

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M.**

**ROLL CALL**

Dan Schroder	Rodney Allen	Michael Bertaux
Leigh Girvin	JB Katz	Jim Lamb
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:05 pm		

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

With no changes, the minutes of the May 5, 2009 Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (6-0).

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

With no changes, the May 19, 2009 Planning Commission agenda was approved unanimously (6-0).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Johnson Residence (JP) PC#2009019, 1030 Four O'Clock Rd. (*withdrawn; to be rescheduled to a future date*)
2. Allen Residence (CK) PC#2009018, 596 Gold Run Rd.
3. Koch Residence (MGT) PC#2009020, 95 Victory Lane

With no motions for call up, the consent calendar was approved as presented.

**PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:**

1. Gondola Lot Master Plan (CN) PC#2009010, 320 North Park Avenue

Mr. Neubecker presented a proposal to Master Plan the north and south parking lots surrounding the town gondola terminal with a condo-hotel, townhomes, commercial uses, mixed use building, new skier service facilities, new transit facilities, and two parking structures. The proposal also included development on portions Wellington parking lot and the East Sawmill parking lot, plus modifications to the Blue River, all of which are owned by the Town of Breckenridge.

This is one of the largest projects the Commission has reviewed, and certainly one which has potential for enormous impacts to the Town. While we do not want to rush this process, we would like to review this application in as timely a process as possible. Accordingly, the applicant has committed to working with staff and the Commission to address issues, and has started by submitting a plan that is very similar to the recently completed Gondola Lots Vision Plan. As staff has done with other major applications, staff will schedule reasonable portions of the project to cover during our meeting times, and can adjust the schedule if too much or too little is trying to be reviewed.

The review will be structured into several topics. Some topics overlap into others, and there will be some skipping around in the order topics are presented. However, staff believes the listed topics would be appropriate to cover for a preliminary review of the master plan. After a round of input on each, the applicant will be making a single set of revisions for the master plan, and staff and the Commission will proceed from there.

- I Introduction to process / Overview of project (5/19/09)
- II. Circulation/Access
  - a. Vehicular
    - Public road alignment
    - Parking structures
    - Project parking
    - Traffic/Circulation/Impacts
    - Service Access
    - Transit/Gondola
  - b. Pedestrian Circulation
- III. Development Concept
  - a. Site plan/uses
  - b. Architectural character
  - c. Building heights

- d. Amenities
  - e. View Corridors
  - f. Landscaping
  - g. Relationship to Historic District
- IV. Density analysis
  - V. Infrastructure, Utilities and Drainage
  - VI. Blue River Corridor
    - a. Amenities
    - b. Improvements
    - c. State Permits
  - VII. Sustainability/Green Codes/LEED
  - VIII. Phasing

The next step in the process will be to review specific aspects of the project. Staff anticipated that circulation, access, and transportation issues will be the first topic to discuss, as these issues may affect major design aspects of the development. Staff noted that issues raised during one meeting may not be directly addressed in the next meeting, which may focus on a different topic. However, staff will attempt to keep the Commission informed of plan revisions and new information when necessary. Otherwise, plan revisions will be presented near the end of the process, when one final plan including all revisions is presented. Staff welcomed any general comments from the Commission on the process proposed.

*Applicant Presentations:*

Mr. Alex Iskenderian (VRDC): Mr. Iskenderian discussed history of the project, including removal of density as part of the Peak 8 Master Plan. The Peak 8 Master Plan included a transfer of density from the gondola lot to the Peak 7 and 8 base areas, as well as some sunsetting of density. Started the charrette process with the Town to begin visioning the Riverwalk and gondola area, and determined that the updated density (201 SFEs) would be appropriate for the site. Additional input from the Town was that the development area needed to be well integrated into town. VRDC put together a committee with Town and VRDC representatives, and spent 6-8 months doing a visioning process to come up with the current plan. The group met with Town Council and Planning Commission several times during the visioning process. Several public open houses and focus groups were also held to ensure that the public was engaged through the process. Overall the process seemed successful, and the plans from this process were submitted to the Town.

Mr. Bill Campie (DTJ Design): Mr. Campie discussed design drivers for the master plan process, which were noted in the Planning Commission report. Big issues were compatibility with the Town, transportation and transit. Discussed design concepts for the plan, including “extending the grid,” which was deemed too close to mimicking Main Street, and “the grand hotel” based on a quality iconic building as the core of the plan. Both concepts were taken to public meetings and discussed with the community. The input provided by the community helped the design team to get to the plan that was submitted to where it is today.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

- Mr. Bertaux: Abstained from the issue as an employee of the Breckenridge Ski Resort.
- Mr. Lamb: Why aren't there two entry points to both of the parking structures? What is the second access at the south parking structure for the condo hotel? (Mr. Campie: Second access is valet / special events parking which is separate from the main entry point.) Agreed that circulation is a great place to start.
- Mr. Schroder: Infrastructure and drainage is a really important issue, especially snow melt concerns with the structures.
- Ms. Katz: Where do you foresee skier drop offs happening? The current configuration is very busy. (Mr. Campie: Considering temporary parking spots in addition to the Gondola Drop off area. VRDC is considering adding drop off at Peak 8 as well.) Buses do a one-way from Park or go all the way through the project? (Mr. Campie: Unsure of exact bus routing at this time.) (Mr. Allen: When will you have input from CDOT regarding the bus access?) Is the bus parking area also used for shuttle buses from hotels/condos? (Mr. Campie: Shuttles will go to the gondola drop-off or the Peak 7 drop-off.) Circulation seems to be a large component of the master plan process. The impacts are really important.

Mr. Pringle: Have you analyzed the traffic study? Concerned with the access point with 1st Bank and town hall. (Mr. Campie: The traffic study shows that this alignment works. The left turn is an LOS (“level of service”) E, which is typical for unsignalized left turns. A signal is not possible at that location.) The 1,200 spaces will be in addition to the parking needed for the condo/hotel building in the south parking structure? (Mr. Campie: Yes, condo/hotel parking will be located below the condo/ hotel building. Also the building will have conference and restaurant space. Retail/restaurant uses are also proposed to be located along the ground floor of the building.) Will the Town/Commission see a full development plan for the Riverwalk? (Mr. Neubecker: There are goals to expand the Riverwalk and this is the transition point from the developed river (south) to the natural river (north). Currently the river isn’t accessible. Need to determine when this happens and who takes care of it, how it is phased, etc.)

Mr. Allen: Can Mr. Campie please walk the commission through the circulation? (Mr. Campie: Displayed the proposed site plan and noted locations for parking structure, condo/hotel building, mixed use building, transit/skier service building, bus transfer circulation and drop off, townhomes, etc. Will use diverse building heights on site so the entire site doesn’t look the same. Park Avenue is the main access for the site, with some access from Main Street. Project doesn’t bring a lot of new traffic to the town; rather it provides walk-to uses, parking to replace the existing lots, circulation for buses, pedestrian and skier traffic. Team is working with CDOT on Park Avenue access, but proposal is that buses will access from Park Avenue and at proposed North Depot Road. Warrants for a traffic signal may be met at Park Avenue and French Street with this project, which will help to facilitate circulation. Pedestrian access will be provided and well identified. Proposed streets will have design techniques to promote slow speeds. Potential service access locations were identified.) Can you walk us through a pedestrian’s journey from the skiback, to the structure, to town, etc.? (Mr. Campie: Once skiers are used to parking in this development, we believe that many will park in the south parking structure which is closer to the skiback access via the Skyway Skiway. Also will provide signage for pedestrians through several plaza areas through the project and around the condo/hotel to Main Street and other areas of the gondola lot.) (Ms. Katz: What is the slant of the site?) (Mr. Campie: High point at southwest end.) (Mr. Neubecker: Described the ownership of the buildings around Town Hall. They are not under Town or VRDC control.) The vision sounds like it is to get people to Main Street. (Mr. Pringle: The train park will be located along the proposed pedestrian way.) (Mr. Campie: Discussed trolley or some kind of loop transit that services the project and the Main Street.) (Mr. Pringle: Important to keep the plazas small and dynamic.) How far do we discuss the Riverwalk at this point? Important to circulation as well. (Mr. Neubecker: Riverwalk will connect to the bike path to the north. Many important river corridor discussions are anticipated for channeling, eddies, habitat, landscape, etc.)

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

Stephanie Epps (listing agent for property on Watson adjacent to the project): Concerned with traffic and pedestrian safety on Watson. It’s a busy road. People on bikes don’t look for cars. Will be difficult to cross the road without a bridge or some other crossing assistance.

Bill Kiester (Resident at French and Main): Noticed that many skiers do not use the “ski back” and instead remove their skis and walk across Highway 9. Need to address skier circulation.

Dave Garrett (Adjacent Property and business owner): Was there any discussion of putting a structure on the Gold Rush lot or in another location that is more hidden rather than in the center of town? Important that conceptual things, such as building heights for hotel and structure, are discussed before it is approved. Heard in meetings that the street grid system should be maintained to keep the “small town feel”. The “grand hotel” idea has been tried in several projects in town (Village at Breckenridge, Main Street Station, Beaver Run) and they have had issues filling their plazas and businesses.

Mark Burnell (Property owner at French and Wellington): Curious about whether the approach of “blurring the property lines” is the right way to go. Who are the land owners? Just VRDC and town? (Mr. Allen: Yes.)

There was no additional public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Comments:*

- Ms. Katz: Really disappointed in the circulation. The amount of pickup/drop-off area is under-estimated and is used by more than just ski school users. Pickup/drop-off shouldn't be buried in the middle of the project. They are going to go as close to the gondola as they can get, regardless of where you provide drop-off space. People will drop-off on Watson and other streets with traffic issues. Even if the lodge shuttles are supposed to go to Peak 7 and drop off, they won't. People want to ride the gondola. Shuttles also will start pulling up wherever they can, and are more likely to go to the designated spot within the project. If CDOT allows the ¾ turn at North Depot road it might work, but overall disappointed with the bus circulation. Concerned with parking structures and filling up north first, because the south parking lot is closer to everything else and is more hidden, and that's where everyone will want to park. Concerned with the access point for the bank and town hall is constrained and will have heavy use. Seems that the current system is finally clicking and it is critical to maintain that. Agreed with what Ms. Epps said regarding Watson Street traffic. Agreed that other issues on the list will be addressed during the process.
- Ms. Girvin: Agreed with Ms. Katz that the exit for the south parking lot is inadequate. Current circulation is already constrained; and adding 600 cars with no signal is not appropriate. Turn lanes are going to be needed on French Street and on Park Avenue. Lodging bus designation points will need to be considered. Would like to see a diversity of architecture on the property, and the three clusters of townhomes should all look different. Swan Mountain Villas is a good example of everything looking the same; we don't want suburbs here in Town. There are a lot of impervious surfaces here and concerned with water quality. Going to lose parking if the river is moved to the east. Most important reservation is to create a "real place" and not just something that "feels like a real place". We don't want it to feel like River Run. Agreed that the approach is correct as far as topics listed.
- Mr. Schroeder: Left turns at the south parking garage are a major concern. Left turn into the north parking lot on French needs turn lanes. The gondola is a draw for people in town, and need to make sure that people will use public transportation rather than get a car out of the structure to drive to Mi Casa or another restaurant. Fearful that traffic isn't minimized. We are approaching this in the correct manner.
- Mr. Lamb: Blue River corridor should move up on the list and same with the CDOT permits. Comments that Ms. Girvin made about French Street and 1st Bank intersections are shared. County and town have done a great job with a complicated bus system, and need to be included in discussion for the bus system and routing. Liked the two parking structures (north and south). Circulation does seem most important and the is the backbone of the process.
- Mr. Pringle: Liked Mr. Campie's thoughts about bringing the dynamic flavor into the development with small pedestrian areas and cars. Concerned with traffic and congestion at the end of a ski day. What can we do to bring people into the project, and also make it easy to get out? Can an underground roadway be explored to get people out of town? Access and egress and circulation management are most important. Create an authentic story and viable project. The condo/hotel will be a large building and iconic, big buildings when done correctly and when sympathetic to town vision can be great. Agreed with Mr. Lamb that the river corridor should move up on the list. This is going to be the most important project that the town will see in a long time. We are approaching this process correctly.
- Mr. Allen: This is a great start, and the project goals and vision are good. Agreed with Ms. Girvin regarding the turn lanes. Would like to see North Depot Road enhanced to be a place where a lot of the cars go, if cars go from French and to North Depot we will have the least amount of pedestrian conflict. Would like to think ahead about how we capture the pedestrians from future lot development at Gold Rush, Postal Lot and Parkway Center developments, especially when people cross Park Avenue. River corridor is a part of circulation and should be discussed now. Has coming out of the north side of the south parking structure been considered with a roundabout at Mountain Thunder Drive? Phasing plan should include a pedestrian circulation plan that works with the entire project throughout the construction. The north parking structure should also be "wrapped" like the south structure. Ski back tunnel is a big issue and is a current disaster and doesn't seem inviting or easy for thousands of skiers to get through the project. Where is the sense of arrival for skiers? Can the tunnel arrive into the plaza to invite people in? Concerned with pedestrians walking along Park Avenue. Gondola plaza looks wonderful, but the crossing over to Watson and the South Depot Road doesn't seem inviting.

Buses turning left onto Park Avenue are key and need to be confirmed with CDOT. We are approaching the process correctly.

Applicant Response, Mr. Campie: Goal for the north parking structure is to locate it closest to the gondola and nearest egress from town. There will be less reason to drive down Watson with signals at Ski Hill and French. Many of the circulation issues mentioned are already problems today, and it is our intention to improve the current situation with this project.

2. Lot 5, McAdoo Corner (MGT) PC#2009009, 209 South Ridge Street

Mr. Thompson presented a proposal to construct a new 3,365 sq. ft. restaurant on Lot 5 of McAdoo Corner Subdivision. At this time Staff anticipated no positive or negative points. However, the applicant is considering a wood fired pizza oven. If positive points would be needed to mitigate the negative points, the applicant would most likely add solar panels to the roof to mitigate the negative points.

Staff believed that the application was moving along nicely and welcomed any additional input from the Planning Commission. Staff requested feedback on policies 158, 80A, 163 and 164.

Applicant Presentation, Janet Sutterley, Architect:

Ms. Sutterley discussed the updated elevations for the building that addressed the Commission's previous comments.

Building design has changed to meet code for density and connections. Façade changes to materials and windows, and the setback was updated per concerns with adjacent historic buildings. An elevator and stair were added to meet code requirements and are located on the south side. Roof design was updated to reflect the elevator addition. Mechanical equipment will be located on the first story roof and is screened with adjacent properties and landscaping. Chimney is there because it is a wood burning pizza oven. Density was also moved to the basement of the structure. Larger spruce trees were located on the north side of the building. (Mr. Berteaux: What are you going to use the basement for?) Storage, coolers, handicap bathroom, food prep area, etc. (Mr. Allen: Do any of the surrounding buildings have a metal chimney?) Brick is adjacent, and materials are not determined at this time. Open to your ideas. (Mr. Neubecker: We can look at the code and I think brick is something we would consider. If it is a stove pipe, then a metal chimney makes sense.) (Mr. Allen: How big is the chimney?) It is about 10 feet high. (Mr. Pringle: Would prefer a more typical material that is compatible with the architecture.)

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

Stephanie Epps, neighboring property owner/local realtor: The property is within an association. To pave the parking the rest of the association will need to be involved, for the Commissioners information.

Jan Radosovich, neighboring property owner/local realtor: Where is the new staircase? Concerned about the location. (Ms. Sutterley discussed the stair and its purpose for emergency use only as a secondary access.)

There was no additional public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Berteaux: Supported the grease trap and paving the parking. Supported EPA phase II requirement for the wood burning appliance. Would like the chimney to be brick and put the solar panels in anyway.

Mr. Lamb: All of the concerns have been addressed. Trust you to work it out regarding the chimney materials.

Mr. Schroder: Looks ready to go for final. Would like to see brick on the chimney, and would love to see solar panels whether or not there are negative points.

Ms. Katz: Happy with the changes that have been made. Less concerned with the chimney and trust you to work it out. Trust that Ms. Epps will work with the HOA to get paving. Ready to go to final.

Mr. Pringle: Is it possible to do a wood fire pizza restaurant that is EPA rated? (Mr. Thompson: Some EPA furnaces may be available. One neighbor did call and would prefer that if a wood burning device is used that it meet all EPA requirements.) (Mr. Neubecker: Code requires an EPA Phase II for residential but not for a cooking device.) (Ms. Katz: We cannot require them to do more than what is required.) (Mr. Neubecker: You are welcome to use EPA Phase II if you wish.) Changes look good and have no critical comments. Please look for way to avoid the negative points for the stove.

- Ms. Girvin: Missed the first hearing, but what we have now looks good. Agreed with Mr. Bertaux's comments. Liked the look of the brick chimney next door to this project. One comment for staff is that the public comments from previous hearings weren't included in the staff report and it would be helpful to include those.
- Mr. Allen: Thought it looks good and open to chimney materials. If you use metal on the chimney, please show some example where its been used before. Would like to encourage you to see if there are incentives for putting in solar panels and propose that.
- Ms. Sutterley: Can solar panels be used to heat paved areas? (Mr. Neubecker: Positive points will be necessary if they choose to use a wood burning appliance.) (Ms. Katz: Can we waive the model requirement?) (Mr. Neubecker: The Planning Commission can waive that requirement.)

**COMBINED HEARINGS:**

1. Peters Residence Renewal (MM) PC#2009015, 305 & 307 East Washington  
Mr. Neubecker presented on behalf of Mr. Mosher. The application was presented as a worksession at the May 5 hearing due to issues with the public notice. The proposal was to remove the non-historic additions from the west and south sides of the existing historic cabin, then relocate (on site), restore, and locally landmark the cabin. The proposal was also to remove the non-historic structure from the property, and construct a new single-family residence. This application was approved in 2006, but the permit was about to expire. This application was to renew the permit, thereby extending the vested property rights. This proposal has been discussed in several previous work sessions.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

- Mr. Bertaux: Good.  
Mr. Lamb: Good.  
Mr. Schroder: Good.  
Ms. Katz: Good.  
Mr. Pringle: Good.  
Ms. Girvin: Good.  
Mr. Allen: Good.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis and the Peters Residence Renewal, PC#2009015, 305 & 307 East Washington. Ms. Katz seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

**TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:**

No report was presented.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

1. CLG Presentation by Mr. Dan Corson, Colorado Historical Society  
Ms. Cram introduced Mr. Dan Corson from the Colorado Historical Society, who was in attendance to observe the Commission's review of projects within the historic district as well as make a presentation to the Commission about their responsibilities as a Certified Local Government.

Mr. Corson: Thanked the Commission for allowing him to present at tonight's meeting. He presented packets of materials to the Commissioners. The packets included information regarding Colorado Certified Local Government requirements, economic benefits to historic preservation, and information on the National Trust for Historic Preservation and preservation week. He also touched on the tax credit process.

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

- Mr. Bertaux: How are we doing? (Mr. Corson: Everyone does it differently and each community sets its own standards. Our goal is to see that you know what you're doing and what the guiding principles are, and not to criticize but to educate.) We wrestle with some modern issues on a regular basis, one is solar panels on historic buildings and the other is replacing windows in an historic building when there are newer energy efficient windows on the market. How do other towns struggle with this? (Mr. Corson: We now have solar panels on the state capital but you can't see them from the street. Only provides about 1.2% of the power on the building. Some communities consider an energy audit

(insulation, etc.) prior to allowing installing solar panels on historic buildings. Windows are complex. Energy efficiency doesn't mean that it is the most sustainable solution. If the windows have been there for several hundred years, they may be better off to be restored as they will last many more years. Important to consider what amount of energy is used to manufacture and transport that window.)

Ms. Cram noted that historic training for the Planning Commission will be scheduled in the fall.

***ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00p.m.

---

Rodney Allen, Chair