

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Christie Mathews-Leidal	Jim Lamb-Absent	Ron Schuman
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard	
Dan Schroder	Lowell Moore	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the August 20, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the September 3, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No comments.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS

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

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to construct a hotel and condominium project consisting of 49 for-sale condominiums and a 137 guest room hotel. The project will also include amenity spaces, back of house support spaces, common areas, restaurant, bar, commercial kitchen, pool and spa, ski lockers and outdoor dining and seating. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission believe the design meets the intent of the conceptual view corridor exhibit?
2. Does the Commission find the design meets the Master Plan's "transitional mountain style", requirement, based on the proposed materials, design and if the amount of glazing is appropriate?
3. Does the Commission support awarding positive two (+2) points for providing additional onsite parking beyond the required minimum?
4. Does the Commission support awarding positive three (+3) points for providing a public access easement?
5. Does the Commission agree with the remaining points in the Preliminary Point Analysis?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Leidal: I had a couple of questions on the parking and also the architecture. On the floor plans, a couple of the parking spaces were double deep... were those counted as one or two parking spaces?

Mr. Kulick: I believe one space.

Brent Carr: They were counted as two.

Ms. Leidal: How are the extra parking spaces going to be used? Could someone just come up and park in those spaces? Is it serving as a parking garage? Did the traffic analysis take those extra uses into account?

Mr. Kulick: They did, it is maybe not quite as specific as what you are asking. They broke it out and tailored to the exact specifications of the proposed uses. When it was reviewed by engineering in 2018 there was a lot of follow up questions from the Engineering staff. The blending of uses for parking. The number of hotel rooms, restaurants, bars. The original development agreement request was to take it to .85 spaces per unit but ultimately withdrew that request in favor of abiding with the Master Plan requirement of 1 space per lodging unit.

Ms. Leidal: I thought it was 1.5 spaces per unit in the code?

Mr. Kulick: It is consistent with the master plan, which is different from the parking code. We follow

- the master plan in this case.
- Ms. Leidal: It is a unique situation, the total number is referred to in the traffic analysis.
- Mr. Kulick: Precisely why we are asking whether it is eligible for the +2.
- Ms. Leidal: Have we given positive points before under this policy?
- Chris: I believe we have, I don't know off the top of my head. In this case, in terms of the total points, it probably doesn't matter that much since they will likely have a passing point analysis with or without the +2 points.
- Ms. Leidal: I did have questions on the architecture. Could you please review the locations of the materials and color packet? I was having trouble understanding where these were located?
- Sarah Broughton: I will be cover that in my presentation.
- Mr. Gerard: With respect to the diagram we've been presented. P1 parking floor, there are a series of private condo/garages on Page 37.
- Sarah Broughton: Those are counted as parking spaces.
- Mr. Giller: I have a small parking question. I think it is great BOEC is there, I wonder if some of those users or guests may be physically challenged, and I wonder if we can accommodate that?
- Brent Carr: Spaces closest to the elevator would be van accessible.
- Mr. Giller: My guess is they need more than two spots.
- Matt Stais: We have met with them multiple times.
- Mr. Giller: Whatever it is, let's have the points reflect that accordingly. On the view corridor, we've gone round and round on this but we've seen more of three units rather than the original one building. The view corridor between the townhomes that has been reduced to 24 feet- I would like to hear your thoughts on that. Christy had spoken to the color pallet, and I think the information on the pallet is vague. Chris mentioned materials above 30 feet would be fire resistant, but we are not seeing that in your elevations.

Ricardo Dunin, Owner/Applicant: I've been a skier coming to Colorado for years, and this is a passion project of mine. I was asked to keep this to a minimum. We were very careful in choosing our team. I am excited to work with them and also not being from Breck, I wanted to have locals here.

Sarah Broughton, Architect: We are a Colorado based architecture firm with studios in Denver and Aspen. We are very passionate about this project and are honored to be working for the applicant. We have a team of 40 professionals and have had our company for 16 years. We wanted to first thank staff, we appreciate their hard work and collaboration. The majority of our presentation will be addressing those comments from the January 15th Preliminary Hearing. Those comments included "the building appears contemporary rather than transitional, reduce amount of glass on the building façade, and explain the material pallet."

Since January, we have been working to reduce the overall height. What is shaded (rendering presented on the screen) has been reduced. We have removed mass and scale off the north side of the building. These reductions to the north side represent an overall 92,000 square feet reduction. The building has been further stepped back from the Four O'Clock neighborhood. We eliminated an entire parking level. We've been spending a lot of time understanding the rest of the buildings at Peak 8 and 7. With the Grand Lodge and Crystal Peak on Peak 7 being 5.5 stories, the Grand Colorado has a combination of 5.5 and 6 stories and One Ski Hill place at 6.5 stories above grade. Our project is deliberately designed with three modules, and less height and density compared to other projects on Peak 8. In the center it is between 5.5 stories and 4 stories, along ski hill road is 3 stories, and the cabins coming up the hill are 2.5 stories.

Elena Scott, Norris Design: Neighborhood context and compatibility is very important to us. We've reached out to our neighbors to see what their concerns and excitements are. We've had open houses, and heard a lot about pedestrian connectivity. The red dashed lines on the graphic are showing pedestrian circulation. We believe we've achieved a better circulation plan here compared to the master plan. An additional pedestrian access we've provided is across the western part of the property. It links down to Ski Hill Road. Also you're

able to go through the lobby of the hotel as well. Importantly, connections to neighborhoods on either side link people through. Pedestrian connections we think are very important. Meaningful public spaces, plazas and open space are important. We have exceeded the requirement for these types of spaces. There is some excitement about the restaurants, beer hall, etc. Hotel amenities are also important spaces, dining and ski locker rooms. Lastly, on the view corridors, I'm going to touch a little on the Master Plan changing significantly over time. In the original, we have buildings in the location of the ski slope. The view corridors are maintained, at our closest point we have a 10 foot offset from the property line, and most significantly we have a 63' offset at our furthest point. The other view corridor on the east side by the cabins is aided by the cabins being limited to 2.5 stories. All the decisions we've made have been in an attempt to increase view corridors and provide connections for pedestrians.

Sarah Broughton, Architect: Chris showed this slide earlier, this is a rendering of the base area from the Peak 8 terrain park. Looking at the public south facing courtyard (rendering shown on screen) we see the 24 foot view corridor. Overall, in between One Ski Hill Place we will see a view corridor of 34-63 feet. Overall, as I've mentioned we have been working very hard to present architecture that is a compliment to the master plan and buildings on Peak 8. Part of our process is to go backwards and look at historic precedent. In doing so, that has informed the architecture you are seeing tonight. Some historic photos are visible here, early sketches of the architecture associated with dredge mining. A lot of work has been done to increase things such as eaves so it is even more of a mountain alpine style. Another part of our process is really understanding the context. Here are images of Peak 7 and Peak 8, Grand Lodge, One Ski Hill Place, Grand Colorado, and we will point out some similarities to these buildings in our architecture. Starting with architectural features, as we went through, this is a comparison sheet between East Peak 8 to One Ski Hill Place. So some similarities, similar roof slopes, both buildings feature gabled roof forms with deep eaves, dark roof forms, heavy timber, exposed structure and detailing. We brought in heavy timber beams into our window walls and roof rafters. The project features wood siding and a combination of wood and metal balconies. The other thing here is the use of dark wood shingles on gabled walls.

Mr. Giller: Can you expand on this?

Sarah Broughton, Architect: Going into architectural features, this is a view of East Peak 8 and Grand Colorado on the right. Dark roof forms, heavy timber exposed structure and detailing. We brought those elements into our building. The use of metal and wood railings, heavy timber siding and the use of a natural stone base. Chris touched on glazing, and mentioned that overall we have reduced the amount of glazing by 8,000 square feet. We did a comparison as well and used Grand Colorado to compare. Staff recommended using Grand Colorado to compare. Overall, Grand Colorado's average gable has 36% of glazing, ours also has 36%. Grand Colorado's solid walls have 33% glazing, at East Peak 8, we have 14% glazing in the same area. For the overall palette, we brought some physical samples with. Stone base, rough wood siding, between a more natural and darker stain. Wood shingles which are in the solid portions of the gables, and a combination of wood and metal guardrails. One clarification, we have to have fire retardant material between 40-60 feet, and non-combustible materials above 60 feet. They will appear natural from that distance. Going back to the terrain park rendering, on Peak 8, you can see the building in context to the full hill. Good view of view corridor, tightest area is 34.10 feet, 63 feet at widest. The loading dock is placed carefully to shield view and noise. This is a closer view from Ski Hill Road, this is the vehicular access that drops you into the middle of the building, where you take an elevator to the main lobby. You can also see in this rendering where the architecture steps down to the east toward the Four O'Clock neighborhood. We want to reinforce that we intentionally brought down the height of the cabins while still maintaining a generous view corridor. You were asking about the link between the center of the main module and that is a wood screen over glazing, that is meant to be less formal and designed to visually go away. That is what is depicted here between the two sides of the hotel. We kept the roof height as low as possible in that area. This is a view of our public south courtyard, with ski access to the Four O'Clock. The lobby, restaurant, and beer hall all depicted here. And with that I am happy to answer more questions. We have floor plans if anyone has questions on those.

- Mr. Giller: Thank you Sarah. Any questions?
- Ms. Leidal: In our packets it calls out heavy logs, where are those?
- Sarah Broughton: Those will be in between the gables and at the ends and sidewalls.
- Mr. Giller: Continuing on what materials go where, our copy in the packet varied a bit from what you showed us. What should we go with?
- Mr. Giller: Can you speak to the metal in the railings?
- Sarah Broughton: We will have a wood top, and underneath it will be metal, not determined whether vertical, or horizontal.
- Mr. Giller: Low luster finish?
- Sarah Broughton: Yes, it will be dark bronze, matte finish.
- Mr. Giller: Rough wood screen, is it now dark shingles? Page 12 of material packet, page 68 of 104 of the PDF.
- Sarah Broughton: Correct.
- Mr. Giller: How much of the metal roof should we expect below the slope?
- Sarah Broughton: Until the non-combustible sixty foot line.
- Mr. Giller: When the metal goes to the wall, the luster or sheen really matters. If you're going to wrap that metal on the walls from the gable, make it a flat finish.
- Sarah Broughton: It is our intent that it is a dark bronze matte and non-reflective.
- Mr. Schuman: On page 43, south looking at the view where you see the ski lift to the right side, you are showing what appears to be a generous view corridor, but I don't think that is right because if you look at page 5, (plan view) I don't see.
- Elena Scott: Because of that wedge we incorporate, it looks a little different than it does on a plan view.
- Mr. Schuman: I don't think you can see that view corridor in the rendering you showed versus what is on the actual plan. The view doesn't appear to have any space here whatsoever on the site plan.
- Mr. Giller: What is the elevation of that deck over the loading dock?
- Sarah Broughton: That plaza level is over a story above the loading dock. I can guarantee these renderings are the same as the plans.
- Mr. Giller: Any members of the public who wish to speak to the project?
- Ms. Puester: The planning commission also received copies of 7 letters since the packet was released on this project. Wanted that on the record.

The hearing was opened for public comments.

Sacha Lori Mosca, Glenwild HOA: Two questions and concerns. An exciting project, my concerns are related to the local community and the potential negative impact that this project might have on our homes. I noticed you have plans for evergreens and shrubbery, our view will now be a construction site. Number two, my concern is related to traffic. Real life impact experience, when there is backed up traffic up on ski hill and down, traffic is at a standstill and it impacts emergency vehicle access. I think left turns into the project are going to become a big problem for you, I wish there was a turn lane for access. I would hope my town representatives would consider this strongly, I don't know if there is precedent for this, but I think there needs to be a local impact points.

Dan Gralla, Resident of One Ski Hill Place: Can we look at the first presentation again? I would like to see the three picture vie corridor diagram we've seen several times. I think this picture is a bit misleading. It was stated the setback on One Ski Hill Place is 10 feet. It sounds like twenty feet to me. When you look at the width of the access road, I imagine it will be 40-50 feet wide. It fits in there quite easily, if we go to page 19 and look at the actual plan? So you look at this particular diagram and you can see there is no way the proposed road will fit. The two diagrams don't jive. It in no way represents what is being built. Where do the commercial vehicles turn? (Mr. Giller: There is a hammerhead turning area.) Will we hear the beep beep

beep (backing warning signals) the whole time. What is the purpose of the pedestrian corridor leading to ski hill road? Do they want to be picked up by a car on the side of the road? The gondola was built to bring people up and down the mountain. They shouldn't be going to the street at all. What is the purpose of it? The setback is again daunting to me, the cartoon diagrams do not match that picture. I think further to the parking spaces, there is concern about traffic on the road, it doesn't matter what it is zoned for, if there is parking, there they will use it. Spaces will be used by anyone, so if we are really concerned about traffic on Ski Hill Road we shouldn't be encouraging providing additional spaces. It would be nice if the building was stepped down. Architecturally it looks like urban Denver today.

Alex Foroglou, 452 Highpoint Drive: (Reading email verbatim from what was submitted to the Planning Commission via staff on 9/3/2019). Her concerns included: 1. Location of service entrance, 2. View corridor, 3. Height and step down, 4. Parking. (Full email is in the project file in the Community Development Department.)

Jane Hamilton, 172 Sawmill Run Road: Very appreciative of your prior applicant who worked really well with pedestrian access. They were very helpful and met with me. That access for us is huge but it is far-reaching to the whole community. Graham and Mike did a great job with that and that carried through with the current applicants so thank you.

Tim Casey, 108 S. Harris Street: We are pleased with the commitment made by the applicant. It includes BOEC space and parking space, and will expand our ability to serve our clients. We've asked the applicant to memorialize and put that into a lease that will survive the development permit and allow us to work in that space free of charge. The applicant is more than willing to do that, we are into a lot of details of how the BOEC would function in that space. Thank you for your consideration.

Trisha Hyon, 110 N High Street: I have worked up at Peak 8 and around beautiful ski towns around the world. I think that finishing the Master Plan here in Breck is so important. Important for the town and to have a flagship hotel. To finish the vision and have a complete master base village that is well thought out is incredibly important. I think timing is very important. I think we all intended years ago to finish. I appreciate all the hard work and finishing the vision for our town.

David Hartman, Sawmill Run Road: I want to thank the developers for a number of things that helped our Four O'Clock sub. We have been looking at for 12 years, 500 car trips down our residential road every day. You have reduced the parking lot which will make a big difference in traffic volumes. That road (Sawmill Run Road), 14 years ago, we were promised Vail would use that parking lot just for staging of One Ski Hill Place, then they were going to install that road (proposed service access of East Peak 8) and they promised us they wouldn't use our road for continuous use. I had senior executives tell me they didn't build that road because they didn't want employees driving in front of their lodging property. I want to reinforce that road should have been there for the last 12 years and it was never installed by Vail Resorts. I do appreciate the public access that has been put along the east side of the project. I wanted to put a bug in the ear that there is a public access easement through boulder ridge and there needs to be a connection there. I know it exists, I think it should be looked at because other neighborhoods would benefit from that public access too. Overall thanks for taking in neighbor's concerns.

Public comment was closed.

Ms. Puester: I was able to look up past precedent for parking overage in 18/R. I can only find one instance where we assigned +2 points for 505 S Main, Building D, Phase 2. They received +2 points, required to provide 51 spaces per the master plan and they provided 80. The project was approved in the year 2000.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Moore: Still a little concerned about the master plan calling for ‘transitional mountain style’. Not sure this design is there quite yet, some of that comes down to not seeing detail with this proposal. I would like to see more detail, specifically on the railings and trim work and what the shingles look like/material. That ties into the neighborhood context, trying to weave the four large structures together, that make sense. The other thing I’ve been concerned about, is the access up there between the two buildings. The service access. All the service trucks have to wrap around almost a 180 turning left. In the letters, people have concerns about that. Looking at the topography, it may not be possible to cut that angle. I definitely understand and sympathize with the people saying they are going to hear a lot of beeping. I get that and am concerned about that for the neighborhood. 1. View corridor, I am concerned about this, in the original master plan those buildings were different shapes. Some of these pictures are hard to tell. I think it is real tight between One Ski Hill and the proposed project. 2. Not quite there on the architecture but glazing is appropriate. 3. Apparently have done that in the past, I think it is more of a negative here, I guess you get two points. 4. Absolutely. 5. I agree with remaining point analysis.
- Mr. Schuman: 1. I’m not convinced it is right on with what was presented today. I’m not hard and fast against it, unless the views are incorrect. Some of the pictures presented seemed to indicate a better view corridor. 2. Agree with Lowell, seemed very plain jane, but again maybe it is the photos. One seems to glow more than the other, some of the presentations are tough to gauge. Not there yet on transitional mountain style. 3. In favor. 4. In favor. 5. Agree with remaining points. We’ve got a stack of papers here from One Ski Hill Place, and I think you might need to educate them that you have development rights just like One Ski Hill Place did. Clearly a lot of disgruntled concern from One Ski Hill Place.
- Ms. Leidal: Thank you for the changes you’ve made. And working with the Four O’Clock subdivision. I still have some concerns with the project: 1: Do not believe we are meeting the intent of the view corridor with the master plan. Between the cabins and the main hotel, last time it was 62 feet, and now it’s 24, that’s less than half of what was previously presented. I understand and appreciate you dropping the height of the cabins. The Master Plan also showed stepping down. My concern is the Master Plan staggered buildings, and now you are running the cabins and the hotel more N to S rather than E to W. 2. I’m okay, we are moving in the right direction. I don’t think the floor to ceiling windows are appropriate up here. Anyway you can break that up would be greatly appreciated. 3. Do not support any points for parking overage. I don’t think tandem spaces should count as two. It also conflicts with Master Plan, you provide spaces and they will come. 4. Yes, support, and thank you again for working with Four O’Clock. 5. I support except for the positive two points for parking.
- Mr. Schroder: As a prelim it is nice to see it coming together. Something is going to occur here. I’m very pleased with the changes. A lot of emotion and feeling with some of these, especially congestion on Ski Hill Road. We can’t change what is occurring down the road, but thank you for stating that concern. 1. View corridor isn’t to create big gaps between buildings, I do believe arrows at the highest part of our screen here is compressed beyond what it should be. The arrows are laying on top of proposed buildings. View corridors on other two meet intent of what view corridors are supposed to be. All of this is about compromise. We gained a loss of a full story, even though view corridors are a little squeezed, we’ve gained. 2. Transitional mountain style is combining mountain and modern. I believe the trouble we are having is the pallet of grey, and we are used to seeing more of a light tannish wood color tones. The deviation in color is really the problem here, that is something to take in mind. It’s more HGTVish. I do believe it meets the master plan’s requirement. 3. Don’t support. Always short parking, trying to limit cars that go up there, people will still drive. Under parking units isn’t going to help us in the future. No two points. 4. Absolutely, the

- project isn't an exclusive members only resort. 5. Support it as presented by staff. Under relative code they can go higher, but they have to offset points.
- Mr. Gerard: 1: East side is okay, as Dan pointed out, lowering the cabins was significant. This view is buffered by a stand of pine trees. You might gain some ground if you would do a mock up from that sub into the cabins. On the west, I think a lot of people have raised questions, in some of the mock ups it looks like a nice view, but as pointed out it is just to provide separation between buildings. 2. Maybe. We all got hung up on the materials and if we could put that together that would answer a lot of questions. Some of the stone looks too bright, maybe some texture and browns mixed in. If you could paint up your mockups to use the actual colors, that would help. 3. I objected to the extra parking last time around, I don't think there should be two extra points. Increase traffic is contrary to the Master Plan. No positive points. 4. Yes, three positive points. Maybe we should look at Boulder Ridge and put that in the next packet. 5. I agree with the point analysis with the exception as pointed out by Christie about the fireplaces.
- Mr. Giller: I want to thank the applicant and their agents. I think you've worked hard. We judge this project against the master plan and the five questions here. Thank you for your interest and comments. 1. A lot of positive things about this massing, view corridors are acceptable, also like some of the touches of the massing like the vertical screen. 2. W hotel in Aspen is more traditional than this... devil is in the details. It is acceptable, but we need to see more details on railings roofing lighting, etc. We could be okay. Keep going in the direction you're going. 3. Reluctant positive 2 points. I see both sides. 4. Yes. 5. Just the fire pit comment to check on the points and plan consistency. Thank you to everyone.
- Sarah Broughton: Are we allowed to go into the final hearing as of today or what are the next steps? (Mr. Kulick: Some of the big issues are on the fence. If you keep moving in the right direction we could move to a final.)
- Mr. Truckey: I'd be concerned about going to final at this point. We need to have things nailed down pretty well. We will need an additional Preliminary Hearing.
- Ricardo Dunin: We will really listen and do what was requested. Ideally we would like to go to final because of the timing on our Development Agreement.
- Mr. Truckey: I'm not sure what the timing for the Development Agreement is but we can be flexible, but do want another preliminary hearing.
- Matt Stais: February.
- Mr. Truckey: I understand it is a time crunch, but we want the Commission to be comfortable with this before we go to a final hearing. I think you have time for another prelim if your deadlines is February.
- Ms. Puester: There are other things that come into play if you go to final and don't get an approval. For example you would not be able to reapply for six months.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)
 - a. Fiber connectivity meeting coming up for those interested-on the 12th.
 - b. Conferences are covered.
 - c. Ms. Puester introduced Luke Sponable, our new Planner I. Started today.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair