

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 - arrived at 5:59pm
Mike Giller	Steve Gerard - absent	
Dan Schroder	Lowell Moore	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the October 1, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the October 15, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3 Event Tent, 1595 Ski Hill Rd, PL-2019-0424

Ms. Puester: Staff has a few changes to the findings and conditions; it was just a numbering issue.

Mr. Giller made a motion to call up the Grand Colorado Peak 8 Building 3 Event Tent and the Commission concurred.

Mr. Sponable: This follows previous applications in years past, where there were no issues. Staff did not find any issues relating to circulation. Any questions?

Mr. Giller opened the hearing for public comments.

Nancy Pierce, owner at One Ski Hill place 717 University Ave in Boulder: Saw this was approved and One Ski Hill place didn't get notice. I hike and bike, and coming down the mountain to see a tent is really not very pretty. There are plenty of places private residents can rent, and I don't understand the necessity of another structure that looks like construction. I have lived in construction for five years.

Mr. Sponable: This is a party tent for Grand Colorado owners.

Ms. Leidal: Looking through policy 36, are the rules, two temporary tents or one temporary tent per year? Did that little for-sale tent fall under the purview of that rule? (Ms. Puester: We can only speak to the tents we have permits for.)

Mr. Schroder: As I read the policy, tents are allowed for this period of time, so I would be apt to support the tent.

Mr. Lamb: I would go with a yes, we are talking eight or nine days that it will be up.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Lamb. The motion passed 5-0.

Ms. Puester: Nancy, please meet with Luke after the meeting to discuss the hours and uses for the tent.

2. Watson Mauka Addition and Remodel, 301 N. Main St, PL-2019-0443

Ms. Leidal: Is there any landscaping being removed? (Mr. Lott: There are two shrubs in this area. I spoke with the applicant, Janet Sutterley, and she agreed they will be relocated or

replaced.)
Ms. Puester: Staff made some changes to the Findings and Conditions - a sentence at the end of number14 was added.

The Watson Mauka project was not called up and was approved as presented.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. King House Relocation, Addition, Restoration, Garage, Accessory Apartment, and Landmarking; 300 N. French Street, PL-2019-0034

Mr. LaChance presented a proposal to relocate the historic circa 1890's house approximately 5 ft. towards the interior of the lot (east), construct an approximately 100 sq. ft. addition, install a basement and concrete foundation, conduct a full restoration of the house, designate the house as a Local Landmark, relocate the historic secondary structure (cabin) further towards the interior of the lot (east) and conduct a full restoration, construct a detached 2-car garage and accessory apartment with new driveway, expand the existing driveway, and install a new fence and landscaping.

Mr. LaChance addressed the public comment letter included in the packet from an adjacent property owner to the east. In regards to the concerns about drainage, staff has the following response: The Site Plan has been reviewed multiple times and approved by the Town Engineer, the applicant is proposing to maintain the existing direction of flow, there is a Drainage Easement on the neighboring property for the purpose of capturing drainage from upstream properties, and there is a standard Condition of Approval in the packet which requires a drainage plan to be approved by the Town Engineer prior to issuance of the Building Permit. Staff does not have any concerns regarding drainage. In regards to the neighbor's concern about tree removal, staff has the following response: The applicant is proposing to plant more trees that they are proposing to remove, only one tree is proposed to be removed between the proposed development and the neighbor, and five trees are proposed for screening between the proposed development and the neighbor. In regards to the neighbor's concerns about construction in the Sherman Ave. right to-of-way and the impact to the views, staff has the following response: There are not any structures proposed in the Town-right-of-way, the Town Code allows a second driveway because it has been approved by the Town Engineer with a special Finding, and any cars parking in the right-of-way would be illegally parked. Finally, in regards to the neighbor's concern about the accessory apartment, access, and impervious surfaces, staff have the following response: There are not two residences proposed as the letter states. The proposed accessory apartment by definition is a component of the existing single-family residential use per Town Code. It is not required to be deed-restricted because this application was submitted prior to the current Development Code becoming effective, which does require new accessory apartments to be deed-restricted. The access to the proposed garage and accessory apartment is through the existing driveway in the Sherman St. right-of-way, not "green-space" as the letter states. The proposed site plan would result in less site disturbance than an alternative design for a driveway from N. French St. to the garage/accessory apartment along the northern side of the existing house. Mr. LaChance passed out and reviewed new modified conditions of approval.

The hearing was opened for public comments. There were none and public comment was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: No questions, let's open up to the applicant. Any questions to the applicant? (No.)
Mr. Moore: I would like to say good job Mr. LaChance on your response to the neighbor.
Mr. Lamb: It totally keeps with our code, so I'm on board.
Mr. Schroder: We've had a site visit and two preliminary hearings, and I support this project.
Ms. Leidal: Thank you Chapin, thank you to the applicant for hearing our concerns.
Mr. Giller: I agree, this is a good project. We have been on site, and have carefully considered this project.
Mr. LaChance: I would like to add a new Condition of Approval #14, stating that the final plans shall specify

the additional driveway width to be no more than 20', including flares, and re-numbering the Conditions of Approval thereafter.

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve with the modified Findings and Conditions of Approval, seconded by Mr. Lamb. The motion passed 5-0.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Collins Residence, 106 S. High Street, PL-2019-0068

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal to remove an existing non-historic modular home and construct a new 4 bedroom, 5 bathroom single family residence with a 2 car garage along South High Street. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Windows and Doors - Staff recommends the elimination of the diamond shaped windows on the west façade of the rear module and the French Doors on the connector and rear module to comply with Design Standards 91, 95, 96, 128. Does the Commission support this recommendation?
2. Connector - Staff finds the length of the proposed connector acceptable but finds the design needs to be simplified by eliminating the French Doors. Staff also finds the angled wall plane on the front module reduces its façade width, which affects the width proportions and the amount the connector is recessed from the front module. Does the Commission agree?
3. Building Form - Staff finds the angled doorways and wall plane out of character for the District and out of compliance with Priority Design Standard 120. Does the Commission Agree?
4. Does the Commission support the recommended point analysis?
5. Does the Commission find that the application may return as a final review if issues identified by the Commission are addressed and the project passes a point analysis?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Giller: Small point of order from Mr. Schuman.

Mr. Schuman: My company worked with the owner Mr. Collins. I would still be impartial to this application. (The Commissioners unanimously agreed Mr. Schuman did not have a conflict of interest.)

Ms. Leidal: In regards to Policy 9, setbacks, I see we are not meeting the relative setback to the north and therefore it is earning negative points. It also looks like the plans show the overhang on the south side of the rear building encroaching on the relative setback on the south side. So the south side should be receiving an additional negative three (-3) points if that is the case. (Mr. Kulick: (reviewing the plans) I think you may be correct. Policy 9/R does not allow for roof overhang encroachments like 9/A does. We will correct the point analysis moving forward.)

Mr. Schuman: Did the Casey residence have diamond windows? Who had that? (Mr. Kulick: The Giller residence addition and on the Ploss residence's main home, which is new construction, had diamond windows.)

Ms. Leidal: Are there mullions shown? (Mr. Kulick: Yes)

Mr. Giller: Did you get to the point with the applicant where you talked about reducing the glazing in the front facade of the home? (Mr. Kulick: Initially it looks like a lot of glazing on the front (western façade of front module), but there is a bump out and then the two side windows are recessed several feet back. There are a couple of houses on Harris Street that feature a similar window pattern.)

Janet Sutterley, architect for Collins Residence: I want to start with Christie's question. If you zoom in to the site plan, we are five feet six inches away from the side of the house, the intention is that the overhang is six inches. We do have the house in the right place and will correct the graphic error on the site plan. The first thing I want to go over is the connector. If you all will go to sheet A7, I don't know if you remember from the first preliminary hearing, but we are not required to have a connector on this house. I put the connector in because architecturally I thought it worked well. I wanted to split the building into what looks like two masses. We

could take the roof from the front building over and not have a connector. I didn't want the whole north wall to be one flat plane. Moving the roof down helped to break up the roof line. I feel like we are being reviewed under a connector policy that does not apply. Back to sheet A6, we made the cricket much smaller and took away a diamond window, but that is set way back. You will never see that hallway from the street. The Harris residence on French Street has an actual connector and the whole thing is glass. Of course you don't notice it unless you go back into the driveway. The Collins would like to have as much glazing as possible there. The other thing causing a problem is that 45 degree angled wall, again you can't see it from anywhere but it helped open up their patio space. If that were being reviewed as a code connector, we would have to square that off, but I'm hoping we won't have to do that. The second point would be on the windows. The Collins had hoped to be able to do something with the windows that is not completely square and rectangular. They preferred the angular window. It was my understanding that the commission did support those French doors. My feeling is that at the first preliminary what we didn't do is separate the two sets of French Doors in the discussion. Some people were good with one set and not the other. If we could split out the feedback for the two sets tonight that would be very helpful. The last point would be on the point analysis. Clearly we are not going to take -6 points on windows that we will need to correct to comply with two Priority Design Standards. We will be adding a point for a HERS, but we will do whatever you guys decide pertaining to windows.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: When you got to -6 points, where was that? (Mr. Kulick: Staff's preliminary total point analysis shows -7points. -6 points of the total are from Design Standards 91 and 128, related to windows.)
- Mr. Schuman: Looks like a connector, feels like a connector.
- Mr. Giller: Is a connector not required because this is not an historic house? (Mr. Kulick: It's hard to say, if you had the second story connecting the two building modules, I believe such a design would fail several Design Standards. If you are designing what is essentially a connector, it should meet the standards of 80A.) (Ms. Sutterley: The total above ground square footage does not exceed the recommended module square footage.) (Mr. Kulick: The modules don't have to be connected, but when they are connected, it should meet the connector standards.) (Ms. Sutterley: Some connectors are required by square footage.)

The hearing was opened for public comments. There were none and public comment was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: It is apparent a few items have been discussed with staff, and it really has to do with the French Doors and the diamond windows. I agree with staff that the Historic District does lean toward prohibiting French doors. I am in support of simplifying the French doors and diamond windows on the second story of the rear module. We often think of a building as rectangular, but I'm seeing the connector as more of a creative way to connect two masses into one house. I am in support of the angled walls. The code doesn't say it has to be called a connector. Does not fail that priority policy, my interpretation of the code is telling me that. (Mr. Kulick: What about the angled doorways?) Given that our first prelim had angled doors, I am remaining in support of the way they are. 3. Angled doorways I just clarified. 4. I will as staff shakes it out. 5. I would support returning for a final if these items are cleaned up.
- Mr. Lamb: I know Janet can clean up the windows and reduce glazing. I agree with what Dan said on several things. The French doors are not visible, I don't think they look un-historic. This is not a connector. At this point it is just architecture. I think the building looks good. I'm fine with the angled doorways. Point analysis, Janet you know you will get it passing. A little fine tuning and we will be good to go. The western façade is a little over glazed, but we will see what Janet is coming back with.
- Mr. Moore: I will echo Dan, the only thing I would add, the two doorways at 45 degree angles toward the front (Design standard 120) I'm not sure that is consistent, so I would award negative points

for that. No problem with the wall in the back. The French doors are appropriate under the code. Not going to get into the connector. I like what you did Janet. Diamond windows, I totally believe that Janet will fix that, it isn't consistent with the design standards. 4. Support when it changes. 5. Yes, it should return as a final if the issues are addressed.

Mr. Schuman: 1. Diamond shaped windows need to go and French doors are not compatible. 2. Connector looks like a connector and feels like a connector. 3. I think it is out of compliance with design standard 120. I think there are solutions to simplify the angles and remove the forms. IF we say it meets it, we have to come up with a precedent without opening Pandora's box. 4. Support the point analysis. 5. Janet can design away and overcome, so yes on 5.

Ms. Leidal: Thank you for making the revisions to the lap siding and increasing the pavers strip. 1. 2. 3. I side with staff. I have concerns about the angled doors, the French doors and diamond windows. 4. I leave it up to staff. 5. Welcome to see it as a final hearing.

Mr. Giller: 1. In many ways I agree with staff. Diamond window not okay because visible from street. French doors can be okay because not visible. 2. The angle doesn't work for the connector, 3. The angle at the back door is okay. The angle at the front door is incompatible with design standards. 4. I support the point analysis in general. 5. Janet can solve this with Chris and bring back for a final. (Mr. Kulick: Did you think the connector needed to comply with 80A?) I don't feel strongly either way.

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

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 amount of glazing?
3. Does the Commission support awarding zero (0) points for increasing the buffer on the west side of the project?
4. Does the Commission agree with the Preliminary Point Analysis?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Moore: I have a question, for everyone here who wrote letters. Several people mentioned that One Ski Hill Place was supposed to be the centerpiece in the master plan in its height. Now we have something virtually identical in height. (Mr. Kulick: The building is subordinate to One Ski Hill Place. It is below the east cross gable. This was agreed upon in the Development Agreement. We also looked at the overall density and mass, and made sure the project was broken up into modules that were smaller as well. Beyond those two things, this design is meeting the Master Plan and Development Agreement.) (Mr. Schroder: To me One Ski Hill Place still calls out as the centerpiece of the development.) People are concerned that the Master Plan is not being followed completely just from the mass and scale of the East Peak 8 Hotel. I get that one ski hill place is supposed to be higher, but was that actually called out in the masterplan? I don't need to know word for word. (Mr. Kulick; It is supposed to be the centerpiece and have buildings step down to the sides. The recommended heights in the Master Plan are relative policies. Almost all the buildings approved in the Master Plan area exceeded recommended heights and earned negative points. The East Cross Gables of One Ski Hill Place is not its highest point, but the project is below the East Cross Gable (by only 1/8 of an inch) as stipulated in the Development Agreement. are below it.)

Mr. Schuman: When the easement was granted, would one ski hill place have been notified? (Mr. Schroder: The view corridor plan actually shows the driveway from years ago in a similar location so

this is not new information.) (Mr. Kulick: No, since it was an agreement between two parties the Town is not involved. If it were a subdivision then the Town would be required to give notice.)

Ms. Leidal: We were talking about buffering and 7R. My question is precedent wise, have we ever considered off-site improvements to meet policies? I'm concerned we may be setting precedent by considering improvements off site. (Mr. Kulick: We would like you to weigh in, as it is written in 7R, it is asking is the site buffered? The language in 7R is a bit more interpretive. It is speaking to buffering from adjoin properties and public views. When we researched buffering for other projects within the Peak 7 and 8 Master Plan area, most of the other projects had landscaping along ski hill road. But in the interiors, there was either no landscaping or there was minimal landscaping and they did not get negative points.) Switching to parking, it states the owner is allowed to add 50 parking spaces at their discretion. (Mr. Kulick: We should have that note removed. That is not what we are reviewing tonight.) Also getting back to Lowell comments pertaining to public comments could you please review the circulation from the hill into the plaza. A lot of them talked about access to the plaza.

Ms. Puester: Chris can you comment on the public letters?

Mr. Kulick: We had around twenty letters from the public that were all forwarded to the Planning Commission and the applicants. These letters are now part of the public record and can be viewed at the Planning Department by any member of the public.

Any other questions for Chris? No, invite the applicant to speak.

Sarah Broughton, and with me is Elena Scott and Matt Stais. Ricardo Dunin with Lionheart sends his apologies for not being able to make it tonight. We are excited to get into things here tonight. Quick recap, and Chris thank you for your summary. We met with staff and heard concerns over view corridors, the service driveway, glazing, architecture, and materials.

Ms. Scott: We have been meeting with the neighbors and take it as a complement that people have been writing letters and paying attention to what we are doing and what is going on in the neighborhood. This isn't a property focused on vehicular connections, it is about pedestrians. Loading, we have increased the separation between the two buildings, added acoustical attenuation. On the pedestrian circulation front, we will always talk about how important it is to bring people through this project as a whole. (Shows slide with loading dock locations within the Peak 7 and 8 Master Plan area) All of these red squares are loading docks. We have a lot of people really excited about the restaurants and with that comes loading docks. Not all of the other loading docks are screened or buffered as ours are. Grading: from the low point on our site, we are looking at over a 20ft grade change. We are dealing with residents and neighborhood concerns. The Master Plan specifically had two access points shown, the second is from Sawmill Road. The access to Sawmill Road was recommended not to be pursued, and to be abandoned. One option was to bring all traffic by One Ski Hill Place. We have been very cognizant of all these concerns. I wanted to point out the additional landscaping to show the 23 trees added to this plan. A large portion of the loading dock happens below the pedestrian plaza. These are all things that are not required but we think are important. We got loading dock numbers from One Ski Hill Place. The daily deliveries range from 0-4 trucks depending on the day of the week and time of year. The loading dock is set just below P2 grading. We have talked to the One Ski Hill Place HOA president about connecting conference levels between one Ski Hill Place and ours. We eliminated all balconies from this façade adjacent to One Ski Hill Place. We are working hard to be a good neighbor and fit this building into the property. Lastly, the view corridor, we believe we've done a really good job of taking these view corridor lines and adjusting them. I will turn this over to Sarah to talk more about view corridors and architecture.

Ms. Broughton: The view corridor to the west and the view corridor to the east are both blown up here. Starting with the view corridor to the west, in our smallest area, it is 47'1". This view corridor goes up to 85'3". The

view corridor towards the east has been increased to 32'3", and we have kept the elevation of those cabins low while increasing the view corridor. There was concern last time that the views were unrealistic, but this is from a survey. In order to increase the view corridor, we reduced the building size by 4,600 sq. ft. which allowed us to move the building back away from One Ski Hill Place. We've been studying the building a lot, but thought it was important to get up close and personal with the view corridor. One of the things we are doing is tapering the grade so it is less abrupt from the right of way to where the building starts. Other things we have mentioned, the softened landscape and the elevation being stepped. We have not included any balcony on this west side to minimize the impact to One Ski Hill Place. Lionheart is definitely interested in pursuing connections with One Ski Hill Place. We are putting uses across from uses. Existing skier access paths we are maintaining and improving. Height was mentioned and we have been discussing this with staff. We are committed to increase that 1/8 inch height difference that currently exists. We have re-evaluated the color palette and come to you with muted brownish colors that are compatible with the neighbors and One Ski Hill Place. What we are presenting to you tonight is a combination of natural rustic materials with traditional details. We spoke about the architecture at the last meeting, and the gables are a reflection of classic Breckenridge architecture. We have three gable types that constitute these gables. Within the 32 gables, it is pretty evenly distributed between the three gable types. Many of the elements of these buildings (Slide presented of neighboring buildings including, One Ski Hill Place and the Grand Lodge) were influential with our design. Elements we have taken as cues include, similar roof slopes, gables, and roof overhangs; heavy timber exposed structure, heavy timber siding, metal and wood railings, dark shingles, and stone base. We have warmed up the palette by introducing more browns and dark accents. (1) is the dark wood shingles, (2) is the stacked log walls. (3) is rough wood timber siding, similarly we have the rough wood screen and vertical siding for number (4). The stone base (5) was deepened to more of a brown. Lastly number (6) bronze standing seam roof. We heard concern about the glazing. We did reduce the overall glazing. We were asked to bring in details to show how these materials were being used. Our top rail is a 4x4 timber guardrail, and then steel rails. We have reduced the overall glazing by increasing mullion widths and adding more solid panels. One thing you can see here is we are balancing symmetry in these gables. Each gable is the same palette with slight differences. Back to the overall rendering, we believe the palette is more in harmony with the surrounding buildings and landscape.

Mr. Schroder: A number of the letters referenced access to the gondola. What is the issue? (Ms. Scott: Main skier access is in the southwest corridor of the property. We have heard from neighbors that they hoped for a heated walkway from hotel to gondola, but we don't control that property. Having these various ways and paths for people to filter through and around the building is a great improvement over the previous Master Plan. Also, a lot of people are excited about having more restaurants they can walk to.) One other item I didn't address is on 7R Buffering, it isn't just about providing landscaping, but it is also takes in account the setbacks of the building.

Ms. Leidal: I did have a few questions on the circulation and the architecture from Brent Carr's email that states there may be opportunity to pull back the access drive to the east.. (Ms. Scott: We will pull it in if we can. It is also a fire lane.) I had a question about the mullion. What are the sizes? (Ms. Scott: See number 2 of our samples.) How big is your exposed timber column? (12")

Mr. Schuman: The landscaping count? That is Vail's property and it should not be for positive points.

Mr. Schroder: Who looks down at the buildings there anyway (Referencing views from the ski slopes)? Everyone looks at the continental divide.

Mr. Schuman: Speaking of view corridors, that looks very similar to what you presented at the last meeting. I think you are saying that is to scale? I'm skeptical that the view corridor from that vantage point would that large? I hope it is.

Mr. Moore: What is sound attenuation? (Sarah: It is a material that absorbs sound.) (Ms. Scott: This is as important to our guests as it is to our neighbors.)

Mr. Schroder: Was there ever any comment about the gondola noise, it runs constantly from 7:30-5:00? The gondola never quits. (Ms. Pierce: It stops at 5:00).

Mr. Giller: Can you go to the shingles? Is that Japanese charcoaled or stained? (We want to reserve the ability to either char or stain.) Yeah, that char is not compatible. Next can we go to Norris Design's slide 81 on the packet? Sheet number 22. (Page 158 of the packet). (Ms. Scott: The truck goes underneath the garage.) Is that drawing correct? (Ms. Scott: No it is not, it is trying to blend to different vantage points.) Will you correct that drawing? (Ms. Broughton: Yes.) Will you go to landscape. What does that word say there? Trellis? I found inconsistencies in your drawings particularly around the loading dock. There's a lot of concern about adverse affect on neighbors. How will you light the loading dock? (We will keep the light levels as minimal as possible.)

The hearing was opened for Public Comment.

Lindsay Stapay, 21 County Rd. 451: At this point the massing of our Peak 8 is obviously overwhelming. I do want to challenge the council to keep our base and character. I want to challenge the elevations. I really appreciate the professionals who have taken the time to do this work. Please walk over to the base and take a look. There is an imposing mass there. The other thing I wanted to bring up is transportation. The gondola does not run as much as one hopes. We actually had the gondola shut down for animals to pass through, which created a whole new cluster. It gave a bad impression of the ski resort in April and May. I would like to implore us to do some type of study on what that walkability would feel like. It is also showing that the bus station is quite a ways away. I don't think many visitors will walk that distance to get to the shuttles. If this is going to be a hotel with liveliness and lots of people there we need to look at how the pedestrians are going to move in that space other than the gondola because it's not open all the time. This project will be taking away a lot of employee parking, if we are going to be moving those employees to town to be shuttled, that is a considerable amount of people who will be moved. Environmental impact, I saw they have a 20 year taxation, I would like to see that extended, only because we are into 12 years at One Ski Hill Place and I implore you to look at environmental impact. This is livability. We haven't seen a whole season of that impact with Grand Colorado, and yet we are already ready to jump on the bandwagon with the new one.

Nancy Pierce, I own at One Ski Hill Place: Thank you for your time tonight. One of the things that stood out to me most were the red dots, none of the entrances are in front of another property. The issue is it extends all the way over, if trucks get backed up, we will see that. It is noisy, every time you back up you hear back up beeping. The original drawing that had that access was put together with much smaller densities. What is facing that property is a much lower roof, it shouldn't look like one huge wall. The other issue we have is access to the Colorado Super Chair and Rocky Mountain Super Chair. It is a huge hike that goes right in front of our spa. There's ski school in front of there right now. People already have accidents. There is no plan I can see to effectively and efficiently get skiers to where they want to go. I don't know what a better way is. Well how can we get them to the gondola? And the other thing I just wanted to say, I've lived through 4.5 years of construction. Heights are not verified after the fact. I really would implore you, coming from a Historical district in Boulder, as-builts are not the same. Be very, very cautious of lighting. We are supposed to be a 'green ski area' we can't even have lights on our balcony. It is really hard when you don't have a choice of an access road. (Mr. Kulick: we do verify heights after the fact through the ILC process.)

Bill Anderson 202 Sawmill Run: I'm the property on the east edge of this development. Thank you for ski access. The bigger issue I have today is the peaks of the main building. We don't see peak 6 or 5. Now we have these five peaks at 10,032. We just had some GIS work that says our view will be gone. We knew this is coming. We don't have any renderings from our side at all. Matt (Stais) finally was on the deck with me yesterday. I'm imploring you to work together, not trying to be an adversary by any means.

Robert Shelley, one of the 88 full time homeowners at One Ski Hill: There have been some improvements here, but there are still the fundamental issues we have talked about. We were first exposed to this project about a month and a half ago. There's a huge amount of concern that this project is done properly. One of the things

we talked about before is the access to the loading dock. No one has really talked about that this is the last parcel in the area and it is basically closing off the last access point to get to the courtyard area. I'm going to tell you that on the master plan, the view corridors are significantly different. I guess I've heard a couple of different thoughts thrown around about size of the project. This is 40 percent bigger than One Ski Hill Place. This is huge. I'm not opposed to responsible development, but I strongly feel this project needs some additional design work with more collaboration between all parties involved. Huge amount of complexity. A lot of concern over there.

Alex Foroglou, owner at One Ski Hill Place: The most recent was asking about the gondola. At least from a One Ski Hill Place point of view. People knew the gondola was going to be there. None of the other loading docks are near residential spaces. The original master plan in 2003 showed the road significantly in a different place. The parking is now underground, but the road is now in front of our building and trucks will need to make a U-turn. Also an employee entrance, so we will have trucks and employees. There is one shot in the slides that shows One Ski Hill place as the flagship. If you turn it around, you would see a big loading dock right in the center. That's not what the flagship property should look like. We bought our units with that master plan in place, if they can be ignored, what is the point of having them? Thank you for your time.

Dan Teodoru, Timberline Law: Here on behalf of the One Ski Hill Place HOA Board. Speaking for the board who is speaking for the constituent homeowners. We do acknowledge Lionheart's efforts on the design of this project. We are dealing with a long period of time of no communication. And we are dealing with the unfortunate legacy of how Vail Resorts planned their development. Some of the adjustments have been great, increasing the view corridor/separation to 36 feet has been great. We received these changes about ten days ago. We have been working diligently with design professionals of our own so we could get an understanding of what these changes are, how they help the impacts the HOA was concerned about. When we talked about the covered truck load spot, in terms of the buffering, they've done a great job of trying to turn that around. We haven't had enough time to work through this to give an educated decision to our constituents. A lot of issues such as the height, massing, visual impacts, access. We need to have the opportunity to work through this. If you look at that view corridor slide, it was never designed to be a service access. Vail resorts never consulted with anyone. We never had any opportunity to consult. Basically, this process is here for the adjacent homeowners too. We ask for additional time.

Graham Frank, I'm with Breckenridge Grand Vacations at 1627 Ski Hill Rd: I have a unique perspective of being on both sides of the line tonight. There's been some things said tonight that I feel need to be addressed. No. 1. When the Master Plan was amended, all of these things were vetted time and again. The council took all of that into account multiple times. Each time of the eight times it was amended. I think it is the wrong position for people to put that on you, when it was vetted multiple times. I also don't like the fact that there are things being cherry picked. Things like loading docks, they are significantly far enough from each unit. You guys heard all of it, and all of it was vetted. These comments that ILC's are not vetted and that this staff doesn't do that. They are followed to a T. There is no nefarious activity that goes on, whether it be lighting walkability, etc. Basically an 8 million dollar project was glazed over as we talk about walkability. Thank you for the process. Thank you for what you do.

Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Lamb: We have been doing the Master Plan for Peak 8 for 19 years. We have thought these things through. There has been so much discussion over the years on everything. You go up there and it is a massive place, but it is where we decided to put our density, but it's where it belongs; it's a ski area. Some of the people who live up there may not be thrilled with parts of it, but it is a decision made over many years on where density should go. I agree with staff on all four questions.

- Mr. Schuman: 1. Yes, I do question the East Peak 8 photos and their accuracy. 2. We should be good stewards of transitional mountain style. 3 I do not agree with because I think we are awarding points for offsite efforts. I do agree with the point analysis. I am concerned about the lighting. I really appreciate the staff effort in reviewing this multiple times. I'm concerned about the accuracy of what we are reviewing. We noticed Mike had a number of issues to point out. There should be a double and triple check on the applicant's side. I think that needs to be reviewed possibly one more time before we go to Final. My last comment is it is a difficult project but there has been a lot of time and effort that has gone into this, it is a good looking project that needs a few reviews again.
- Mr. Moore: Sarah and Elena, thank you for all the changes you have made. Really important to me. There has been a lot of thoughtfulness on the part of the developers. Getting Sawmill cut off, they are lucky. The granting of the easement by Vail Resorts, I would have done the same things. 1. As far as the conceptual view corridor, I do agree with staff. It is appropriate to do it that way. 2. Transitional mountain style, we are certainly getting there. 3. I have to go with Ron, at the same time, I do think it is weird our system does +6 points for Sawmill residents being able to walk in. I do still agree with the preliminary point analysis. I don't know if it is ready for Final. I'm not adverse to going to final.
- Ms. Leidal: Very much appreciate the public comment. I also very appreciate the applicant taking neighbor's opinions into account. This is a platted parcel with density on it. There is also a master plan that has been amended multiple times, also a development agreement amended multiple times. We have a performance based zoning, where you can go over the density/height and still pass the project. I think there is too much program on the site, but the project is playing by the rules. In terms of the questions: I think the master plan is conceptual. One Ski Hill Place has been located further to the east than shown on the conceptual development plan. We have a new access easement cutting across tract three. So yes, things have evolved over time and we are doing the best we can with today's circumstances. 1. I would like to see the revised sections to figure out if the view corridors are met. 2. Master plan regarding architecture has been met with the natural materials. 3 and 4, I don't agree with the negative points going away with the site buffer. Buffering needs to be on your site. If it passes point analysis and all absolute policies, it should come back for a final.
- Mr. Schroder: The trees are an accommodation. Attempting to help buffer the building prior constructed. No one who lives in a currently existing development ever likes the neighbor. It is all public process. These staff come here every single day. They are always available to converse. To not know this was coming isn't anyone's fault other than those who chose not to find out what was happening. It would be great if the community could read the public info when it is available. 1. Absolutely. 2. Absolutely. 3. Agree. 4. Agree with point analysis, and recommend it comes back for a Final Hearing.
- Mr. Giller: I want to thank the public and the design team. 1. The design does meet the intent of the conceptual view corridor. 2. Yes it meets design. Minus the charcoal shingles. On the west buffer, I don't think the loading dock is adequately screened. I would encourage you to cover that loading dock area at least to the northeast corner of peak 8. Come back to us and tell us in more detail how you are going to manage lighting. I don't support 0 points for increasing the buffer yet. I disagree with the prelim point analysis. I think they could correct that and come to a final, but you are taking a risk. We would want to see our input fully addressed.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary (Memo Only)
- Mr. Giller: The town attended Mountain Town 2030 Sustainability Conference.
- Mr. Truckey: Next year we will be hosting in conjunction with Summit County and others. The council is moving to vegetarian meals and we'd like the commission to consider this.
2. Class D Majors Q3 2019 (Memo Only)

3. Class C Subdivisions Q3 2019 (Memo Only)

Ms. Puester: I'll just mention that some of us went to the National Trust Past Forward Conference in Denver. Some sessions were better than others. But I think the most interesting one I went to was about climate change and how to address rising water and fire issues.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:29 pm.

Mike Giller, Chair