

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:36 p.m. by Chair Giller.

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal - tardy
Mike Giller - present
Dan Schroder - present

Jim Lamb - present
Steve Gerard- present
Lowell Moore- present

Ron Schuman- present

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the February 19, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 5, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments were received from the public.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Dahman Garage and Accessory Apartment (CL), 129 Klack Rd, PL-2019-0025.

Chapin LaChance, Planner II, presented to the Commission an additional Finding regarding Policy 28 (Absolute) Utilities and the requirement for placement of utility lines underground. With no call ups, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

TOWN PROJECT HEARINGS:

1. Breck 365 Apartments, 365 Floradora Drive,

Mr. Lott, Planner II presented a proposal to construct 102 workforce rental apartment units in eleven buildings, a neighborhood community center with a leasing office, and associated parking on approximately 5.3 acres south of the Blue 52 neighborhood on the Block 11 parcel with access from Floradora Drive.

Peter Grosshuesch, Director of Comm. Dev., commented that there has been a recent change in the expected project regarding pricing, which may affect whether or not the project is constructed as modular vs. stick-built.

Commissioner Questions:

Mr. Lamb: If it is modular, does it have to meet Town Building Code snow load requirements, or are these subject to Federal snow load requirements? (Ms. Best, Senior Planner: yes, they will be built to local Building Code snow load requirements).

Mr. Giller: Would it be the same architect? (Ms. Best: Not sure. By having entitlements in place that allows us to submit for Xcel Permits while we work through the design changes). OK.

Mr. Schroder: My one overarching concern was about snow-storage. How do we manage non-functional snow-storage? If we have an excess amount of parking spaces, do we use those? (Mr. Lott: I would imagine that would be happen.) Mr. Komppa with Corum Real Estate is here and can answer questions. (Mr. Kulick, Planner III: Sometimes you have to get more specialized equipment that may increase annual costs. We do get into scenarios like this week where we are maxed out. We saw this with the Broken Compass application where their site plan provided a large snow storage area that was not functional).

Mr. Lamb: I am ok with it, because during heavy snow events, they will lose parking spaces, but they are over on their parking so I think they can make it work.

Mr. Moore: Will it be assigned parking? (Ms. Best: No)

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: Is the smart-siding a composite material? (Ms. Best: Yes, it is an engineered wood siding.) I like the texture, it looks good. Also, I saw lighting on the landscape plan. Does that meet our lighting requirements of the Code? (Mr. Lott: There was not a detail provided, but I can look into it.) Lindsey Newman with Norris Design: They have caps on them so the lighting is fully shielded and downcast.) Could these buildings grow a little bit in height due to the foundation walls? (Mr. Komppa: Our intention is to make those board form concrete or extend the siding in any areas where this would occur). OK, why is it needed? (Mr. Komppa: with the modular construction, they require a crawl-space.) OK, thank you. Where is the flagstone? (Lindsey Newman with Norris Design: located at the sport court and the benches to create a seating area, and acts as a pathway through to the community gardens. We have the flagstone located in a few locations where there will be enough traffic to necessitate a hard surface.)

Mr. Gerard: I know where the rec path is, but it is not marked in any of these drawings. (Mr. Lott explained where the rec path is.) And then the wide sidewalk, that is located along the east side of Flora Dora, correct? Since the rec path is getting positive points, it should be called out on the site plan. (Mr. Lott: OK, note taken.)

Mr. Schuman: Are you concerned about the management of the snow storage? (Mr. Komppa: Absolutely, we are considering revising the plans regarding the shed and to work with Public Works to come up with answers for the snow storage. We recognize that it is less than ideal and we are working on creative solutions. We can dump snow in several locations on site.) (Mr. Lott explained other possible solutions to the snow storage issue that could be reviewed as a future plan modification.)

Mr. Moore: What are we looking at tonight, if you come back and stick build the whole thing, would everything remain the same? (Mr. Grosshuesch.: The stick built version would have a slightly different configuration. The building footprints are a little bit bigger. We would have to do all the different calculations. The roofs would be different. (Ms. Best: the roofs would be higher on the modular style because of the crawl space. Our plan is to return to you if we revert to stick built and it necessitates a lot changes to the plan. (Mr. Grosshuesch: keep in mind that the first time the Commission saw this, the plan was for it to be stick built. The pricing info is less than a week old. We wanted to get these entitlements through the Planning Commission so the Council can decide on it. We want you to consider this as a modular project.) (Mr. Komppa: The site plan will remain relatively similar in regards to building massing.)

Mr. Giller opened the Hearing for public comment. No members of the public commented.

Commissioner Comments:

Mr. Lamb: I think it looks good. I am not concerned with snow loading. I think you can make the snow storage work. It sounds like this is still being massaged, but I would encourage you to make the snow storage work as best as possible. I like the more contemporary architecture. I support the point analysis.

Mr. Gerard: I asked Jeremy to discuss the height of the project vs. Blue 52 because there was a public comment at the last Hearing regarding concern for the height. Everybody has had a chance to look at Blue 52 and it does not block any views. I think the rec. path should be called-out on the plans, and it is a logical way for those who will live here to commute. Not sure how many bike racks you need. Concern for dedicated place for dockless bikes. I don't know who is going to park an expensive bike outside. A dog park would be great addition. Parking excess will absorb snow storage issues. My guess is tenants will fill up all those spots. I like building in the metal panels which will conceal outdoor clutter from long term local tenants. I think the project looks really nice. I think it will be a good addition of rental workforce housing and agree with point analysis.

Mr. Schroder: I believe architecture and materials meet our code. Agree with snow storage areas and how specialized equipment may be necessary. I do support point analysis and support approving this project.

Ms. Mathews-Leidal: I support point analysis. I think the project is too dense and too dissimilar to Blue 52 in the vision plan that is called out. I agree with staffs analysis regarding snow storage. Suggestion regarding

relocation of courts and privacy for back decks of units.

Mr. Schuman: I don't have any concerns about architecture, detail or colors. I agree with staff interpretation about snow storage, but disagree with Mr. Lamb about snow storage. I think even in an easy snow year, it is going to be a challenge. I think we are setting the operator up for failure. I think this project is not ready for us to review. Too much program on the site. I don't think we should be looking at it right now. If it wasn't for the points for meeting a Town Council Goal and providing employee housing, the project would be failing the point analysis. There are so many unknowns that we are trying to correct on the fly. I would love to see it come back in a much better format.

Mr. Moore: That is my concern as well. I do understand that we are approving this as compatible, relating to our Code. I do consider Policy 5 to be important. I agree that it would be a failing point analysis if it were not for workforce housing. I agree with the point analysis as presented by staff. I agree with staff's interpretation regarding snow storage, with the caveat that we are expecting that to work because of excess parking. I agree with the point analysis.

Mr. Giller: I think the architecture needs improvement. Because it is modular, we have a lot of applied balconies and applied stairs, things like that. Balconies provide screening for clutter. I don't think this project is compatible with the Breckenridge vernacular. At the end of the last presentation, the architect said they designed the Aspen project that the Commission toured. I think we all remember the visual clutter that we saw in carports, porches, etc. at that project because of the lack of sufficient space for storage. I don't think that Aspen design was that successful. If you go to a gable roof, you can still have contemporary architecture and gable roofs and that is way more compatible to Breckenridge. The windows have improved now that they are double hung. If you do go to a different architect, I think you should be more compatible with Blue 52. You can still do that in a way that is contemporary. The massing and the colors and the stairs and decks could be more compatible to the Breckenridge vernacular. You should make snow storage work. You will spend a lot of money and go through a lot of trouble if you don't. I agree with the overall point analysis. Finally, minus 19 points suggests this project has problems. Workforce housing is important. I would like to see this project improved.

Mr. Gerard: The problem is that we are trying to move the project forward for infrastructure reasons with a blind eye, but the modifications may come back to us. (Mr. Grosshuesch.: The modification will be presented to you, and if you think the point analysis needs to be changed, you should change it. The Council wants to see which policies the project has an issue with.)

Mr. Lamb: I would be good with sending it to the Council, because they will see the issues we point out. (Mr. Kulick: They are already getting the maximum, negative six points, under Policy 5 Architecture.)

Mr. Schuman: All the negative points are warranted. I would love to change the point analysis, but I don't want to interfere with entitlements or slow the process down. I am confident that staff is going to bring this back to us (if it changes) that is a more acceptable solution. (Mr. Grosshuesch: It is important to note that the project has the 19 positive points available to it. Employee housing is important to the Town). There are 16 free points there. It meets a passing point score, so I am going to vote for it, but it doesn't mean I like it.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Schroder. Mr. Giller, Mr. Moore, and Ms. Mathews-Leidal dissented (voted "No"). There was a procedural discussion about whether or not the Commissioners could vote no on the application without modifying the point analysis. Mr. Lamb then withdrew the motion and Mr. Schroder withdrew his second before the remaining Commissioners voted, so the motion did not pass.

Mr. Giller: I think the concern on the point analysis is the architectural compatibility, and it is already at the

maximum minus 6 points. It is further confusing that this may not be a modular project ultimately.

Mr. Grosshuesch: If it does get redesigned, the staff will have to evaluate the Development Permit classification and whether or not it is reviewed at staff level or goes back to the Commission. Right now, what we have is a modular project. We have a plan that we have to evaluate against the code, (you are not charged with considering) the business plan.

Mr. Schuman: We have all the information we need to make a decision. Unless we change the point analysis, it passes. I am not going to change anything. I agree with the point analysis.

Mr. Grosshuesch: It is already getting negative points for snow storage.

Mr. Giller: Does any Commissioner have any comment or questions on the point analysis?

Mr. Schuman: I think the point analysis is accurate.

Mr. Schroder: All the policies are presented clearly with the points allocated as they ought to be, from my perspective. They are offset by positive points earned and passes with zero.

Mr. Moore: I agree.

Mr. Lamb made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Schroder. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only) Mr. Gerard asked about the Blue 52 Townhomes that will be deeded back to the Town. (Ms. Best, Senior Planner: Two of the units are owned by the school district in exchange for the parcel on Block 11.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:39 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair