

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal	Jim Lamb	Ron Schuman
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard (Arrived at 5:32pm)	
Dan Schroder	Lowell Moore (Not in attendance)	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the July 2, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved. Bottom of page three should be axis instead of access.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the July 16, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Handbook of Design Standards

Ms. Puester presented an overview of changes to the Handbook of Design Standards and Policy 4 Mass. The Commission was asked for feedback on the proposed language.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: Didn't really see any inconsistencies, looks like a good process to bring it up to speed and refresh.
- Ms. Leidal: Julia and I spoke about this and I don't have a good answer on how to further define half story. Perhaps it needs further discussion, priority policy 81 Building Heights regarding the half story is confusing. This is the first time we have seen the text, talked about going a half story above, the second bullet point I understand we are noting that a half story means six feet. I don't understand why we are measuring from finished floor to ceiling, rather than to the mean. We measure to the mean of the historic structure and then give them six more feet for the addition on the back with this right? Maybe I misunderstood. My concern is people are going to push up their first story ceiling to make this half story taller overall. If they start 14 feet off the ground and get that much more overall height. I hope we would measure the way we measure all historic structures. Once again, I wasn't at those meetings so maybe there are other reasons behind this, but I'm concerned about unintended consequences.
- Ms. Puester: The six feet in that diagram is referring to the second story side wall plate, not the overall mean, so that the second story would appear as a half story. This was a consensus of the stakeholder group. We are trying to define it here in the policy. I see your point on the first floor. Let me tweak this language and see if I can get it there.
- Mr. Gerard: My understanding from the stakeholders is that a second story side wall measurement is up to six feet, which would make it irrelevant to the height they want inside, because you measure to the mean of the roof.
- Ms. Leidal: Sidewall is irrelevant, why is that shown?
- Mr. Gerard: People who were builders and designers in the group felt that was significant in the compromise.
- Ms. Leidal: Anything above five feet is density.

- Ms. Puester: The stakeholder group did not want to see a full story on top of the first floor. The lower second level sidewall achieves the half story appearance.
- Mr. Gerard: If sidewall went up full story, then have a roof on top of that, it looked too big in the mass modeling that we looked at.
- Ms. Leidal: So why not say 6 feet above the historic structure?
- Mr. Giller: Christie and Julia are right, we didn't want to see the wall plate too high in comparison to the historic structure but did not talk about that in detail with the group. I don't have a silver bullet that explains it but the overall massing of the roof can't exceed a certain height. The sidewall plate does that but it needs more work.
- Ms. Leidal: What is throwing me is I don't understand why we are calling out the height of the first story and the walls.
- Mr. Giller: We don't want a full floor above the first story of the house.
- Ms. Leidal: But then someone could jack up their first floor.
- Mr. Giller: Assuming it is based on an historic structure
- Ms. Leidal: But it is not. I understand there is a lot to consider, I have concerns and I don't have an answer.
- Ms. Puester: I will work on it before it goes to the Town Council.
- Mr. Giller: Lower side wall is a good strategy to reduce overall height and mass. Based on the top plate height of the historic house.
- Ms. Leidal: Thank you.
- Mr. Giller: I have a couple small changes-for solar 'highly visible' is overly permissive. You might consider the word 'overly' or something that is a bit more restrained as is in the SOI Standards.
- Mr. Gerard: Priority design standard 89 on page 86 is about setbacks, bullet 3 construction of a new building on a site with an existing primary structure. An addition more or less, it talks about the setback, but priority standard 80 sets a different length.
- Ms. Puester: It is actually for a new separate structure and follows the subdivision separation standards for footprint lots.
- Mr. Gerard: Understand if it is two separate, but what if they use a connector? Then you've only got a minimum 5 feet. I don't think that it is clear.
- Ms. Puester: I can add language to clarify that it is for new structures not connected above grade.
- Mr. Gerard: I can see someone squeezing the other building up by the primary structure otherwise.
- Ms. Puester: OK. How about the suggested points that have been added to the Handbook and Mass policy. Points look good? (PC: Yes)
- Mr. Gerard: Did great job putting talk into words in an easy to understandable context. The update will be welcome.
- Mr. Lamb: Everyone involved did a great job.

Mr. Giller opened the work session for public comment. There were none and public comment was closed.

2. Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3, Point Analysis Revision Work Session (CK), 1595 Ski Hill Rd, PL-2019-0240

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to revise the point analysis of the Grand Colorado on Peak 8 Building 3. Revisions are in regards to the applicants desire to eliminate employee housing that earned positive points under Policy 24/R at the original approval on January 26, 2016. Since the Development Code underwent a significant update subsequent to the most recent approval. Several other points from other Policies will be affected by a change to the point analysis. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission believe the project is eligible for additional positive points under Policy 25/R Transit for the offsite bus shelter or the project's adjacency to multiple ski lifts?

2. Based on past precedent for providing public access, staff recommends positive three (+3) points under Policy 16/R, Internal Circulation, for the dedication of a public easement through the site. Does the Commission concur?
3. Does the Commission support awarding one (+1) positive point under Policy 43/R if the sculpture is formally recommended for approval by the Public Arts Advisory Committee?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schuman: On the easement, would you want to include One Ski Hill place? The property line between One Ski Hill Place and Building 3 splits the walkway. (Mr. Kulick: We would like to have the whole area under an easement, it makes for a better connection to the bus stop and gondola but they do not own One Ski Hill Place. This situation is similar to Lincoln Grill/Blue Fish and the Blue Front Bakery, where we got one easement and then one on the other side later when it was under planning review.) This opens the door for the conversation about getting both sides.
- Mr. Schroder: Interesting we would modify point analysis if building is already under construction. (Mr. Kulick: With large projects things change over the course of development. They pursued the point change in March and then withdrew the application. Now they're pursuing the modification again and the code changes went into effect. Due to the code changes that became effective in February, they approached us and wanted to have a dialogue before submitting a modification application.) It makes sense things would change as we go, look at how many different renderings have been done.
- Mr. Schuman: What is the rhyme or reason to this modification? What else are you planning to change in the future?

Mike Dudick, Applicant, Presented:

We got behind the development of two buildings of employee housing on Airport Road. The way things have progressed, the employee housing development was a part of the East Peak 8 hotel Development Agreement and then it wasn't. With the timing of the code changes and the way the application came in, we weren't able to count those points associated with that employee housing project but I feel that massive amounts of housing is provided for that project. We desire to eliminate the workforce housing associated with this project since I know we are providing a generous amount of workforce housing (48 bedrooms coming online) that is ineligible to be counted under the code. These large lodge buildings create a lot of new workforce and I have to have the housing, not about the points, to be able to keep the resort open. Thanks to staff for trying to evaluate this under the new code.

With respect to easement, we can't do anything with One Ski Hill place, however the corridor between them increases from 15' to 54' in width once building 3 opens.

With respect to transit, this kind of development doesn't happen in a vacuum, we regraded Ski Hill Road, all the elements start working together, we had to carve out a parcel where our property doesn't encumber the gondolas. From Ski Hill Road to the plaza level it will be ADA accessible without any change of apparatus. Breckenridge mountain metro district owns the land the Bus Shelter will go on, so we are a part owner, technically, but not on paper. None of transportation improvements happen in a vacuum. It isn't on our land, but it is happening because of our efforts to build this building. The project is adjacent to the busiest chairlift in North America (Colorado Chair). Whether it is summertime evacuations or winter lifts, people are using that bus stop. Would like positive four points for it.

In regards to the sculpture, we worked with Rob Wolfe and the Breckenridge Public Arts Commission. The sculptor Andy Scott has done some beautiful stuff. The sculpture is treated stainless. We had 110 applicants, narrowed to 10 and had three onsite visits from artists and selected Andy Scott. If we are getting points, we

should get 25 positive points based on the money that is going to this one.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Curious about the statue. Maybe down the road winters won't be as long anymore, to put a snow centric sculpture in a place that might not have as much snow. There is also some paganism going on here. (Mr. Dudick: The sculpture will be less warrior like than the iteration here. My wife joked she would date the statue before we put a jacket and horns on him. Ullr is more of a hunter, less of a snow god. Wants snow to track animals to hunt rather than for recreation. Tip of arrow is a snowflake, longstanding prayer for snow, whether in summer or winter which will point to the top of Peak 8.)

Mr. Giller: How tall is it? (Mr. Dudick: Designed at 20-25 feet, construction team is going to scale it this week. Don't want it to be overwhelming or underwhelming so I will decide between 20-25.)

Mr. Schuman: Again, I know you're trying to get extra points beyond passing here. Is there another step to your plans here? Is there another shoe to drop? (Mr. Dudick: No, we had five outdoor fire pits, and now there are four. We just want to get this project passed. The housing thing was a glitch, it did what we wanted but didn't count for points.)

Mr. Giller opened the work session for public comment. There were none and public comment was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: This conversation was helpful. Currently we do not have a successful ADA approach to get to plaza level, this project will improve that a great deal. The transit is so far off the property, I do wonder what kind of precedent this would set for the future if we were to award +4 points. Has the town transit put any monies or dedicated any effort to putting the bus shelter there or is this mostly driven by the applicant? (Matt Stais, Architect: We've created a covered porch all the way around the building and at the lower plaza so people can wait out of the elements. It is attached to the project.) (Ms. Puester: Staff recommends +2 points for transit and they're asking for +4. What is your recommendation?) 1. I'm in support of positive +4 points for transit. 2. Support +3 for the easement. 3. Support +1 for public art.

Ms. Leidal: Agree with staff assessment on questions 1. 2. and 3. 1. +2 points for shuttle system, I am concerned with off site precedent for awarding additional points. 2. Yes, +3 points; 3. Yes +1 point for the art, for sure.

Mr. Gerard: Very appropriate to review this under the new code. You are choosing to come to the table and look at this again. I agree with Christie on off site points, if we were at a point where an additional two points would make or break it, I might have my arm twisted and award +4 for transit. 1. +2 points for shuttle; 2. Yes, great way to contribute to city, clearly +3 points under circulation policy; 3. Yes, +1 point for public art.

Mr. Schuman: I like their reasoning for +4 points, but I think it is off site of the property, but it is essentially one continuous project, you take one piece out and the entire project is less. 1. I think, +2 is appropriate for 25R, I could support +4 if there is language that staff comes up with to justify this as a one-off maybe though; 2. Concur with staff on +3 for the easement; 3. Support +1 for sculpture.

Mr. Lamb: I worry about precedent, but also this is bigger, like Ron said and lean toward +2 for 25R. 1. +2 points transit; 2. Yes, +3 points crucial part of development; 3. Totally support +1 point for sculpture, didn't know Ullr was a pagan, fine.

Mr. Giller: 1. Yes +2 points for transit.; 2. Yes. +3.; 3. Yes, +1.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)

Mr. Schroder: Does this go out to the public in some manner? Staff: Yes, if they subscribe.

2. Class D Majors Q2 2019 (Memo Only)- Mr. Schroeder. Find this interesting. This is nice to have the list provided. A lot of houses approved for development recently.

3. Class C Subdivisions Q2 2019 (Memo Only)

Other Matters:

Ms. Puester: A unique opportunity to go to the National Trust of Historic Preservation Annual conference which will be held in Denver this year. I sent out an email regarding this and other upcoming conferences earlier today. How many people are interested in attending the National Historic conference? (Numerous commissioners interested.) Ok, I will send out more information on the membership and rates.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:33 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair