck forms to some degree but I like the transition. Parking, more parking is better. Smart strategic move and support +2. Landscaping, had to be toned down based on not in ROW support +2 in right places. I agree with the prelim point analysis.
- Ms. Leidal: Thanks for changes to plans. I appreciate you working with the 4 O'Clock subdivision and abandoning access from Sawmill Road. See density (modules) as two not three. Do not agree that it meets the view corridors. Now we have two modules because it's all connected. Used to be layers to look through to 4 O'Clock. I agree with the height analysis. Architecture, will need further discussion on. Same palate of materials and transition from what is out there now. Don't think it meets intent of master plan language of transitional. Show us streetscape view from Ski Hill Road mentioned by the other Commissioners. Not sure building has sense of place here in Breck. I look forward to more information. Onsite parking, not supportive of points, concerned about providing more parking up at the base. Aspen is trying to get rid of parking because it's too much. In conflict with the master plan. 200 extra spaces seems excessive. Maybe 50 extra would be ok. Landscaping, understand the loading but should provide a variety of heights not all 8' tall have some 10' and 12' to show some depth and would then consider some positive points. Also not sure positive points under 16 R for easement—needs to be public.
- Mr. Gerard: This is a tremendous improvement. The project has one big module and one little module which affects view corridors and size. Concerned. Concern that roof height has a 1/8 inch difference from max height per the Development Agreement. Couldn't we get a foot difference at least? Agrees with how height is measured. Architecture, it's interesting but too much glazing and frontage of glass, too reflective up there. Lots of modern features right now but we'll see how this progresses. Parking, do we need excessive parking up there? Traffic concern. Maybe better downtown. What's point of 200 extra parking spaces you are not going to need? Not sure on positive points for that. Landscaping fine +2 good. 4 O'Clock easement, yes it needs to be a public easement, need more information. 5' not wide enough could be chokepoint. Moving in right direction.
- Mr. Moore: Modules meet intent of master plan. View corridors—hard to build this size. Height, inch and 1/8 interesting to live with but ok. Architecture, the way it looks now like it stands alone, highly out of place. They should transition better. Parking, no problem with +2

- points. Exceeded the minimum. Landscaping with the footprints of project +2 is appropriate. Point analysis is close and support it.
- Mr. Schuman: Is broken up into 3 modules. Not really any view corridors, buildings are much higher than original 35' since the master plan so the view corridors are not there. Agrees with height measurement calculation. Staff should confirm that measurements are in comparison to One Ski Hill Place as mentioned by Mr. Himmelstien. Highest point of biggest building is only 4' higher sounds a bit silly. Architecture, beautiful on its own but wants to see streetscape and how it relates to the others up there. It is dissimilar enough to recommend negative points under 5R. Parking, could support +2 points. You're going to be reservoir for other owners and skiers needing parking. Landscaping, average job, maybe could warm up to +2 points down road as this plan develops further. Rest of points agree with. If trucks have to come up ramp with multiple deliveries at time that could be problem. Its already a problem at Buildings 1 and 2 up there. One connection to think about is to the gondola; that was what it was intended for.
- Mr. Giller: Thank you. You've worked hard on this since we saw it last. Peak 8 is special and has high quality work and want to finish it out the same. Thinks this is only 2 modules. Support height methodology. Architecture, it's contemporary and not the transition we talked about at December meeting and not like rest of Peak 8. Don't think contemporary design meets 5A or what Graham represented to us at the master plan modification in December when we allowed it to go from rustic to transitional (between rustic and contemporary). Architect could redesign to make it happen. Nothing says we can approve contemporary design and cannot approve. Parking would award +2 points. Landscaping would support +2. Agree with points analysis. Look forward with resubmittal and like you want to finish Peak 8 in high quality manner.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)
Code changes approved. Great job Mark and staff.
2. Date Change for First Meeting in February
Mr. Schroder made a motion to move the first February meeting from February 5th to January 29th; seconded by Mr. Schuman. The motion passed 7-0.
3. April 16 meeting conflicts with spring break. Proposes moving to Wednesday, April 10.
Mr. Schroder made a motion to move the April 16th meeting to April 10th; seconded by Ms. Leidal. The motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair