

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Mike Giller	Mark Leas	Allen Frechter	Keely Ambrose	absent
Ethan Guerra	Elaine Gort	Susan Propper		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the August 20, 2024 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the September 3, 2024 Planning Commission Agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES:

- None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Wachtel Garage Addition and Kitchen Remodel, 4 Spencer Court; PL-2024-0341

Mr. Leas asked about the points allocation under Policy 33/R for electric vehicle (EV) chargers. (Mr. Cross clarified that they could receive a maximum of positive three (+3) points for EVs under the current policy.) Mr. Leas thought the point allocation for EVs was of negligible value given that the likelihood of someone putting two or three EVs at the same time in their garage was low and there should be a consideration for reducing the positive points available for EVs.

Mr. Frechter stated that he did not want the two negative (-2) points for a 7-foot retaining wall and paving for this project to become precedent. (Mr. Kulick responded that the totality was a negative six (-6) as the project was originally assigned negative four (-4) points for the driveway and retaining walls.)

With no call ups, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. BGV Parcel 3 Duplexes, 355 N Park Avenue, PL-2024-0302

Ms. Crump presented a proposal to develop eight duplex structures (16 units) on the South Gold Rush Lot, described as Parcel 3 in the recently approved development agreement between the Town and BGV. Ms. Crump summarized that the point allocation included negative three (-3) points under Policy 5/R for excessive similarity on architecture, negative one (-1) point for unbroken ridgelines greater than 50 feet in length, and positive one (+1) point for attractive water detention/retention areas; the application had a recommended score of negative three overall.

Planning Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Frechter – Are three-story buildings allowed on Parcel 3 per the Master Plan. (Ms. Crump stated that any building in the project is allowed to go up to 38 feet.) Mr. Frechter asked if the points should be in increments of two. (Mr. Kulick responded you could allocate either negative three (-3) or negative six (-6) and he and Ms. Crump further described the point allocation calculations.)

Mr. Giller - Would shuffling the building types be considered a remedy for the similarity issue? (Ms. Crump replied that the applicant would most likely not shuffle the building type since they were designed for the locations and specific slopes, but they could shuffle the exterior materials palettes among the buildings.) Mr. Giller asked if the landscaping points applied to all three detention areas. (Ms. Crump

showed the detention/retention areas on the site plan and confirmed that only one point is assigned for all detention facilities.)

Mr. Giller – Has staff considered negative points for all of the retaining walls. (Ms. Crump noted that Policy 7 is waived under the development agreement. Mr. Kulick added that the development agreement process negotiations took into account the acceptable density for the site and the surrounding wetland areas to be preserved, which resulted in shifting the development toward the center of the area. The applicant dedicated a large portion of the parcel fee simple for wetland preservation to the Town. That shift required more site manipulation overall, resulting in more retaining walls.)

Ms. Propper – How would it work to require employee housing and the roundabout to be completed prior to the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) for this project? (Ms. Crump replied that a Parcel 2 application is expected soon to meet the timing requirements but that the Commission would not see the proposal for the roundabout as it will only be reviewed by CDOT and the Town Engineer.)

Mr. Leas – Is it intentional not to have a sidewalk along the west side of Park Avenue? (Mr. Kulick replied that there was less programming associated with the Gondola Lots area so the sidewalk concept on the west side had been abandoned. With no sidewalk infrastructure on the west, it will be easier to preserve the wetlands on the west side.) Mr. Leas asked how the gondola right-of-way would work with sales of the units. (Ms. Crump stated that the gondola easement will coexist across the entire site and was still pending approval from the State tramway board.) Mr. Leas asked about future wetland mitigation and wetland micro-pools. (Ms. Crump clarified that any additional mitigation determined necessary beyond what was specified in the development agreement needed to be addressed through this current application process. She added that the micro-pools would be created by this development but deferred to the applicant for confirmation.) Mr. Leas asked if the fireplaces were natural gas. (Ms. Crump confirmed.)

Applicant, Graham Frank, of Breckenridge Grand Vacations (BGV) - Parcel 2 is ready for review but they have been trying to sequence them to make the application process convenient for staff. He added that they were working on the roundabout application, as well. For the gondola easements, he stated they would pursue a tramway variance, the variance describes how evacuations from the gondola would occur if it was necessary to remove people off the roof in the case of an emergency, in addition to other allowances for the easements. Frank stated that the wetlands mitigated within the site were not historical wetlands; instead they were created by the development of the gondola and installation of a tower pier. Closing off that man-made drainage from the historical flow back into the wetlands and the micro-pools, which would be created by this plan, will slow down the flow of water. He finished by stating that all of the required wetlands mitigation is already complete in terms of purchasing the wetlands credits.

Applicant, Bill Campie, of DTJ Design - The architectural design proposal was about efficiency, but they are heading toward eight (8) unique buildings to respond to staff's comments on excessive similarity. He noted that the retaining walls would be attractive, not concrete or CMU, and will be presented in more detail at the final hearing. He added that the tree buffer had evolved based on trying to create a diverse and healthy forest for the area near Highway 9.

The project was opened to public comment; there were no public comments and the comment period was closed.

Mr. Frechter - Agreed with the points as recommended by staff and agreed the landscaping buffer is compatible with the concept plan as proposed.

Ms. Gort - Agreed with the points as recommended by staff and agreed the landscaping buffer is compatible with the concept plan as proposed.

Mr. Guerra - Agreed with the points as recommended by staff and agreed the landscaping buffer is compatible with the concept plan as proposed.

Mr. Giller - Agreed with the points as recommended by staff and agreed the landscaping buffer is compatible with the concept plan as proposed. He added that the retaining walls facing the roundabout would have a real visual impact if not well crafted.

Ms. Propper - Agreed with the points as recommended by staff and agreed the landscaping buffer is compatible with the concept plan as proposed.

Mr. Leas - Agreed with the points as recommended by staff and agreed the landscaping buffer is compatible with the concept plan as proposed. He was hopeful that there would be eight (8) different building styles as described by the applicant.

All Commissioners agreed that the application was ready for a final hearing.

OTHER MATTERS:

1. Town Council Summary

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.

Mark Leas, Chair