

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:41 p.m. by Chair Giller.

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal
Mike Giller
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb
Steve Gerard
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the March 5, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 19, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Village at Breckenridge Master Plan Amendment and Lobby Conversions (CL), 535, 555, 655 S. Park Ave, PL-2019-0021. Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to convert a portion of the Antero Building (Plaza 1) residential condominium lobby and the Shavano Building (Plaza 2) residential condominium lobby into commercial use, for the expansion of the existing adjacent commercial uses into the lobbies. The Antero Building lobby is proposed to be reduced by 371 sq. ft., and the Shavano Building lobby is proposed to be reduced by 337 sq. ft. The applicant proposes that the HOA will retain ownership of the converted lobby spaces as General Common Elements. The HOA also proposes to transfer density for one (1) existing 100 sq. ft. Large Vendor Cart and one (1) future 100 sq. ft. Large Vendor Cart, for a total of four (4) Large Vendor Carts.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Gerard: I am trying to wrap my mind around the parking issue. I understand the parking requirement for the Vendor Carts that we previously approved, and can see the math as to how the parking requirement for this project can be rolled into the Vendor Cart's parking requirement to result in a total of one required space. I can't see where the other fourth will go, if there is a deficit of parking on site. (Mr. LaChance: You are correct, any future fourth Vendor Cart would be required to have onsite parking spaces available to be approved, which the Village currently does not have. When we processed recent Development Permit applications for the Village in 2018, such as the Large Vendor Carts and the Chateaux Building change of use, we did not look at the parking requirements for the entire Village HOA-owned properties. The Chateaux Building actually had a surplus of parking available in the garage directly beneath the building because we were just looking at the Chateaux site, so we approved the change of use for that building and the increase in the parking requirement. For the three Vendor Carts that were also approved in 2018, we used the surplus of parking available under the Chateaux Building to approve the Vendor Carts. Any future project within the Village would require the Village to address the non-conforming parking situation.) So we're going another parking space in the hole? (Mr. LaChance: We are being consistent by using the same methodology for this application that we have used for recent projects within the Village, but we have required the applicant to state the existing and required parking on the proposed Master Plan matrix, so that it is very clear for any future applications that the Village is non-conforming in

terms of parking. A Finding regarding the non-conforming parking situation has also been added to the Findings and Conditions of Approval in your packet.)

Mr. Schuman: Are the property owners for the other lots within the Master Plan informed and supportive of it the application (Mr. LaChance: Vail Resorts, you mean?) Yes (We have not received any public comment regarding this application. We provided public notice pursuant to the requirements for a Class A Application, but have not received comments.)

Mr. Schuman: Let's say the property owners of Lot 3, 4, 5 want to change the density in the Master Plan for their properties, will this limit their ability to do so (Mr. LaChance: No. The Village HOA can't touch the Vail Resorts property's density and Vail Resorts can't touch the Village HOA's property density, unless agreed upon in writing.)

Nathan Nosari, General Manger for Village at Breckenridge HOA: We currently only have plans to convert the Shavano lobby. The adjacent Christie Sports is taking over the 300 square feet. We aren't adding new tenants just, expanding commercial into the lobby. We will also have private ski lockers for guests in the converted space.

Mr. Gerard: Will the commercial space have access into lobby? (Mr. Nosari: No, because it would be two points of entry for Christie Sports and they don't want that. We would be using that space for ski storage and lockers for tenants.)

Mr. Schuman: I think it is good use of space.

Mr. Lamb: Agree.

Mr. Moore: Agree. Just shifting space.

Mr. Schroder: Agree.

Ms. Leidal: Agree with staff analysis.

Mr. Gerard: I think the project is very straight forward and a good use of space. I think saying that the applicant is meeting the parking requirement is making a bad situation worse, where we already have a deficit and making more of a deficit. This is creating space that wasn't space before. The rest of the project is fine.

Mr. Giller: I agree with staff analysis.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Lamb. The motion passed 7-0.

2. Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3 Employee Housing Change (CK), 1595 Ski Hill Rd, PL-2019-0031. Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to change the approved point analysis for PL-2015-0215 by eliminating 3,500 sq. ft. of deed restricted employee housing associated with the Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3, a 105 unit interval ownership resort condominium at the base of Peak 8 Ski Area currently under construction.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Gerard: Does the development agreement make any reference to this? (Mr. Kulick: The Development Agreement for this specific project does not address housing.)

Graham Frank, Breckenridge Grand Vacations:

As a point of clarity, one of the questions is why are we removing this housing. The reason being, is since its inception we partnered with Kenny Thaemert to build a 32 unit housing project on Airport Road. So we will be housing BGV employees in those buildings. So it isn't just us saying we have a passing points analysis. We will be utilizing housing elsewhere.

Public Comment:

Richard Himmelstein, (19 Peak 8 Ct.): I have two properties on Peak 8. I object to the change to remove housing. At One Ski Hill Place we have been struggling getting employee housing and I also know there's been a lot of shared workforce with the Grand Lodge up there, and this would impact housing even more. We're already short of employees due to housing. Disagree that this is the only change. Negative ten points being taken, I believe the Grand Colorado does not meet the Master Plan and does not meet height

requirements. I've personally waived my rights to sue over this but there are others that can. There was an agreement I signed with the developer and I cannot sue the town. But I know more people could bring it up. It's not just the negative 10 points for the housing but the height of the building.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: That point analysis is what drives the commission's decision and point analysis still passes at zero so I support as presented.

Ms. Leidal: Agree.

Mr. Gerard: My only concern was whether the development agreement may have impacted workforce housing. I agree with the staff analysis. They already took negative points for height. This passes the point analysis and I believe that they have put a bonus in the community with the Airport Road housing.

Mr. Lamb: We already discussed height. It passes the point analysis and I support.

Mr. Schuman: Thank you for explaining the housing Mr. Frank. It passes point analysis, so I support.

Mr. Moore: I agree with everything so far. Point analysis passes. I agree with staff analysis and other Commissioners.

Mr. Giller: I do agree and appreciate you pointing out additional housing.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Gerard. The motion passed 7-0.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

Ms. Leidal: 2nd reading when does Historic District moratorium become effective? (Mr. Grosshuesch: it will be an emergency ordinance so it will be effective immediately.) Did you get any specific feedback regarding the proposed standards? (Ms. Puester: The Council does not want to allow parking in the front.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: We talked about it more at staff saying that surveys were coming back with that problem and, with all due respect to the Planning Commission, we recommended an absolute policy not allowing front yard parking to the Council.) And they supported? (Mr. Grosshuesch: They did.) Our development code changes went into effect February 12. If we're still seeing projects submitted before the date, will you let us know when any projects come in with new codes? (Ms. Puester: We're using the new codes except for a couple historic sites that will be under the old code, so there's a handful under the old code left for you to see. We will let you know when that changes.)

Mr. Schuman: Breck 365 update? (Mr. Grosshuesch: Breck 365 was withdrawn prior to hearing. It came back to they're very uncomfortable with cost estimation showing the resulting 6 million over budget. Rather than re-engineering, they just said let's pull the plug and have staff reconsider what to do. We do have utilities in the ground so it's not an entirely clean slate. We need to have someone reevaluate what is salvageable. One of the issues was it was a very large project and the Council did not necessarily want to see a continuation of tall buildings throughout all of Block 11.)

Mr. Giller: I think that was a good decision. The project had architectural challenges.

Mr. Schuman: Let Rick Holman know we agree with him. (Mr. Grosshuesch: Council would like to see us look at a new plan with less density and keeping higher densities towards back.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair