

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by (acting) Chair Schroder.

### ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal  
Mike Giller (absent)  
Dan Schroder

Jim Lamb  
Steve Gerard (absent)  
Lowell Moore

Ron Schuman

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the June 4, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the June 18, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

### PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None

### WORK SESSIONS:

#### 1. South Gondola Parking Structure, 150 Watson Avenue, PL-2019-0173

Mr. Kulick presented a Work Session to discuss a new public parking structure to be located on the existing South Gondola Lot. The proposed project will provide 688 parking spaces within the structure, plus 255 exterior surface parking spaces, bicycle parking and public restrooms. The proposed structure totals 249,984 sq. ft. and will provide 413 additional spaces beyond the South Gondola Lot's current capacity.

Kirk Taylor with Walker Consultants: Thank you for your continued confidence in Walker and continuing to move forward with this site from the Tiger Dredge project. These are the projects that we love to do. We are excited about your investment and the community impact. As far as the design, we have systematically tried to move it forward and gone through many concepts to get to this point. Construction documents are targeted for late 2019 or early 2020. I know there are some questions regarding the landscape plan. It is in preliminary stage. We still have comments from CDOT and the Town to address. We understand there are adjustments to make.

Michael with Walker Consultants presented. Showed renderings. There are new bathrooms planned. A lot more than currently at transit center. Bathrooms are at grade. People need to go to bathroom right away after long drive. Design concept for bathrooms is outbuilding similar to other outbuildings in Town. We have stairs in all four corners to allow for pedestrian activity. Vehicle ramp along Park Ave. Less pedestrian activity. Best location for ramp.

Kirk Taylor with Walker Consultants: The intent is to separate vehicle and pedestrian activity. Locating ramp to west side to lead pedestrians to the Blue River, reducing conflicts. Stair elevator core intended to be a beacon and anchor where people want to gravitate to and from. Works well because easily identified from Main Street. Equidistant for connectivity to downtown core and winter ski activities. Bike plaza along Blue River. Materiality: intent with non-natural materials is durability and cost. Don't want to be cavalier with budget. Those will be dialogs to have as we move forward.

Michael with Walker Consultants: Historic mining facilities as precedent for design and style. Took cues from elements. Also cues from industrial buildings outside of the area. Cues from the Breckenridge Welcome Center museum for cross buck and core ten. Cues from existing building in arts district for uneven windows. We haven't done full analysis but we do have minimum openness for windows. We could make windows

smaller if possible. We would be happy to entertain modifications to window designs if needed due to cost. We have 3D forms to break up façade. We brought samples. We are open to reducing cross bracing on West elevation. Agree it looks busy.

The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission agree that negative three (-3) points should be awarded for exceeding the 25% threshold for non-natural materials, but not greater than 50%.?
2. Does the Commission agree with staff's height interpretation?
3. Does Commission have any comments in regard to the project?

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Schroder: Where would the landscaped pedestrian area that you showed us go? By the river side? (Mr. Kulick: Yes) Where is the entrance to what is currently the Gold Rush Lot? (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer): I don't think either of those crosswalks (across Park St.) will exist. We need to go back and work on the site plan.

Mr. Moore: Is the bridge across the Blue River going to line up with the elevator tower? (Mr. Kulick: Yes. With the height, they were trying to be conscious as they stepped back from the river. They are aware of our height concerns and trying to design with that in mind.) Will the Town be responsible for the parking on the north side? (Mr. Kulick: We have a lease to manage the entire South Gondola Lot.)

Mr. Schuman: Is lowering the grade an option in regards to building height? (Kirk with Walker Consultants: Qualitatively, if we look at the southwest portion of site, that is the highest portion of site. 12' higher than Watson street. It slopes uniformly across site. Parking structure sits halfway across. Structure maintains grade across site. We will go approximately 6' below grade as it goes across site. We don't want to go fully below grade because of added design requirements.)

Mr. Moore: Is it physically possible to go down? (Kirk with Walker Consultants: We always can, I just don't think it going to be a direction we want to take. Cost would increase due to water table and required systems. Awaiting geotechnical report.) (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: Would not be prudent decision for publicly funded project.)

Mr. Schroder: Do the stairs track with the levels of the windows in the stairwell? (Kirk with Walker Consultants: Yes.)

Mr. Schuman: Pedestrian flow from NE corner elevator location to Watson lot? Where is pedestrian flow from deck to gondola? (Kirk with Walker Consultants: We want them to walk along Blue River not through the parking lanes, but we haven't designed that yet.)

Mr. Schroder: Do we anticipate something happening to transit center? (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: We are studying that. The challenge is not to disrupt the existing transit. We don't want them crossing wherever they want. We want pedestrians to cross at one very celebrated crosswalk.) (Michael with Walker Consultants: The goal is to consolidate and separate, to remove different use conflicts from pedestrians.)

Mr. Moore: Is there enough room to add more landscaping on walkway on north side of structure? (Kirk with Walker Consultants: Soft "No". Snow removal is concern. Landscape area will be more problematic for maintenance. Want to separate pedestrian movements from vehicular. Right now it is sidewalk with raised curb, which is better for maintenance.)

Ms. Leidal: Regarding roundabout, I'm concerned that the southbound traffic from Frisco will block the northbound traffic turning or going straight. Skier drop-off parking? Walker indicated locations and TBD regarding egress points in relation to roundabout. Don't know if one lane or two lane roundabout. Comments we have to do more work on. It is evolving.

Mr. Moore: Ramp is two way? Walker Consultants: Yes, it is an express ramp.) That will be interesting. (Michael with Walker Consultants: Traffic engineer is working with CDOT. Meetings have gone well.

Comments for revisions. To take a step back for a second, Pedestrian and traffic improvements will probably be implemented as a phased approach for 20 year horizon. Questions regarding implementation of different roundabouts in area.

Mr. Schroder: I appreciate that siting is equitable for different users. (Michael with Walker Consultants: We looked at multiple footprints, including 90 degrees, closer to park, oriented west, etc.) (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: Long exercise to get to this point.) (Walker Consultants: This is still going to be a phased approach to build on where we are starting here. It is not likely it will be part of this project but we don't want to do things that will inhibit future improvements. Ex: Bridge across Blue River. It may look different in future. Some of the parking lots are in flux. We are making decisions that will allow flexibility.) (Mr. Grosshuesch: Alternative locations on the site were having issues with separating pedestrians from vehicles. Primary design principle to create that separation which does not currently exist. Also had issues with stacking. We have pretty good stacking bay with existing plan but not with previous plan.) (Walker Consultants: We didn't want to have issues with the cue backing up onto road. We wanted that cue to occur on site.

Mr. Moore: Now I am more confused. Come in off Watson, pay as you drive south, drive up ramp, and to get out? (Michael with Walker Consultants: We want to avoid cross-traffic. Design will probably not be pay on entry. We are still trying to figure out supply, the que, etc. Not prepared to discuss operations and revenue control today. Biggest influx is in the morning. Based on preliminary numbers, majority is coming from north. Less so from south, so right in, right out should still be able to facilitate that. Intent is to move people to northeast corner as quickly as possible and move inwards. Not everybody is going to leave at the same time. Discharge is not going to be the same as influx. People will be exiting on Park. Folks going south will have to go up to roundabout, do hook, and go down.) (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: We want to free up transit movements. We are discussing with CDOT if we could have another access point.) The roundabout is important.

Mr. Schroder: We didn't talk about height and there is a -20 points for that. (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: We need to know where the dividing line between districts. Does the Planning Commission agree with interpretation of exactly down the middle? It is a transition. Do you like interpretation of right down the middle?)

Mr. Kulick: Down the middle is our interpretation. Read from LUD Guidelines for LUD #20. The parcel is a collection of several lots. We are more concerned along the river. Height on stair towers was an extension of the provision for elevator tower. Remainder of structure when looking at east elevation is compliant, except for towers. (Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: We could lower stair tower but the elevator ridgeline will look goofy.)

Mr. Schroder. Building heights are recommended at 2 and 3 stories. The plan seems appropriate. (Michael with Walker Consultants: looking south from Gondola, heights step up to match mountain profile.)

(Ms. Smith, Town Engineer: We can come back with circulation in a Work session)

Ms. Leidal: Agree that negative three (-3) points should be awarded for exceeding the 25% threshold for non-natural materials, but not greater than 50%. Agree with staff's height interpretation. I agree with staff in regards to their comments on the solid to void ratios, the large openings should be reduced. Agree with rest of commission. Great looking structure for a utilitarian building. Nice transition. Thanks for your effort. Look forward to more info on circulation.

Mr. Lamb: Agree that negative three (-3) points should be awarded for exceeding the 25% threshold for non-natural materials, but not greater than 50%. Agree with staff's height interpretation. I think the community is excited. Ok with height. Height issue will be brought down so they will be brought down in points, and there

are other opportunities for points, so I think it could get to passing point analysis. Good location. Addresses issues we have in town like I-70 and parking.

Mr. Moore: In regards to negative three (-3) points for exceeding the 25% threshold for non-natural materials, but not greater than 50%, we don't actually know what that number is, so I will withhold judgment. Frankly, materials seem fine. Agree with staff's height interpretation. Come back with Work Session for circulation. It is important. I know there is lot of moving parts.

Mr. Schuman: Agree that negative three (-3) points should be awarded for exceeding the 25% threshold for non-natural materials, but not greater than 50%. Agree with staff's height interpretation. I like the view corridor shots. If you could put real buildings in the drawings, that would be great. Lighting: Please consider dark skies and lighting. I think the Town should accept negative points for energy conservation. I don't think the town should get a free pass.

Mr. Schroder: Agree that negative three (-3) points should be awarded for exceeding the 25% threshold for non-natural materials, but not greater than 50%. Agree with staff's height interpretation. I think this is a nice design. My favorite is Vail parking deck. I think this proposal compliments the Town. The point analysis can be shifted by two feet. (Mr. Kulick: Still room to add positive points. Goal is passing point analysis. Everyone is confident we can get there.) I appreciate public comment to look at from a few different angles. Need for parking and whose responsibility. Very pleased when I saw the PC packet. Stairway windows offset is appropriate. Often calling things out in the 2000s different that 1800s. Follow stairwell for active experience. Close to passing point analysis.

**Public Comment:**

Lee Edwards, 108 N. French St.: 50 years. None of us have been here 50 years yet. We need to open our eyes and think about things that we can do before we build it. We can reduce height. Main Street Station did it. This is not how you typically start a project. Usually you look at the site, circulation, context etc. instead of going straight to the architecture. This is backwards. We have a trough of a river. Breckenridge Professional Building was a mistake. Town owns property in this area along the river. Why this project is not incorporating property across the river in a coordinated master plan is very short sighted. Why did we end up putting the parking structure here as opposed to the north side of the Gondola? (Mr. Grosshuesch: That was a business decision between the Town and Vail Resorts that is outside the scope of this application and the Development Code). How much land do we control under this agreement? (Kirk with Walker Consultants: 6.3 acres in the lease agreement). We need to have some more cross sections so the community can understand what is going on and to give everybody an idea of the height. This could go down an entire level, and it has been done before. On the west façade, we have left the ramp exposed. Is there a reason? Still a big box. 50 years. We can put some ins and outs and make it better. Architecture is good. I think it should go through a few more public hearings so people can see the view from the gondola. Thank you for your time.

**FINAL HEARINGS:**

1. Cavanaugh Residence, 208 N. Ridge Street, PL-2019-0067

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a new 1,275 sq. ft., 2 bedroom, 2 bathroom single-family residence along North Ridge Street, with a 3-car, subterranean garage.

The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Landscaping – Staff finds the proposed landscaping plan provides adequate street trees along French Street. Does the Commission agree?
2. Parking - Staff recommends the allocation of positive one (+1) point under Policy 18/R because the onsite parking is accessed from a shared driveway. Does the Commission agree?

3. Does the Commission have any additional comments on the proposed project design?

*Commissioner Questions:*

Mr. Moore: Last time we were talking about there was not enough room for the trees. Have we solved that with the ELA in the ROW? (Mr. Kulick: Yes). Good. That was a big deal two weeks ago.

*Commissioner Comments:*

Ms. Leidal: Agree with landscaping. Agree with +1 point for shared driveway. Thanks for past precedent research. Agree and support the project.

Mr. Lamb: Agree with landscaping. For +1 point for shared driveway, I was curious because of Development Agreement, I will go with staff and I support. Good project. Support.

Mr. Moore: Agree with landscaping. Agree with +1 point for shared driveway. Both parties should get positive points. Great project.

Mr. Schuman: Agree with staff on landscaping. Agree with +1 point for shared driveway. Great project. Come a long way. Great exercise for us to work though. Good job.

Mr. Schroder: Agree with staff on landscaping. Agree with +1 point for shared driveway, it is a priority from Streets Dept. Support project.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Moore. The motion passed 5-0.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

The Commission briefly discuss the ongoing fiber optic cable installation project.

Ms. Leidal: Could you give an update on Handbook of Design Standards Open House? Mr. Grosshuesch gave a summary on the Handbook of Design Standards Open House. Takeaway – there was a lack of active criticism. We feel that it went through a good process and this represents a series of good compromises. To be sure, there are varying opinions. Staff is comfortable.

Ms. Leidal: Big turnout? (Mr. Grosshuesch: About 20 people in the room, including four staff members.)

Mr. Moore: Where did the mass bonus turnout? (Mr. Grosshuesch explained 15% mass bonus option and associated negative points.)

Member of public, Lee Edwards, commented regarding 4' setback requirement for connectors and how the Town can expect issues with that in the future.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 pm.

---

Dan Schroder, Chair (acting)