

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Chair Frechter.

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller - absent	Mark Leas	Allen Frechter	Susan Propper
Ethan Guerra	Steve Gerard	Elaine Gort -absent	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the February 21, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the March 7, 2023 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- No public comments and Mr. Frechter closed public comment section.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1. Thomas Residence Addition (SS), 314 Lincoln Avenue, PL-2022-0524

Ms. Szrek presented a proposal to locally landmark and rehabilitate an existing historic residence, construct a basement and basement connector, interior remodel, and add a garage to the north of the primary structure. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission agree that a window opening predated the doorway opening on the southern façade and that the proposed design complies with Design Standards 23 and 76?
2. Does the Commission support the recommended point analysis?
3. Does the Commission have any additional questions or comments on the proposed project design?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Guerra: No questions.

Mr. Gerard: No questions.

Mr. Leas: No questions.

Ms. Propper: No questions.

Mr. Frechter: I have two questions for the storage space; if the applicant makes that bedroom and or bathroom would that require another review? Or affect parking requirements? (Ms. Szrek: Yes, it would affect some of our Codes. You are correct about the parking, they would have to provide an additional parking spot if it were to be changed into a bedroom. Right now, they are maxed out on their parking. Further, they would be required to have egress.) The setbacks from the north side of the garage to the adjacent homes window wells; it is a foot or 13" inches. Do the window wells not count as part of the required setback? (Ms. Szrek: Window wells are at or below grade so they would not be a part of the setback. Building Department and the Chief Building Inspector preliminarily okayed it.)

Mr. Guerra: I would ask about the door on the east side. You found the historic photograph dating back to the 30s. Were you able to identify when that was changed into a doorway?

Sonny Neely, Neely Architecture, Applicant:

It must have been a repurpose or had a stair associated with it. It is 24" inches above grade. I think that they might have done it to rent out the back bedroom.

- Mr. Guerra: I saw you did some forensic excavations. Did you look at that? I am just curious why we are seeing a door opening.
- Mr. Neely: It is probably similar to what happened on the front of the residence. I believe they renovated the upstairs separately from the downstairs. They put the wall in between the stair and living area. Then they put a fireplace in that corner at the front of the house. That necessitated the closing off of the other door, the original 36" door. Then I think when they decided on opening it up as one living unit, they put that arched opening in the wall to partition the two spaces. They may have done it the same way in the back at some time where they just sublet the house. (Mr. Guerra: You are going to make that one door go away?) Yes, it will go away just like the doorway on the front. It is obvious that the window went to a door, the brick is cut and chipped and irregular. I think it is very obvious that there were two 36" doors; one in the front and one in the back.

The hearing was opened for public comment; there were no comments and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Guerra: I have no further comments. 1) I do agree the window opening predated the door opening and I think it complies. 2) I agree with the recommended point analyses. 3) No other comments.
- Mr. Gerard: 1) Yes, I agree. I thank Sonny and the department for their investigative work. 2) Yes, I support the recommended point analyses. I think this is an important residence. It is part of the Historic District and a contributing structure. It is certainly eligible for landmarking. I support the project; I think it's a great amount of work. Adding the extra excavation to provide storage space underground is a no brainer; it may make your other work easier.
- Mr. Leas: 1) Yes 2) Yes 3) this is a fascinating renovation because of the scope of it.
- Ms. Propper: 1) Yes 2) Yes, I agree with the point analyses. 3) No additional comments.
- Mr. Frechter: 1) Yes, I do agree the windows predate the doorway. Glad to see it restored to how it was originally built. 2) Yes, I do agree with the point analyses. 3) No additional comments.
- Ms. Szrek: I want to add a point of information that staff would like to make a motion to add the additional finding to the project in regard to the mention of heated paving on the plan set and the ability of the applicant to come back to claim the additional banked positive point (+1) to add up to 500 square feet of heated paving if code allows at the time of application. We just want to clarify that the heated paving is not approved under this permit.

Mr. Gerard made a motion to approve the Thomas Residence Addition with an additional finding that the snowmelt on the plans are not approved with this approval and the applicant can return to work with Staff to utilize the banked positive one point later if allowed by code at the time of application, seconded by Mr. Guerra. The motion passed 5 to 0.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Breckenridge Grand Vacations Gondola Lots Site Specific Development Permit (CK), 350, 355, 415 S. Park Avenue, PL-2022-0208

DISCLOSURE: Ms. Propper disclosed that in June of 2021, she and her husband wrote a letter to the Town Council in support of the Master Plan for this area. This was prior to her joining the Planning Commission and prior to any application for site-specific development. The Commission agreed there was no conflict of interest and Ms. Propper remained for the hearing.

Mr. Kulick presented a proposal for a site-specific development permit application for 57 condominiums, 24,149 sq. ft. of commercial space, 80 hotel units, 10 duplex units, 9 employee housing apartment units, and 3 townhome units over 10 buildings. The proposal also includes roadway and pedestrian improvements, including a roundabout at the intersection of Park Avenue and French Street, a new gondola, a new park and pedestrian plaza, and a 1,076-space parking structure. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Building Height:
 - a. Is the Commission supportive of a building height exemption for the focal towers on Buildings 1 and 2, and Building 1's emergency stair tower?
 - b. Does the Commission find there is enough variation in height throughout the site?
2. Architectural Compatibility:
 - a. The parking structure's eastern façade is designed with 78% non-natural materials. Based on past precedent, staff recommends the assignment of negative six (-6) points. Does the Commission agree?
 - b. Does the Commission agree that flat roofs are allowed without the assignment of negative points for Mixed Use Buildings 1, 2 and 3 under the master plan?
 - c. Does the Commission believe the style of windows on the eastern façade of the North Gondola Townhomes should be adjusted to better complement the adjacent Historic District?
3. Site and Environmental Design: Does the Commission agree the proposal is sufficiently buffered due to the increased tree retention along South Park Avenue and the proposed landscaping plan?
4. Landscape Plan: Does the Commission believe that an award of four (+4) positive points is deserved based on the revised landscaping plan that includes the retention of additional mature trees and increases the quantity of trees on the east side of the North Gondola Lot, adjacent to the river?
5. Additional Comments: Does the Commission have any additional questions or comments on the proposed plan?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Propper: I was wondering if the new gondola would be built at that time so there are no problems with pedestrians crossing Park Avenue? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, between the parking structure, roundabout, the gondola, and the circulation in that area these are all required to be completed in the first phase of development.) What about the EV-capable spaces in the parking structure, would there be any positive points with that? (Mr. Kulick: I did overlook the chargers with the amount of things to review for this meeting. They may be eligible for positive points under Policy 33.)

Mr. Leas: Question about the parking garage. It is going to be a similar situation where Vail Resorts owns the land and is leasing it to who? To the Town? To BGV? (Mr. Kulick: It is my understanding that BGV has a lease agreement with Vail Resorts.)

Mr. Gerard: There is going to be three places, because we have three lots, that parking charging stalls could be installed. Will there be separate analyses on receiving positive points at each individual location? Can they max out the positive points three times across the development? (Mr. Kulick: Similar to architectural compatibility; on this they can only get the maximum number of points across the entire development). Staging goes the way it looks like it has to go, the immediate loss is going to be to the Gold Rush Lot parking. Is that part of the required parking that is to be provided? (Mr. Kulick: That is. Based on precedent, there is some allowance to disregard that requirement to provide those spaces while the area is under construction. There are several hundred spots that will be interrupted. But we have precedent from our own project.) My final question. Unbroken rooflines, on any of these buildings? There are some pretty long runs. (Mr. Kulick: That

is something that staff will need to review. There can only be one negative (-1) point assigned.)

Mr. Guerra: My questions regard the flat roofs, and the language that is used. If the question is allowing flat roofs, I think we should review the language. You did not address the windows on the eastern façade of the North Gondola townhomes. On the flat roofs, you are asking us if we agree that those types are allowed. I would want to go back to that language. (Mr. Kulick: The way it is written is very awkward “These buildings may have both gabled and hipped roofs, there may be flat roof types that may also be used for outdoor decks.” It does not say that flat roof types may be used as decks. It makes it seem like a third that is being permitted.) I think that flat roofs can be a component, but not a main component in the design. So I ask again how are we interpreting that and I think that is what you are asking. (Mr. Kulick: I think that is why we specifically asked the Commission. I would agree that building three sounds like it is more of a component. For building one and two, it is Staff’s opinion that it is allowed.)

Mr. Gerard: We had the discussion about rooftop decks. It was a hot topic from an applicant downtown. It was specifically part of our thought process that in knowing these would be used for rooftop decks so they built some language in. I am not sure they built in language that all the roofs can be flat.

Ms. Propper: Building two is along the river parallel with the townhomes, would we also want the style of windows to reflect the adjacent Historic District? (Kulick: The design language for buildings one and two were not specific about the transition into the Historic District area. It says the townhomes will utilize roof forms and some traditional elements of the homes in Breckenridge. It is vague; it does not go back into the specific building elements.)

Mr. Gerard: Roofs, there was a specific conversation that I recall about the idea there could be many roof tops utilized as entertainment type decks, where people would be on those rooftops, and we were still struggling with roof top decks in the downtown zone. There was a decision made to specifically permit those to pull them out of any later objections to having rooftop decks. (Mr. Guerra: My question is if that is the language from the original master plan?) (Mr. Kulick: Yes, this is from the approved master plan. I think that it was part of it. There was discussion on roof top decks, but it had just as much to do with roof top decks in the actual historic district on Main Street. Activating the roofs with hot tubs, pools was an important element of the design so it was written into the Master Plan.) And it was clearly disclosed that the applicant wanted roof top decks for entertainment type purposes.

Mr. Leas: The big question that we have not been cleared up, it allows gable roofs and allows flat roofs. It appears that we have 100% flat roofs. (Mr. Kulick: It is a question being a relative policy, they get negative points. I think guidance is important depending on what they do to modify them. In terms of points, they are already receiving the maximum points for architectural compatibility. The flat roofs and windows of the townhomes are almost a bonus point for them.)

Mr. Frechter: I agree with Susan, the eastern façade needs to complement the Historic District. In hindsight, we didn’t think of that during the planning of the master plan. (Mr. Kulick: I think we acknowledged that the townhomes would be a smaller building, so that was the bridge to the large buildings. I think we acknowledge that building one and two were going to be the largest. We want there to be a diversity in height.) There are going to be safety barriers along HWY 9? Is there adequate space to clear snow from the development and the highway? (Mr. Kulick: Those items have been discussed by Engineering. Those developments would be decided with Engineering and CDOT.)

Mr. Frechter: When we did have the previous meeting with the applicant, we had a lengthy discussion about the design of the project. We gave them a lot of feedback towards the transitional

designs influenced by other towns and areas. We gave positive feedback to those designs and those were all flat roofs.

Mr. Leas: Based on what Allen brought up about the right-of-way on the west side of Park Avenue, that sidewalk is going to go from one roundabout to the next roundabout and connect to the ski back? (Mr. Kulick: They are obligated to go to the other side of the roundabout to make the connection. They are going around, but they don't have a street crossing.) I think it is a good idea, but I wanted to understand.

Graham Frank, Breckenridge Grand Vacations: Mark, to answer your question on ownership. A single entity under BGV owns both the South Gold Rush and North Gondola Lot. We have a long-term land lease on the North Gold Rush Lot and then we would condominiumize the boxes where the employee housing structure is located. It would be condos inside the air rights; very similar to what we did on the lot up at Peak 8. (Mr. Leas: and BGV would manage and collect for parking?) Correct, we would manage and collect the revenue.

Bill Campie, DTJ Design: This project been going on for years now, I think that it has gotten better over time with input from the community. We did intend to allow flat roofs in the development and that is why it says they are allowed. We just separated it out and put an additional statement regarding the roof top use. That is why it is separated the way it was. Those other rooftops did not have the additional consideration. It was never an intention to and that is why it doesn't say one roof type would be dominant. It allows these types and rooftop decks. DTJ and BGV have gone through multiple rounds of design revisions, predominantly driven by community, commission and staff input. This is the third version. Each time have taken the discussion of the planning commission as an assignment. We have prioritized tree preservation in areas discussed by the Commission. We modified the circulation per the discussion and implemented landscaping along the river corridor. We made a massive reduction in heated surfaces and outdoor water. Architectural style changed a lot through the project; during master planning we had a lot of ideas and concepts. We quickly pivoted based on feedback. I think that we have come to a place that both parties really like. We have tried to find a way of infilling this in Breckenridge. Building heights were up and we now have tried to meet those. The master plan does mention to vary heights. We have varied the type per building and in terms of Code and introduced stepping down the buildings. The park: we just need to move a few feet and we can create the barrier. The encroachment of the easement, that discussion has begun because they want that too. The internal circulation has multiple solutions for the bus route turn around and will continue to work with Engineering. Regarding the negative points, our intention is to have no negative points. Our intention is to meet that section of the Code; whatever that is. Wood siding on the parking structure, we will do. We feel confident about removing the points. Again, this is a resort project, it will be difficult to avoid the points. We will have to offset. We do have the maximum number of EVSE points, located in two locations. BGV has a value system already. They have a REMP program they are implementing a lot of things that the Town is looking at doing. Our expectation is to finish this with positive points, not just zero.

Ms. Propper: No questions.

Mr. Leas: We just had an energy work session. The discussion around availability of real estate for the implementation of the solar. You should talk to staff about overcoming some of the energy points through that avenue. I did have a question about the site plan. Specifically, how the hotel works with the building across from it. It looks like there is a grander entry for the other building. How do these buildings interact with each other?

Mr. Campie: There is a discussion about shared amenities, check-in, or operations. Both will have lobbies, but one will be more centrally used as a universal check-in. It will be similar to the parking; it is consolidated as well. You would have a shared operational system across the whole district.

- Mr. Leas: If you are going to have multiple locations of activity, and guests have to carry luggage from one building to another, I think it is important for the Town to realize that the heated paving is a safety issue. (Mr. Campie: The Commission can give us the allowance for heated surfaces.)
- Mr. Gerard: How do you think that you would respond to the comment on more historic type windows and features on the townhomes stepping down from the hotel property? (Mr. Campie: We are not going to fight some battle about the size of windows. The larger windows are better in terms of living perspective and energy efficiency.) Are you still willing to be engaged in conversation with the Town of Breckenridge on these items? (Mr. Campie: Yes.)
- Mr. Guerra: Flat roofs will be highly visible coming down in the gondola, are you planning on using ballast rocks or something similar? What will we be looking at on top of the roofs? (Mr. Campie: We have not gotten to that level of detail yet. But that is a marketing window along the gondolas, so we want to make sure that it looks good.)
- Mr. Frechter: I do not have any questions. I think that is great stepping down with the garage and changing the structural steel. (Mr. Campie: What is shown there is not a structural element; that was a design concept. It is open for sure, but that will be a concrete structure.)

The hearing was opened for public comment.

Frank Robinson, Woods Drive, Board member of HOA: Going south of Park Avenue, will there be a right-hand turn lane into the parking garage? I think that we should have one, there is going to be a lot of traffic going into the parking garage. I think we should have two lanes going out of the garage going to the roundabout, to facilitate the cars dispersing from that area. Some going right, some going left. I want to thank BGV for connecting the sidewalk to the skiway, that is going to eliminate a lot of traffic along Woods Drive. Skiers ski down or walk down to get to the parking lot. And the parking garage adding spaces would be a big help. The south Gold Rush lot is Zone 3 for short-term rental purposes. That property is Zone three, very limited on short-term rental. I think it should remain Zone Three just as Woods Drive. So, I hope that we don't have a switch of hands and since Vail or BGV has it we will make it Zone One. Our concern is that we want it to remain Zone Three for rental purposes.

Margaret Douglass, 105 Woods Drive: The safety issues with the parking structure and access only on Woods Drive. What if there is a fire or EMS is needed we are going to be trapped behind the traffic of the enormous parking structure. Thank you to Town Council, I was able to view the traffic study and the study area does not include Woods Drive above the parking structure. We are 25 units up there that I feel are being overlooked in how this may affect our safety and access. I am happy to hear about the sidewalk coming from the skiway down. Because I think if I were with my family and figured out instead of skiing all the way down to the tunnel, I could just ski down Woods Drive, I would. I do understand that Woods Drive is a public street and does not belong to our neighborhood, but it is also not a ski way.

The public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Comments:

- Ms. Propper: 1A) I am supportive of the Building Height exemption. 1B) Yes, I think there is enough variation in height. 2A) I agree that there needs to be more natural material on the facade. 2B) I have looked at the language over and over. I think it does permit flat roofs. I am saying yes to that. 2C) I would like to see the windows on the townhome adjusted. 3) I do think the addition of trees provides sufficient buffering. 4) I do agree with the four positive points. I have no additional comments.

- Mr. Leas: 1A) I do concur. 1B) I think there is variation in the height. I would like to see more. 2A) Yes, the parking structure. 2B) The question still has not been answered as the plan is present if that is the appropriate language. I would say no to that. Maybe we have some variation there. 2C) the site environmental design, I concur. The landscape plan, I like that. No additional comments.
- Mr. Gerard; 1A) I am supportive of the building height exemption. I think that helps to break up the facades of the building. 1B) I think there is enough variation in height. I would change the height of the hotel which is one big, long building with an unbroken ridgeline. 2A) I think there should be a reduction in non-natural materials. 2B) The flat roof issue is interesting, and I am not sure if all should be flat roofs. 2C) I think that there should be some adjustment to the Townhomes to complement the adjacent historic district. The windows should be redesigned a little bit. 3) The increased buffering is appropriate, and I approve of that. 4) The landscape plan should receive four points for the design around the mature trees that were allowed to stand. My comments are I think that we are getting better each time. Thank you and great progress.
- Mr. Guerra: 1A) I am supportive of the height exemption for the towers. 1B) I do find that there is enough variation in the focal towers and step down of other buildings. 2A). I do agree that we need to see more natural materials on the parking structure façade. Six points are warranted. 2B) It is a question to me because it was brought up. It is not clear that everyone agrees. Staff does not and have asked us. Are they allowed? The applicant says that they are. The language, to me, is vague. I won't over comment on that. I like the design so I would agree that flat roofs are allowed without points, I would like to see some ballast rocks or something. 2C) I agree that the windows need to be readdressed. 3) I like the buffers, moving the parking garage helped a lot. 4) On the landscape plan, I was excited to see the inclusion of those extra trees. I am supportive of the four points.
- Mr. Frechter. 1A) Building heights. I agree with the exemption for the towers, particularly because the stair tower is setback into the middle of the building. It is setback; I don't think it will be noticeable. 1B) I think that there is a lot of variation in building heights. I would welcome more, but what is there is acceptable. 2A) I agree on the negative six based on precedent. If the applicant can reduce the non-natural that would be great. 2B) Based on the master plan, I think flat roofs are allowed. 2C) Based on the master plan on what we agreed to, the townhomes would complement to this historic district more. A modification would be necessary. 3) The buffering, I like. 4) I think the landscape plan, based on precedent, should receive four points.

WORK SESSIONS:

1. Stables Village Master Plan

Ms. Crump presented a proposal for a new for-sale workforce housing development located in Planning Area-A (PA-A), planned for the Stillson Patch Placer tract, located on the south side of Wellington Road on the former site of the Breckenridge Stables. The Master Plan proposes 61 workforce housing units, including 5 single-family units, 38 duplex units, and 18 triplex units. The Planning Area-B (PA-B) of the tract will remain allocated to governmental uses, such as open space, recreation, public works storage, snow storage, and solar energy production. The following specific questions were asked of the Commission:

1. Does the Commission have any concerns with the methodology used to establish the existing grade across the site?
2. Does the Commission agree with the analysis that considers the triplex units like duplex units regarding parking requirements?
3. Does the Commission support the proposed fencing in the Master Plan?
4. Does the Commission have any other comments on the draft Master Plan?

5. What comments do you have on the preliminary proposed architectural designs for the single-family, duplex, and triplex structures?

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Gerard: Do we have a legal definition of either duplex or triplex? I did not do a word search. (Mr. Kulick: We do have a duplex and multi-family definition which is three or more units in the same building. I think it worked when we only had parking minimums. You could have five townhomes in a row: each having parking and land. It creates an equity issue; one unit will have one and others will have two spaces. It's easy to miss both ways by adjusting it either being above the maximum or below the required amount. We should have added a townhome, single family-attached or a duplex definition during the parking maximum code change. Since this is a Town project, this maximum requirement can be waived.)

Mr. Leas: No questions.

Mr. Gerard: What is the bus circulation there? (Ms. Crump: There is an existing public bus stop that is close on Wellington Road and Bridge Street, on the north side of Wellington. No public transit will come into this development.)

Ms. Propper: No questions.

Mr. Frechter: In the Wellington/Lincoln Park, there are rules about not parking on the pads in front of the garages to allow access for the alleys. These are engineered so residents can park there and allow for emergency vehicles and such. (Ms. Crumps: Yes, the ROW change has allowed for space for parking and additional feet for vehicle clearance to stay out of the sidewalk.) What is the rationale for the perimeter bike trail? (Ms. Crump: For adequate drainage, they needed a bioswale. I think it was also a benefit to link these areas to the existing trails to the north and south.)

Lindsey Newman, Norris Design: The vision for Stables Village is to create a carbon neutral and net zero workforce housing development focused on green infrastructure and sustainability. We want to include community gardens, some nature play, native plantings and grass. We have a lot of existing disturbances on this site and limited access from Stables Drive. We will make a minimal change to the bike park parking lot connection. The site does have approximately forty feet of elevation change. It is important to see how the topography changes on the site. We are really focusing our development in the main core and decreasing as it goes to edge.

Elena Scott, Norris Design: I wanted to talk about how this development relates to Lincoln Park and the Wellington. We wanted to create a new framework for this neighborhood fronting on some form of open space. The internal courtyard spaces, bioswales, and forest service lands. The connection between Stables Road, this neighborhood, and Lincoln Park can create a buffer between proposed homes and the existing residences. We want to ensure the proposed greens to be as large or equal to the existing. Each has a different theme which is really cool, but also connected. Pedestrian connection into Lincoln Park and the preservation of the forested areas in this zone have been prioritized. When looking at the units as a whole, middle income with bedrooms for growing families, each unit having an EV ready space, and a covered parking space. Our bedroom count is 175. The bioswale itself does offer a few environmental advantages like runoff volume, water quality, and groundwater facilitation. We are looking at all components of the site to improve it as a whole. We do have 22 surface spaces provided across the neighborhoods; parking for our guests. The recycling and compost center is for the entire neighborhood as a whole. This replaces the existing recycling center on the Stillson site and also introduces composting. We have established an average grade and have a level playing field for a baseline to which we will measure height. We have both uphill and downhill units. Important talks with Engineering include traffic control on Stables Drive as well as connectivity. We have proposed to flip the parking at the Bike Park so it is adjacent to the trail; that has also been done with Engineering. The red represents the five foot walk, the green and orange

were developed with walking dogs and getting bikes up to that trail; this will be done with signage. Huge benefit to the community and neighborhood. The fencing is a more modern approach. The fencing on plan B and plan A is to provide buffering. The three foot fence is permitted in the rear of the property for dog runs and similar situations.

Suzanne Allen-Sabo, Allen-Guerra Architecture, Stables Village LLC: We are at a schematic model stage with the architecture. We need to look at the placement, grade, and the solar calculations. This would be the first subdivision in Colorado that is both, net zero and carbon neutral. Solar is definitely driving the architecture and how these roofs are oriented on the site. We will be using naturally colored materials on the buildings and roofs. We will have both natural and non-natural materials on the buildings. We are potentially getting negative points on the Master Plan level. Andy will speak about the site and how they sit on the site.

Andy Stabile, Allen-Guerra Architect: There are some buffers around the development. I look forward to Norris making this looking as natural as can be. The architecture itself is aspirational at this point. We wanted to give an idea of what we are going for. This slide shows the home is designed for net zero. Our Preliminary calculations result in 25 to 40 PV panels on the roof. To get those square footages we have large mono pitched roof design. Most will be south or southwest facing roof structures to maximize the single pane and some of the overhangs we get dual use; for roof space and covered decks. You can see that most of the units the roof will face due south. Initial solar analyses show we should get really good solar production from this site. The roof pitches are low because the site steps up as you move north to south; residents will look over the units to the north. We lose views because of the hillside behind. Most views will be North and West. In some areas we were able to bump up the roofs to get some more light in units. The garage access is opposite to the view side; the design can be flipped depending on the view and hillside. All have storage lockers outside the front door, storage in the garage. The main living will always be on the second floor so you get the theatre view over your neighbor to the north. Right now, we have five-unit types; down slope unit, flat lot unit, up slope unit, single family homes, and the tri-plex units in the middle. We are working on a few color palettes, so nothing gets repetitive. We do have some non-natural materials, metals, and other wainscoting. We will continue to refine these elevations and drawing. Things will be changing as we refine with feedback, but that is what we are shooting for.

Mr. Truckey: Just to clarify, when these individual units come back for development permits they are not going to be coming to the Planning Commission. The individual units will be administratively reviewed by staff. You won't be seeing the final detailed architectural plans.

Mr. Leas: I am very confused by this site plan. In order to establish the site, is there going to be consistent grade across the entire everything, or lot specific? (Ms. Crump: They took the topo lines and made them straight to give an average. Our Code right now allows a 35' height limitation. There is an exception in the Code that allows the use of an established existing grade on sites with heavy site disturbance from mining by using an average slope. So we are establishing an average slope to use as the existing grade. This will not be the proposed final grade or the over-lot grading plan. This is just showing the average grade existing on site.) So, this is used as a tool to establish what height is? (Ms. Crump: Exactly.)

Mr. Gerard: To Andy or Suzanne, some of these roofs create a valley. Is this going to create a problem for snow or ice. (Andy: We have designed this to our advantage. We can manage the water and put it where we want it to go. The runoff will go off the side instead of the front to mitigate the issues.)

Commissioner Comments:

- Mr. Gerard: 1) Yes, I agree with the methodology of establishing the grade. 2) I agree that it makes more sense to call the triplexes “duplex units” for purposes of parking. My preference would be to make a quick fix to the definition in the Town Code. Since this is a town project, they can do what they want. 3) I think the fencing is okay. I understand the need to divide the uses. I like the contemporary horizontal fencing. 4) It is well thought out. The view looks atop of another view. Everyone gets something unique. The architectural designs are very nice, pretty, and will be great homes.
- Mr. Leas: 1) Now that I understand the grade, I think that makes sense. 2) I do support the triplex/duplex parking decision. 3) I do understand the fences. 4) I don’t have any specific comments. I am not fan of mountain modern. I think these are going to be appropriate for the site. I just hope the architecture in Breckenridge does not turn into something that we are doing only to comply with sustainability. Architecture should stand on its own. I think that these don’t look like Breckenridge to me.
- Ms. Propper: 1) I am fine with the methodology to establish the existing grade. 2) I like the idea to consider tri-plex like duplex for parking or it would be a problem. 3) I am fine with proposed fencing. 4) I understand Mark’s comments on Mountain Modern, but I think it works for this project.
- Mr. Frechter: 1) I don’t have concerns of methodology for grading. 2) I think the duplex/triplex is okay, parking is important. Everyone should be able to park in two spots. 3) I support the fencing decision. I would recommend going to the upper part of Wellington to see buffering and even down to Vista Point. This is a great plan. I applaud the goals of carbon neutral and net zero.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 pm.

Allen Frechter, Chair