

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:05 P.M.**

**ROLL CALL**

Rodney Allen  
JB Katz  
Dave Pringle

Michael Bertaux  
Jim Lamb

Leigh Girvin  
Dan Schroder

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

With no changes, the minutes of the August 4, 2009 Planning Commission meeting were approved unanimously (6-0). Mr. Schroder abstained as he was absent on August 4<sup>th</sup>.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

With no changes, the August 18, 2009 Planning Commission agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Exchange Building Master Sign Plan Amendment, PC#2009037, 100 South Ridge Street

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

**FINAL HEARING:**

1. Preservation Village at Maggie Placer, PC#2008024, 9525 Colorado Highway 9

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to develop 21 townhomes in the form of nine duplexes and one triplex. Four of the units are to be sold as market-rate and 17 will be for workforce housing. There will be 16 three-bedroom units and five two-bedroom units. Each unit will have at least a one-car garage (some have two-car garages).

Changes since the last review July 21, 2009

1. Staff, Applicant, Agent and neighbors met at the property July 24<sup>th</sup> to walk the property and review setbacks and site buffering.
2. The “red, yellow, green and blue” accent colors have been muted slightly responding to neighbors concerns.
3. Buildings 8-9 and 10-11 have been moved east away from the rear setback and landscaping has been added to better buffer to the neighboring property.
4. Snow stacking has been made more efficient.
5. The detention pond has been designed to preserve existing tree buffer to the north and follow the existing drainage patterns on the site.
6. Underground utilities have been located to preserve the existing tree buffer along the east property line.
7. Exterior dark-sky compliant lighting cut sheet is provided.
8. The playground is fenced to the west.

With the revisions provided with this submittal, Staff believes the concerns of the Commission, Staff and neighbors have been well addressed. Overall, Preservation Homes at Maggie Placer should be a welcome addition to the Town’s stock of permanently affordable workforce housing. There is good variety of architecture, functional floor plans and easy access Town via the existing sidewalk and the public transit system.

Mr. Mosher noted that the landscaping plan (handed out new copy) had been revised with an agreement between Woods Manor (in the County) and Maggie Placer to plant six Spruce trees on their property to aid in buffering the impacts along the west edge of the development facing Woods Manor. Woods Manor does not want the social trail passing through their property and wanted the trees planted to discourage its use.

Staff recommended approval of Preservation Homes at Maggie Placer, PC#2008024, by supporting the passing Point Analysis and by endorsing the attached Findings and Conditions.

Mr. Royce Tolley, Preservation Homes, one of the applicants, spoke and noted the development team’s efforts to resolve issues with the adjacent property owners groups (Woods Manor and Ski and Racquet), including circulation,

tree preservation and landscaping. The developer realizes that some issues still remain with the adjacent Woods Manor group regarding the playground and the building colors.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Jay Rust, president of Woods Manor HOA: The group appreciates the larger building setbacks and screening improvements with the proposed spruce trees on the Woods Manor Property, but requested that the number of trees be increased from 6 to 10. The HOA understands that the cost of trees could be significant, and believes that the cost of the increased screening could be offset with the removal of the playground. The HOA is still concerned with the building colors and that the colors do not fit in the Town of Breckenridge compared to other recent remodels. The HOA is delighted that the retaining wall will have boulders and landscaping and will help to keep the slope from eroding. He also noted that the brighter colors take away from the quality of the architectural features.

Mr. Steve Werner, retired judge, resident at Woods Manor: Has a young granddaughter. Mr. Werner spoke about the proposed playground, and the fact that his upper level unit faces the proposed playground. The playground is too close to his unit. Was concerned that the playground will attract teenagers at odd hours, and that noise could occur.

Ms. Kathy Rust, resident at Woods Manor: Spoke in detail about the proposed colors. Understands that interpretation of color is totally subjective. (Passed out a list of recent multi-family remodels that have incorporated colors.) Architectural Control Committees and Planning Commissions help to make sure that the built environment respects the town history and the natural setting. Cited the Development Code section regarding color blending into the natural settings. The staff comments from a previous hearing were also cited. References to natural materials and earth tones were made in the comments and in the code. Listed the various materials and colors proposed on the building. Respectfully requested that the guidelines be reviewed that the project color scheme not “unduly conform” to the site’s context.

Mr. Sebald, Woods Manor: Requested to see the new color board. Requested the Mr. Mosher confirm the number of materials, textures and colors on the buildings. How many of these colors on the board will be on the major textures of the building? (Mr. Gerken, BHH Partners, Architect: On one building (two units) 5 different colors and textures would be on each building.) How many accents are on the building? (Mr. Gerken noted that there are two different trims on the buildings.) This number of colors and textures does not fit in with the context of the neighborhood. Also noted that the Valleybrook Daycare did not have this many colors.

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

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Schroder: Are you sure that a garbage truck can get through the drive lane? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, fire department trucks also.) Where is the retaining wall at the playground? (Mr. Mosher pointed it out on the site plan and noted the fence along the edge of the wall.)

Final Comments: I am in favor of the project as it is submitted. I appreciate the suggestion of diverting some funds from the playground to add more trees for screening; however, I think that the six spruce trees are sufficient buffer. Also, I believe that recreational structures are important to the project and Policy 20 of the Code encourages the use. I think that with 21 units, there could be up to 20 kids living in this complex. With the State Highway so close to the property, I’d prefer that the playground remain where it is away from the highway. I know that the accent color scheme has been muted, and I even supported how the scheme looked before. Fine with the color change. I think it fits within the color chroma as it is and I support it.

Ms. Girvin: Final Comments: I am not a big fan of this project at all. I think there is too much density on the site. I don’t like that the entire site is being nuked as a result. This site is a gateway to our community and we are losing a treed hillside and gaining a big negative impact. My hands are tied and I can’t do anything. I would respectfully request that the Council reconsider the requirement at property annexation to require 50% affordable housing. This is the result we will be seeing. My concerns are that the off-site landscaping on the Woods Manor property not impact the existing path of the social trail in the hopes that the Town can one day secure an easement in that location. I don’t think that the playground makes sense where it is because it is next to one of the market rate units. It should be moved closer to the affordable units, because they will be the ones that use it. The color scheme makes the project too busy.

- Ms. Katz: Final Comments: If this were a perfect world, I would agree with Ms. Girvin regarding the site disturbance and loss of trees, but we are constantly struggling to find locations for affordable housing. Affordable housing is a real need. I love this project and prefer that we do these types of niches throughout Town. I love the colors, and I believe they are earth tones and they are different, just not brown like everything else. In general, development impacts everyone negatively and positively, depending on your perspective. Woods Manor can buy their own spruce trees as added buffers, and it should not be required of the developer. I think that it is a great compromise that there are spruce trees being offered by the developer at all. The playground comments made at the last meeting were not meant to be offensive, and I support the playground use. Don't believe that the playground will be a place for teenagers to hang out. If you want to create a place for teenagers to hang out, put in a picnic table and nothing else, and they will show up. But they won't show up here since other people will use the playground. Possibly the playground could have daytime hours posted. I think that if there is after hours unwanted noise it should be a police enforcement issue. I support the point analysis. If it had more un-natural materials than what is proposed, I would support the points be changed to negative six. Don't believe the trail will have heavy use.
- Mr. Lamb: Final Comments: I appreciate the developers, staff and home owners working together. Looking at the Code, this project passes with seven positive points. I agree with Ms. Katz that the playground should be an enforcement issue and it should remain in the project. I think that there is a strong landscape plan. Several of the colors are so similar that I don't think they are unreasonable. The architect has a long record of building quality projects around town. Support the project and the Point Analysis.
- Mr. Pringle: What is the material being used for siding – plywood or cementitious siding? It is noted as plywood in the drawings. (Mr. Hogan: It is cementitious Hardi-plank siding, and the drawing note is incorrect.) (Mr. Mosher: The Findings and Conditions will be changed to reflect that prior to issuance of a building permit the final drawings will reflect the change.) Were the plywood panels impacting the negative three points assigned under policy 5/R? (Mr. Mosher: They were not considered a natural material in the initial review because of the smoother texture. The horizontal siding and wainscot are natural and compromise about 50% of the elevations. So, negative three points (-3) were assessed. Changing to Hardi-plank should not change the point analysis.)  
Final Comments: We need to make sure that Hardi-board siding is changed on the final drawings. With these confirmed, I support the negative three (-3) points for un-natural materials. I think that the playground isn't necessary in terms of project cost, and think that barbeque grills might be more appropriate in this site plan for the residents. I agree with Ms. Katz that if more trees on the Woods Manor are requested then the property owners should plant trees. I think that the colors are a little over the top, but, on the down side, I think that the earth-tone colors all blending together (like in the Highlands) loses something and that the colors here could be good. I agree with the point analysis as long as the negative points for un-natural materials are correct. I appreciate all the efforts of Ski and Racquet and the groups striving to work together.
- Mr. Bertaux: What is the fence made of? (Mr. Gerken: Pointed out the fence detail in the packet and the location of the fencing.) (Mr. Mosher: Staggered 1X planking.)  
Final Comments: I like this site because it meets several of the town's goals for diversification of affordable housing and I like the southern location close to transit, sidewalk, shops and restaurants. We have struggled with the density impacts in the past for this property and this proposal seems very workable. I support the colors and think they look more muted since the last meeting. I support the playground and believe it could be expanded. I support the project and the point analysis.
- Mr. Allen: Final Comments: I believe this is a great example of the public process working. I believe everyone's involvement has made this a better project overall. I support the playground and, per Policy 20, it is suggested by the Code. I support the colors and could be persuaded to award maximum negative points for materials. The project would still easily pass the Point Analysis. I believe that the landscaping shown is the bare minimum and meets the absolute policy. The project will be an asset to the community.

Mr. Mosher asked to add two conditions (to be formally added after the meeting):  
Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit

#22. Applicant shall execute and record with the Summit County Clerk and Recorder an agreement running with the land in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney that allows for the planting and maintenance in perpetuity for the six (6) spruce trees as shown on the approved Landscaping Plan.

#23 Final drawings shall reflect that the Pre-finished Plywood Panels identified for each building is replaced with Pre-finished Cementitious Panels.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to recommend approval of the point analysis for Preservation Homes at Maggie Placer, PC#2008024, 9525 Colorado Highway 9. Mr. Lamb seconded and the motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion approve Preservation Homes at Maggie Placer, PC#2008024, 9525 Colorado Highway 9, that reflects new conditions #22 and #23 above. Mr. Bertaux seconded and the motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

***PRELIMINARY HEARING:***

1. Gondola Lots Master Plan, PC#2009010, 320 North Park Avenue

Mr. Neubecker presented the next topic on the Gondola Lots Master Plan: transportation, traffic, transit, parking and circulation (including pedestrian circulation). The site is surrounded by an existing network of public streets including Park Avenue (State Highway 9), Main Street, French Street, Watson Avenue and Ski Hill Road. These existing roads provide the majority of the private vehicle access to the site. Two new roads are also proposed, including South Depot Road, which connects to the existing Wellington Road at Main Street, and North Depot Road, which will connect into the site from French Street on the north.

Engineering Staff has been working closely over many months with both VRDC and CDOT on options for traffic circulation within the proposed Gondola Lot Redevelopment Site (Site) and the SH 9 (Park Ave) corridor adjacent to the Site. Staff believes the design changes presented to the Commission are the best design for the Town and the development Site, prioritizing a timely and efficient Transit system, effective traffic flow during peak and off-peak times on Park Ave, and minimizing pedestrian and vehicular interaction where possible.

Option 4, installation of a roundabout at French/Park intersection was agreed upon as the “preferred option” for improving traffic operations on Park Ave. Installation of a roundabout enhances traffic flow through the French/Park intersection and accommodates restrictions to left-hand turns onto Park Ave (preferred by CDOT) from both the Transit Access and the South Parking Garage access. Exiting vehicles can turn right and utilize the roundabout for a u-turn to head south on Park Ave. Staff believes this is the best option to ensure Transit reliable access to south-bound movements on Park Ave. If full-movement access is granted by CDOT at the Transit Access, adding the “Bus Only” acceleration lane will also provide for easier left turns for Transit during non-peak hours. A roundabout also provides a functional benefit during off-peak times allowing a free flow traffic movement through the intersection.

Staff believed the design changes presented to the Commission were the best design for the Town and the development Site, prioritizing a timely and efficient Transit system, effective traffic flow during peak and off-peak times on Park Ave, and minimizing pedestrian and vehicular interaction where possible. Proposed changes to traffic circulation within the Site included making N. Depot Road and S. Depot Road private roads, relocating access to the South Parking Garage from Watson to Park Ave, moving the skier drop-off north of the gondola to N. Depot Rd, reconfiguration of the Transit station and Transit exit route, and moving the current 1st Bank/Town Hall access north on Park Ave to accommodate the South Parking Garage. Improvements to Park Ave include the addition of auxiliary turning lanes and a “Bus Only” acceleration lane at the Transit exit, a roundabout at the intersection with French St., and restriction of left turn movements onto to Park Ave from South Parking Garage exit.

**QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

Staff welcomed any comments or questions for the Commission concerning transportation, traffic, transit, parking, or circulation.

1. Did the Commission support the general circulation plan for the project? If not, what elements require further study, detail or changes?

2. Did the Commission support the proposed round-about at French Street and Park Avenue?
3. Did the Commission support the proposed transit plan?
4. Did the Commission understand and support the parking structure operations?
5. Did the Commission support the proposed pedestrian circulation plan?
6. Did the Commission support the reduction in parking based on the mix of uses, anticipated mode split, and proximity to transit?
7. Were there other elements of these topics that have not been adequately addressed?

Mr. Bill Campie, applicant's representative from DTJ Design, presented for the developer. Mr. Campie presented the development team's transportation goals, including:

- Create a framework of roads, sidewalks and trails that reflect the downtown character
- Reduce conflicts between users
- Create a pedestrian place
- Maintain vehicle access while reducing speeds
- Extend bike path and connect to North Main Street
- Improve bus access and routing
- Develop walk-able streets

Mr. Campie reviewed the transportation changes made since the last hearing, including the south parking access from Park Avenue, roundabout at French Street, added drop-off parking spaces, and modified bus transit circulation. The roadway spacing is designed to reflect the grid of downtown. Mr. Campie showed slides of Park Avenue, beginning at the proposed roundabout at French Street and ending at Sawmill Drive. Pedestrian crossing at French Street would be provided at the roundabout, although not encouraged. The Gold Rush lot will have bus service to help prevent pedestrian crossings in this area. The roundabout also provides an alternative route for bus circulation should the left turn onto Park Avenue not be possible. The bus circulation area has added turn lanes and an acceleration lane for busses turning left onto Park Avenue. The south parking structure access has been moved to align with Sawmill Drive. The parking structures will have card feeder stations rather than a pay booth, a validation process that you can pay at multiple locations throughout the structure and in town. There will not be a left turn option at Sawmill Drive and Park Avenue, and if this becomes an issue there is an option to exit east towards Wellington Road and Main Street or along South Depot road to Watson where the hotel access is provided. The drop-off area at the gondola will have 15-minute parking and there are also several other drop off areas provided by the ski resort. The potential for a trolley has been accommodated in the plan. The existing bike paths will remain intact, and pedestrian bridges may be provided across the river in a few locations. Pedestrian access to downtown will be provided in several locations, including river crossings. Pedestrian access from the parking structures to the gondola is also an important consideration for the plan. The ski-back flow to parking structures will be provided along Park Avenue and South Depot Road.

Mr. Allen opened the hearing to public comment.

*Public Comment*

Mr. Bobby Craig, owner of 322 North Main Street: I like the general concept of the plan and the circulation changes are great. I am concerned with the dead end cul-de-sac at the North Depot drop-off. There needs to be another way to exit from that location because it could get backed up. I think that the density is great in this location, and should be located around a transit station. I am concerned with the size of the buildings; the parking structures and the hotel are very large. I'd like to see them broken into four buildings rather than two, and I like the wrapping of the south structure by the condo-hotel. Better spaces might be created with more buildings rather than these large buildings. I don't want to see another Main Street Station. This is in the town and needs to fit scale. How will employees of Town Hall get to the gondola?

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

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Lamb: Final Comments: Regarding Mr. Craig's comment, I agree that the buildings are large but this is our last big chunk of density in the town, and I think that the density and mass needs to be here. I think the general circulation plan is improving. I think that a single lane roundabout is better because

options are eliminated. The transit plan is better. Parking structure and pedestrian circulation are good. I question the parking study and the mode split; I'd like to see something studied a little closer to home rather than Teton Village. I agree with the comments made regarding French Street and turning lanes into City Market and hope that a turn lane can be accommodated. How will the drop-off be enforced?

Ms. Katz: Can you set up the parking validation so that you can purchase packages? (Mr. Campie: Yes.) The transit building was built by a federal grant, and I want to know what the terms for the grant were. Does staff think this harms our chances to get future transit grants? I am also concerned with the town's image. (Mr. Neubecker: As long as we replace the building from the functional and programmatic aspect it should be okay, although the public and others may not be in favor of tearing the building down because of environmental concerns.)

Final Comments: I still think the condo-hotel seems too big. I am warming up to the circulation and I like roundabouts. I don't think that it being one lane will make it better, but if it has to be one then that is what it is. I feel better about the bus circulation. I think there is an under-estimation of the employee parking needs. Most people will drive themselves. I agree with Mr. Craig that the parking structure buildings are large, but people can't find the parking now and because the buildings are huge people may be able to find them. I support the mixing of the parking counts and that there will be an overlap in use. I am not in love with the complete plan layout, but know we are coming to an agreement.

Ms. Girvin: When you exit the south parking structure will it take into account the 1st Bank and employee parking for Town Hall? You will no longer be able to turn left at the bank exit? (Mr. Campie: Yes, that's correct.) It is already difficult to turn left at this location. (Mr. Campie: CDOT directed the left turn to be removed.) The proposal is to remove the parking spaces overall. We've already lost some parking spaces on the east side of the river. Has that loss been accounted for? (Mr. Neubecker: No.) Wellington Road looks like it is offset from its current alignment? (Mr. Campie: This is a town project. There is only a 6' offset but it is off our property.) I had suggested turn lanes be provided on French Street onto North Depot Road, will there be a turn lane there? (Mr. Campie: No; this has not been contemplated yet, but backup should be better with the proposed garage payment system.) Our current roundabout works pretty well most of the time, but during our busiest days that there is gridlock. (Mr. Jeff Ream, Transportation Consultant: When the roundabout blocks up it won't be a function of the roundabout, it is a function of the large amounts of traffic downstream.) (Mr. Kulick: We have been looking at advocating roundabouts along the Park Avenue corridor to make traffic move more efficiently. When stoplights are in use, traffic gets backed up and roundabouts provide better movement.)

Final Comments: I like the transit circulation. I am fine with the roundabout, and I like them. Not being able to turn south on Park Avenue from the south parking structure is an issue— could there be another roundabout here? Overall circulation is coming along, but we need to look at a more local parking study examples. I do not support the parking reduction study; I have concerns with employee parking and conference space. If possible, a turn lane should be added on French Street. Pedestrian circulation is a good aspect of the plan. I think that the private on-street parking spaces should be counted as part of the overall parking plan. I don't think it is fair that the free parking that is being removed is being moved into a pay parking structure. It is going to be important to study at a future development plan how you leave the parking structure buildings, especially the relationship to pedestrian circulation. I agree with Mr. Pringle about adding commercial and public uses to the north public structure. (Mr. Campie: Would you consider allowing extra density on the site if we added a commercial wrap to the north structure?) I might. I agree with Mr. Craig regarding the size and scale of the buildings. Could parking be added below?

Mr. Schroder: How many people use the ski back? (Mr. Bob Moore, Breckenridge Ski Resort: 30-40% coming off Peak 8 ride the gondola.) (Ms. Lucy Kay, COO, Breckenridge Ski Resort: When the gondola gets backed up, staff will encourage people to take the ski back.) Could a magic carpet be provided to bring people out of the ski back tunnel? This may help reduce people walking off-path. The peak demand for parking is between 11am-3pm; what does that mean? (Mr. Ream: Parking builds throughout the morning, but these are the hours when these structures are the most full.) (Mr. Moore: Skier habits have changed in the past few years. More people are arriving later and skiing later in the day.) Do we just expect that people will use multiple modes of transportation to get here? (Mr. Campie: Remember that we are providing more parking than is currently provided.) I had

some concerns with the 1 to 1 parking ratio. Can you park your car in the structure overnight? (Mr. Campie: The intent is that it is a mixed use parking and will provide parking for people that are skiing or going downtown, and anyone can pay to park there.) I wanted to discuss Ms. Girvin's point regarding North Depot Road access from French Street. (Mr. Ream: The queue will be improved with this system.) From out of the bus depot turning left, will the acceleration lane be in control of this project or CDOT? Will signage be provided for the bus acceleration lane? (Mr. Ream: There will be striping and the plan will be approved by CDOT.)

Final Comments: I agree with Mr. Lamb regarding the one lane roundabout and support it. I agree with comments made regarding French Street. I think the transit plan works. I think that the parking structure operations seem to work really well. Regarding pedestrian circulation, you may want to consider the magic carpet coming out of the ski back. It could help with families. Is the Gold Rush lot a part of the master plan? (Mr. Alex Iskenderian, Vail Resorts Development Company: Yes it will be included.) Will the Woods folks be involved? (Mr. Iskenderian: They wouldn't be a part of the master plan.) (Mr. Neubecker: A ski-back on the west side to the Gold Rush lot would be a separate application.) I support the parking reduction. I would support promoting commercial or non-profit uses in the north parking structure.

Mr. Pringle: I am concerned about the roundabout and the parking structure getting backed up. (Mr. Ream: It operates at Level of Service (LOS) B, which is the second best rating. Vehicles will flow into the roundabout.) I am concerned that people will have to yield to vehicles already in the roundabout because most people are coming north to south. (Mr. Ream: Both parking structures will be loaded in the morning, and will help to create gaps in the traffic movements. They all operate at LOS B. Overall there will be fewer back-ups.) (Mr. Kulick: The speed is really brought down because it is a single lane rather than a double lane roundabout. There will be substantially less delay time with this design.) I still think that French and North Main Street are being underutilized in this project, and that would be a natural spot for an egress for this parking structure. We aren't diverting enough traffic to that area. (Mr. Campie noted that the movement isn't being precluded with this design.) (Mr. Moore noted that 40% typically go towards Main Street and 60% will go toward the roundabout.) I think the bus transportation works a lot better.

Final Comments: Circulation plan is coming along well. I think roundabouts are a better solution than traffic signals. Hopefully additional roundabouts on Park Avenue will help to solve traffic movement and gridlock. Maybe we should also be looking at French and Main. I think the transit plan is coming along well, and wonder if we should plan long-range for more of a regional / RTD type system at this location. Anything that can be helped with the queuing at the structures at peak times should be included. I wonder if we want to revisit the ski back from the bridge area to Gold Rush lot; people are probably trying to ski there now. Maybe we should look at people being able to ski back to this lot for safety reasons rather than promoting several crossings across Park Avenue. I agree with others regarding French Street concerns. I don't mind the 1 to 1 parking ratio but employee parking being combined with the 1200 spaces should be reconsidered. I like how the pedestrian circulation flows through the project. Vehicular movement needs to remain intact through the site. I would promote commercial or public uses being a part of the structures on the north side of the project to enliven the area.

Mr. Allen: Is 1st Bank on board with this change of access? (Mr. Neubecker: We have spoken with them but they are not on board yet. Currently they have an access easement with Vail Resorts that needs to be verified.) Now on the east side of the ski back tunnel it is shown as going east-west and right now it goes north, is there a change proposed? (Mr. Campie: Yes, we are trying to direct traffic and improve the experience.) How does the bike path cross Watson? (Mr. Campie: There will be an underpass.) Was there anything to talk about the intersection of French and North Depot Road and how this will affect City Market? (Mr. Ream: It wasn't included in the LOS analysis, but if there is enough width for a turn lane I would propose that we include it.) (Mr. Moore: It is 3 lanes at the light.) (Mr. Iskenderian: There are four access points into City Market; operationally the garage will work better than the existing situation. We aren't opposed to it, just not sure of the need.) Have other projects been allowed to do a 1 to 1 parking ratio? (Mr. Neubecker: Yes. Base of Peak 7 & 8. You are allowed by code to do this with a parking study showing that it works.)

Final Comments: Circulation has come a long way. I like the pedestrian traffic conflict reductions. I need more information on the condo-hotel parking and what ratio it should be and am concerned with the 1 to 1 ratio. I don't think that condo-hotel parking should overflow into the ski parking. I

agree with staff regarding the mode split. I think we need to address the employee parking. I would like to see the parking study based on local issues. Parking structure operations and organization seem to work well. Roundabout is fantastic. I agree with Mr. Pringle regarding the Gold Rush lot and ski back access. If we explore this, then the tunnel needs to be “Beaver Creek” nice and people prefer to use it so that they won’t ski to Gold Rush and walk across Park Avenue. I support the proposed ski back proposal, but there are going to be people that want to short cut back to the north parking structure. There will also be pedestrians coming from 4 O’clock run area and will be coming to the gondola. Where the buses turn off Park Avenue I have a concern with pedestrian conflicts and we need to address it. I agree with the comments regarding French Street and want to make sure that if there is adequate space for a turn lane we should provide it. Sidewalks on either side of South Depot Road need to be wide to handle large amounts of pedestrian traffic. I support the emergency connection between the drop-off and the bus circulation. There needs to be adequate room on the west side of the Blue River and the condo structure so people can get back to Town Hall. Policy 16/R calls for safe and efficient pedestrian circulation and currently I don’t believe the way the tunnel is operating is safe. I would encourage pedestrian bridge crossings and easements over the Blue River to be determined now if possible. I agree with Mr. Pringle regarding public benefit type uses in the north parking structure and may support additional density for this. If we decide to pursue this, we’ll need to look at the circulation to serve that space.

**WORKSESSION:**

1. Landscaping Policy:

Ms. Cram presented updates on the Voluntary Defensible Space Ordinance and the Landscape Ordinance, including Water Features and Point Multipliers.

Questions for the Commission:

- 1) Did the Commission have any comments regarding the standards noted for Zones 1, 2 and 3 as described in the Voluntary Defensible Space Ordinance?
- 2) Did the summary presented address Commissioner concerns on water features?
- 3) Did the Commission have anything to add in regard to multipliers?
- 4) Were there other items that the Commission would like to discuss for future worksessions?

*Commissioner Questions/Comments:*

Mr. Lamb: I don’t even think in the historic district that we have a Zone 2.

Ms. Girvin: I have a lot of practical questions. Where do I keep my firewood? (Ms Cram: RWB will be available to give direction, it is best not under your deck or next to other combustibles. They prefer it outside of Zone 1, but if it is a tight property they would ask you keep it under a canvas tarp.) What are other “combustibles”? (Ms. Cram: Next to shrubs, trees, etc. It can be next to your house with a canvas tarp as recommended.) In Zone 1 all leaf and needle clutter should be removed. What do I do with it? Landfill? Compost? Is a compost considered a fire hazard? (Mr. Allen: Remember that this is voluntary.) Isn’t glycol a hazard to animals? (Ms. Cram: It is used for the pump and isn’t in the circulating water, but we will verify this for you. South Pine Street has a good example.) The one by the (Carter) park is bad and I was fearful that the water was harmful. (Ms. Cram: We could include in the ordinance that glycol cannot be used outside of the pump.) I would agree with that. Does the town have any authority to require landowners to remove the dead lodgepole trees? (Ms. Cram: They have until June 1, 2012 to remove them. Most property owners are continuing to remove trees on an annual basis.) Can you split the ordinance similar to defensible space so that people in town in the historic district have to remove their trees now? I would like to see positive points for preserving native landscaping. Sensitive construction boundaries and working within site disturbance envelopes are important. (Mr. Neubecker noted that soil stacking area has been an issue, and trying to balance this with impact of hauling dirt is tricky).

Mr. Bertaux: Do you think the change to the Development Code regarding defensible space will be coming soon? (Ms. Cram: Yes and it will be part of Policy 22 along with the other landscape updates.) I like the way the water features text is written.

Mr. Pringle: The task force is a great idea. I think that the best things to do in these types of documents are to look at best management practices, and Ms. Girvin’s questions are good. For example, some people aren’t going to mow their lots. Regarding water features, if I want to put a swimming pool or water



feature in my backyard, what depth requires a fence? (Ms. Cram: That is a building code requirement, and I will look that up for you.) Can we get a cut sheet on the pump systems in water features? If we offer positive points for landscaping then people can get more positive points with additional quantity. I would like to see the minimum required to get a zero score, an absolute policy. (Ms. Cram: Ground zero is forest health. When you have removed the dead and diseased and then created a healthier landscape environment that is ground zero anything beyond that could warrant positive points. People need to understand the relationship between landscaping, buildings, circulation, etc. and mature tree size. We should look at landscaping that is needed on each site, for example if a property should be providing buffer then a buffer should be provided.) (Mr. Neubecker: Remember that a landscape plan can also get negative points per current code.)

Mr. Allen: Can you walk us through the landscape plan from the Maggie Placer project to show an example of defensible space? Within about 20' of these buildings we are preserving the stand of lodgepole pines; does this conflict with the defensible space ordinance? (Ms. Cram: The natural fuel breaks of Highway 9 and the access drive allow for those natural buffers to remain. The code allows for a case-by-base basis review.) I don't have a problem with the way the ordinance is written for water features, but I think that since water features are landscaping they should be allowed to extend beyond the disturbance envelope. What is going on with the mountain pine beetle ordinance? (Ms. Cram: We want to give property owners an opportunity to phase removal of the dead trees and there is currently a 3-year time frame. This is separate from the defensible space ordinance. We also need to look at the staff resources required to enforce the ordinance on an annual basis.) Are you okay with what the Shock Hill HOA is doing? (Ms. Cram: Yes. They are thankful for the voluntary ordinance and an entire neighborhood with defensible space is definitely more effective.) Can we look at off-site landscaping? Why do property lines matter if it helps the project? I think if you provide landscape you should get positive points.

***TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:***

None

***ADJOURNMENT***

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

---

Rodney Allen, Chair