

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher	Trip Butler	Dan Schroder
Gretchen Dudney	Jim Lamb	Eric Mamula
Dave Pringle		
Gary Gallagher, Town Council Liaison		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Mamula: On Page 2 of the minutes (first comments at the top of Page 2): I meant to say that “sometimes a master plan is subject to interpretation”. I wasn’t talking about code based issues but about the Master Plan itself. I wanted to make sure that the Council doesn’t read that as “I think whatever I say is right”.

With the one change, the January 15, 2013 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously (7-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the February 5, 2013 Planning Commission meeting agenda was approved unanimously (7-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Kaltenbach Garage (MM) PC#2013005; 4 Raindrop Green
2. Tannenbaum by the River Exterior Remodel (MGT) PC#2013003; 805 Columbine Road
3. Purbrick Residence (MGT) PC#2013008; 970 Forest Hills Drive
4. Payne Residence (MGT) PC#2013007; 220 Cottonwood Circle

With no requests for call up, the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

WORKSESSIONS:

1. Solar Panels in the Conservation District (JP)

Ms. Puester presented. Solar panels in the Conservation District became a topic of discussion with a recent application to install solar panels on a flat roof within the District. Staff brought a draft policy to the Planning Commission on January 2nd, 2013. The Town Council reviewed the Planning Commission meeting minutes at the January 8th Town Council Worksession, and agreed with the general direction of the Commission’s recommendations:

- Sloped Roofs: Flush mounted panels on sloped roofs should be allowed. Panels *may* be visible from a public right of way, defined as including streets and alleys; however, reduced visibility is a goal.
- Flat Roofs: Solar devices should be allowed on flat roofs if they are *not* visible from a public right of way. (Define “visibility”.)
- Detached arrays should be allowed only if they are *not* visible from a public right of way with the same definition of “visibility”.
- Solar devices in the Conservation District must be approved through the Planning Commission process. Staff did add some submittal requirements as well.

Staff researched the amount of roof coverage on existing installations within the Conservation District. (Percentages represent the amount of panels covering the roof plane on which they were installed, rather than the entire roof area of the structure.)

- 205 South French Street (Abbett Placer Inn) 70%

- 106 North Ridge Street (Summit County Buildings) 50% and 88%
- 203.5 South High Street (Edman Residence) 40%
- 117 South Main Street (Haney Building) 23%
- 107 North Harris Street (Longbranch Condominiums) 85%, 28% and 82%

The percentages show a range of coverage on existing installations. Two options include:

1. No limitation on roof coverage with solar panels. We would look to the preference list to address the issue of if an application is too highly visible.
2. Limit percentage of roof coverage with solar devices. This could have some unintended consequences

Detached solar arrays were suggested by the Commission to be permitted if not visible from any public street or alley. Staff has concerns with allowing detached arrays in the district. The small size of lots in the District could make this option problematic to effectively screen and not impact the area if permitted. Could leave a door open similar to the issue with flat roofs we saw with the last application.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: On the flat roof...is it prohibited if it's visible? (Ms. Puester: Visible from any public street or alley in the historic district.) I would prefer to use our definition of "visible" to be based on the photos that are submitted in the 400' or 1 block radius, rather than have someone come back later and say that we shouldn't have approved it if they can see panels from somewhere. It should be a concrete definition. Secondly, the way that I read this it's somewhat subjective in terms of whether or not an application could be considered to result in detrimental character. So that comes first to us, and then we would give our personal opinions. (Ms. Puester: If Staff was concerned a rating would be in jeopardy, we would send it first to the State Historic Preservation Office for feedback. We also base all recommendations on precedent). We would vote and then it would go to Council and then they could call it up to approve or not, right? (Ms. Puester: That is correct.) The subjectivity is different; there will be different opinions, and I think that this is a good piece of legislation. The Council would get our opinion and they could decide for themselves. Lastly, in the preferences order list, should the historic structure be included in those preferences? Or did you think about that? (Ms. Puester: We could list that separately further down in the preference line. I wouldn't want to see panels on a historic structure before these other options. A photovoltaic device will most likely be on a historic structure.) (Mr. Neubecker: We could tweak this to add that extra language.) I'm not saying that you should, you might just think about it.

Mr. Mamula: The preference list was originally needed when we allowed everything; I think this is part of the older language that doesn't belong anymore. Now that we have a black and white policy, we determine whether it belongs in historic district or not. The preference list doesn't mean anything except give the list of our preferences without "legal ease". This is clunking it up quite a bit.

Ms. Dudney: Doesn't it give the Planning Commission some basis to deny an application?

Mr. Mamula: I think you have that anyway. It is so site specific what we are going to be doing, it doesn't make sense. (Mr. Neubecker: I think that the preference list is helpful to the Applicants. When you have several different structures on one site, it is helpful to the Applicant to see where we would prefer to locate panel. In some cases, the preferred location will be less energy efficient, but better than us just saying 'no'. Giving the Applicant some direction is helpful.) It may be more helpful to the applicant but harder to legislate.

Ms. Dudney: There is something about this that bothers me too. It is all rather subjective, and yet we have these preferences; I view them as more of a guide. Consider Abbeville Placer Inn: if I apply this to that property, it would be allowed because it was not visible from the street. The County

Buildings, probably not allowed. South High Street examples could be allowed and so could the North Harris examples. South Main Street example in packet could be allowed. It would all fall to the interpretation of the Planning Commission and to the Council. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We would also use past precedent.)

Mr. Pringle: That's how we are supposed to vote; we are following precedent and changing precedent at the same time. (Mr. Neubecker: Consider that the Application that led to this discussion isn't on the table at this time. Since it was never approved, it is not precedent.)

Ms. Dudney: I still think this is better than before because it is clearer; if they hone in on the term 'visible' than that gives the Applicant more to go on and the rest is more subjective.

Mr. Schroder: I appreciate the visibility note; we were given photos last time and we talked about peaks. I was appreciative of moving into the conservation district and it put us into a particular target. That works for me. Then it's a matter of visibility; people could lean around the corner to see a panel, but this is that kind of nebulous.

Ms. Dudney: If all we are given are photos from one block away, how do we know if you can see it from two blocks away? Shouldn't we give this a better definition?

Ms. Christopher: I think "visibility" should be defined as an amount or anywhere in the conservation district at the street level. (Mr. Grosshuesch: We were struggling with that as well; how much proof are we going to require an Applicant to provide? If we want them to take photos from every angle in the conservation district, that's too onerous; then we settled for the 400-foot rule. That's the balance.)

Ms. Dudney: I think that you should match the two, so not visible from 400 feet.

Mr. Schroder: I am in favor of matching. (Mr. Neubecker: Reference to 400-foot is a based on one city block.)

Mr. Pringle: After years of scrutinizing with the historic district, this whole discussion is based upon being able to see a contemporary solar panel put on a historic building; maybe we need to discuss whether or not we want solar panels in the historic district at all. If solar garden arrays are available in the future, maybe people can participate in those. I sometimes wonder what we are really doing here. Visible means if it can be seen per the Webster's Dictionary. If you do not want to see it, then don't allow it. I can see you can just about see it from some place within reason. Years ago, we wanted to allow solar panels in the district, and we even wanted to encourage it and we are seeing the impacts from that.

Ms. Dudney: The history of this was that the Council voted "no" on all solar panels in the historic district. Then we voted by majority on some recommendations to allow for them, that Council's interpretation was too harsh and should be more subjective. Flat roof is not okay, but generally on a sloped roof it might be okay as long as it wasn't highly visible. It went back to the Council and they said to us 'we like that, keep going in that direction'. I think that staff has accomplished what we asked for. Now we need to find the level of proof as to how visible we amiable to. Dave, are you looking to forbid them on flat roofs entirely (Dave-Yes).

Questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission find that the amount of roof area covered by solar devices needs to be addressed? If so, did the Commission have a recommendation on the maximum percentage?
2. Did the Commission find that detached arrays should be permitted in the district?
3. Did the Commission feel that other modifications were needed to the policy?

Commission Answers to Questions:

Ms. Christopher:

1. No, I don't think that we need to put a percentage limit to it; could be subjective depends on the application.

2. Allow, not visible from public right of way; the same definition, 400 feet, street or alley level and from a neighbor's.

3. No.

Mr. Butler:

1. No, a lot of good detail in here. I don't think that we need to put a percentage on the amount.

2. Detached arrays should be permitted.

Ms. Dudney:

1. Don't need to specify a percentage.

2. Detached arrays should be permitted as long as the neighbors don't object.

3. I think you need to specify what is the proof we will require for not being "visible".

Mr. Lamb:

1. No, I think a lot of these roofs look better with solar panels covering the entirety roof.

2. We should allow detached arrays, but they should not be visible from a street or alley and should not be detrimental to the neighbor.

(Ms. Christopher and Ms. Dudney agreed with this verbiage.)

Mr. Schroder:

1. No, I wouldn't put a percentage limit on the roof.

2. I appreciate the language on the preferences; it specifically states how a detached array is last option and it works.

Mr. Pringle:

My earlier comments stand; all of the years we've tried to protect these buildings but we are past that.

1. Go ahead and put these on the roof, but I don't think we should limit the percentage. Based on individual situation.

2. The detached arrays should be permitted; I don't think that neighbors should have veto power on each other's project. It should pass code or not.

Mr. Mamula:

1. I'm okay with percentage but it has to be less than 100%; we need some kind of setback from all four edges including the top near the ridge, so that it doesn't project over the roof edges. (Julia- Does the rest of the Commission agree? All of the rest of the Commissioners agreed.)

2. I think detached arrays are a mistake; unfair to a neighbor. It is patently unfair to put a pole array in a yard where the yards are small. So different here than in the Highlands where the lots are large. It will affect your neighbor here regardless.

3. The preference language is clunky and difficult to use.

Other Commissioner Comments:

Mr. Pringle: I don't know that we want to forbid detached arrays, but really there are only a couple of lots where this might be applicable.

Ms. Christopher: What I meant was not that the neighbor has veto power, but we need to put ourselves in their shoes.

Mr. Mamula: It doesn't say that here though. You can't really deny someone from putting array up without that language.

Ms. Christopher: Would like to see the language added.

Mr. Mamula: We are creating a situation that doesn't work. What's "detrimental" to the neighbor?

Mr. Pringle: It should be allowed but probably not going to happen.

Mr. Gallagher: I am hopeful when the discussions of solar farms come up again, Council will be able to encourage people to not put solar panels in the historic district perhaps with an incentive and get them out on Airport Road instead. If it were my druthers, I would say no to detached arrays in historic district.

Ms. Christopher: On Mr. Gallagher's note, is there any way that we can add to the policy that if at all possible, purchase in the solar farm as a first preference? (Ms. Puester: As Staff, we can direct

applicants to the solar farm route, but I have concerns about putting that in code. The solar garden will have limited space, it's a temporary solution. It is not wholly owned by the Town.) (Mr. Neubecker: We can direct applicants to the solar garden however, there are limitations to that.)

Ms. Dudney opened the worksession to public comment:

Mr. Lee Edwards: I really appreciate the Commission's comments in the former meeting. Is the Commission going to see this again? If it is brought again, could we have a map of both historic and conservation districts? When you say that only a few sites could have detached, then I'm thinking that Briar Rose area might be one of them. I appreciate that you dropped alleys out of the definition of visible in the conservation districts. (Ms. Dudney: Alleys is included, but is secondary priority.) (Ms. Puester: On sloped roofs, they can be visible from street or alley; but flat roof and detached arrays not visible from street or alley.) Good, a nice flush mounted solar panel there is entirely appropriate. Alleys are where we put our storage, cars, and trash in the district anyways.

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

The Planning Commission decided that Staff was ready to go to Town Council after making some changes regarding adjacent properties, and including a setback on a sloped roof.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Mr. Gallagher:

1. Since our last meeting the Council has selected a consultant for the hotel study on the F Lot: Lowe Enterprises. Without being told, they really understood what work really needed to be done. It has to be looked at in the context of what is going on elsewhere (Riverwalk, Tiger Dredge Lot, etc.). They put a team together that provided both an owner's perspective, architectural site plan perspective and how it might integrate with the surrounding properties as well as the perspective of the data generators determining market feasibility and doing a 10 year pro-forma. The other two consultants probably could have done a pretty good job but they didn't pull all three pieces together. References checks and contracts are being negotiated by Staff. 90 days from now we should see market feasibility reports.
2. The Riverwalk Center: The site planners and landscape architects that are working on the center provided 4 options for the Riverwalk Center, and a plan with respect to the Blue River Plaza. The Council only focused on the Blue River Plaza due to a lack of time; the Council was generally happy with the suggestions, as well as ideas to increase the usefulness of the Blue River Plaza. They want to open it up so that you can see the Riverwalk Center uninterrupted as well as the mountain (from Main Street). Council was supportive of the goals that they had identified. Consultants suggested moving the Christmas tree. Some felt pro and others con on that idea. The Council will need to focus on the Riverwalk Center both in terms of interior and exterior with parking. Keep in mind we have the F Lot Study and the Riverwalk Center Study going, and there is a little bit of a balancing act going on between the two. You will be seeing both of those fairly soon.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1. Welk Resorts (MM) PC#2012044; 87 Shores Lane

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a 123-unit time-share/condo-hotel at Tract W and D-3 of the Shores at the Highlands Subdivision.

Changes from the June 6, 2012, Worksession:

- A Development Agreement was approved on November 27, 2012, by the Town Council. *In connection with the future development of the Property as proposed by Welk, authorization to increase the 200%*

multiplier for amenity space as provided for in Subsection 9-1-19:24 (Relative): D of the Development Code to 700% would allow for meeting and conference facilities or recreation and leisure amenities on the Property. (This essentially allows the increase in the mass allowance for amenities.)

- Density and Mass square footage numbers have been adjusted and provided.
- Elevations show height and grading.
- Revisions to exterior elevations.
- Additional details on materials and colors provided for the elevations.
- Updated Landscaping Plan.

Staff noted that just prior to the meeting the applicants and agent modified the site plan to move the Meeting Facilities building at an angle from the north property line and have proposed to add a dedicated driveway to the Maintenance Building for refuse and service that is separate from the guest parking area.

Staff has been working closely with the applicants and agents. As with other applications of this nature, there is a lot to review and design. There has been good direction provided by the Commission and the applicants are responding well. We anticipate the height overage will be resolved and presented at the next meeting.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: I need some guidance. Normally the architectural style would not be part of the Code but in this Master Plan there are two references: “Fishing Cottage” and “Mining, Ranching” and “American West” architecture should be encouraged. (Mr. Mosher: Policy 5 in Development Code will address any detail not identified in the Master Plan. As for the “Fishing Cottage” reference, the Applicants for the Master Plan intended this style to be associated with the single-family or duplex (smaller) units.)

Mr. Mamula: Where did the amenity space get eaten up? Is the timeshare sales office counted separately as commercial? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.) Explain the conference use space. (Mr. Mosher: The sales offices represent the 0.3 SFEs of commercial use. (Noted the areas of the amenities on the site plan.)) (The Agent said he would explain in more detail.)

Applicant Presentation:

Richard Hulbert, The Hulbert Group, Architecture, Planning, Communication:

We were gratified by the comments provided by you last time; and we have moved forward. Welk is a ‘club environment’ with a portfolio of properties in various locations. With purchased “points”, our guests can enjoy any of the many locations. It is a very “family values” type of environment which is why a lot of family events occur at these resorts which is part of the reason for the facilities location. Welk gives lots of flexibility to the design team so we are trying to respect the past history of the Breckenridge area. Our narrative is, let’s imagine that there was a mining mogul that fell in love with the area, mined the area then built a homestead close to the Blue River and had guests at his home for refreshments and lodging. He built a barn, a bunkhouse and now all we have is a ‘found’ site. We are renovating that site. We are trying to establish a village, a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment.

Suzanne Allen-Guerra, Team Member of Shores Development Group developing the property to the north of this property.

We really appreciate the proposed revisions that we have received; the Meeting Facilities building is our main issue. We are concerned with the overall mass, scale and the uninterrupted massing. It’s blocking our solar access and is a detriment to our property values. I think that we could suggest some changes; we wouldn’t mind a little parking lot between us and this project and would prefer it to the large building; we could build a berm to increase the buffer; we feel the plantings will grow better without a 40-foot high building to the

south. Another thing that we noticed was that the meeting facility plate height. The drawings show a 12-foot plate height and if you look at the building it has the appearance and mass of a three-story building. If you pulled that roof plate down almost a full story, I think that he could accommodate that upper floor in that vaulted roof space above. In effect that wall is 24-25 feet high. We at the Shores are required to have a maximum overall height of 30-feet as part of that “fishing village” concept that we worked together with Don Nilsson on the Master Plan back in 2007. We agreed to keep our buildings very low scale under 30-feet high from that existing grade and the submitted drawings are basically proposing that these buildings are built up 4-5 feet higher than their existing grade, and this will cast a shadow on our lots which is a serious negative to our property values. That building needs to be pulled away a lot more from the property line. I think that the 6:12 roof pitch is great.

Mr. Lee Edwards:

Is this the second time that you’ve seen this proposal? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.) When this came through for the Master Plan review with Don Nilsson, was anybody here on the Commission or the Council and have a memory of what was presented then? My concern was this started out as three parcels; I can only imagine that it would be more sellable with three parcels and also that we would have three separate buildings. There is one massive structure proposed out there. Was it subdivided as two parcels when it was brought originally? (Mr. Mosher: No, the site was designated as multi-family lodge type use. The previous application that was approved was for a condo-hotel in nearly the same configuration as we are seeing tonight.) As you come into Town, what am I going to see of this structure? This wall/face that faces the highway is going to make the BBC look small, and pale in comparison; as you turn on the corner you are going to see this sucker. It’s going to be huge; it’s not the fault of the developer; this is radically going to change what we are looking at; we haven’t allowed this kind of reaction since the late 1980’s. I agree with the comment: don’t cheapen the project by lowering the pitch. If you have a lot of parking needs, please look at being creative with parking other than so much asphalt.

Mr. Loren Girch, Partner / Developer at the Shores Duplexes:

Our Lot 22 is undeveloped; we are not bringing the building to the boundary line. There will be an easement and another path that gives access to the river. With what we have the ability to do in terms of buffering, the parking would be much preferred rather than this building. If you moved the building away, put more parking against the boundaries. This is a business and evaluation issue, and we’ve never seen the Commission make decisions based on business. They make things look right together. Your project will be a very nice project and hope it is successful; we are proud of the product we’ve built to the north. We think that the building along this edge doesn’t belong there; we think some of the suggestions Ms. Allen-Guerra offered are good and agree with all of Mr. Mosher’s comments and concerns in the Staff report. Regardless of whether or not the building is rotated, lowering, moving it to another side, 90 degrees, the way it sits now, whatever we plant, it won’t grow the way the site is currently presented. We appreciate that you are willing to look at different options.

Mr. Marc Hogan:

I think that the use is fabulous for this piece of property; please remember in the original Highlands Master Plan we’ve lost all of the hotel and multifamily on the east side and this would be a great benefit for the Town.

There was no further public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission have any comments regarding the “glazed balcony railing” (essentially tempered glass instead of newels) for the deck railing system?
2. Did the Commission have any comments on the massing, colors and materials shown for the project?

3. Did the Commission have any comments regarding the setbacks, scale and design of the Meeting Facilities Building?
4. Did the Commission support awarding positive six (+6) points for the provision of meeting and conference facilities or recreation and leisure amenities well over the required amount?
5. At this review, and based on the larger quantity and sizes called out, would the Commission support awarding positive four (+4) points for the landscaping plan?
6. Did the Commission believe negative points are warranted under Policy 7/R, Site and Environmental Design, for the buffering along the north edge of the property to the Meeting Facilities building?
7. Would the Commission support positive points for site circulation and separation of systems under Policy 16, Internal Circulation?

Commission Answers to Questions:

Mr. Schroder:

1. As for the tempered glass “railing”; thinking of the code, I don’t know what would prohibit it and I like the way it looks.
2. I agree with comments regarding the barn/community building; massing seems to be unbroken; I would like to see it more broken and maybe continue to massage the issue of moving the building.
3. See above.
4. Appreciate providing additional amenities and I support positive points.
5. It was noted that our landscape planner hasn’t looked at it yet. Will wait for staff recommendation.
6. I’m not sure the buffering is there just yet; drawing looks beautiful. I don’t know if that is the reality; I would like to see what you are going to do with it before assessing points.
7. I would support positive points; I like the way that the separation is and the various parking lots and potential garbage enclosure and the way that the soft goods are dealt with away from the guests.

Mr. Pringle:

1. I’m not sure that I have objection; I prefer a non-reflective glass, smoked or colored rather than any reflective. (Mr. Neubecker: Stated the code Policy 5/R indicating highly reflective glass is not recommended.)
2. I’m going to wait until further along the line with that; engineered wood is changing to natural, etc.
3. Massing: It’s a lot of building there and I have concerns that you’re going to have a lot of road noise and anyway that you can soften that road noise by moving the entire development back or further south and increase the buffer from the road to your proposal might be good. As far as where you are setting the buildings I would think that maybe you would want to bring the parking lot closer to the building; maybe you don’t need all of that green space between you and the highway. It seems that most of the people that try and build multi-family projects don’t need all of the parking that Code requires and we end up going down to something that is less than 1/unit. More people are using ground transportation. I don’t think that you need that much parking and I’d like you to revisit that.
4. The design of meeting facility could probably get smaller. If you can cut down the size of that, then maybe you don’t need a full wall to wall 12-foot height and the space and you can massage that to fit your needs. If we’re talking about a Colorado barn, I don’t think that this represents one.
5. Whatever the Staff thinks is appropriate. I’m hoping that whatever you do out there, you’re not going to be looking for separate uses out there.
6. Well worth it but the case has been made that you show a wonderful landscaping product that might not be achievable; might take a look at what is going to work.
7. Yes I think negative points for the meeting facility building because there isn’t enough setback for that size. You might want to tighten up that parking and give yourself some relief from that north property boundary. I think, again, that you should be concerned about buffering that noise from the highway and reduce the height of that building to reduce the negative points. I’m not sure that it will be a radical change to that end but I think that it will change the way that we look at the town.

Mr. Lamb:

I appreciate the fact that you're working with your neighbors which will get you a better project.

1. I can see that this railing will get you in trouble with the snow; just in the pictures, it looks a little too modern. You could argue that our Development Code basically doesn't allow that.
2. Colors and materials are fine; massing is too high but it sounds like this is still a work in progress.
3. See #6.
4. Yes.
5. Landscape plan looks fine; I would like to see Ms. Cram look at it; lots of trees, nice zones.
6. Definitely negative points there; seem likes you're heading into a conversation with your neighbors where there is still a possibility for that to get redesigned.
7. Site circulation looks good on this property; people can see the river but not endangering the native grasses on the property.

Ms. Dudney:

This should be a great asset to Breckenridge

1. I'm not sure code says no on the glass railing; I personally think it will get you in trouble and don't like it.
2. Mass and colors are fine.
3. I am sympathetic to your neighbors so that it doesn't shadow their lot.
4. I support the 6 points.
5. Go with Staff.
6. Go with Staff.
7. Go with Staff.

Mr. Butler:

Great project and asset.

1. I like the glazed balcony railing but I think that you'll run into trouble with it.
2. I like massing and colors.
3. The massing is wrong for the Meeting Facilities building; sure if you need that much parking?
4. I support the 6 points.
5. I know you'll get to 4 points on landscaping.
6. I believe you'll reach a good conclusion on points.
7. You'll reach a conclusion on site circulation.

Ms. Christopher:

1. I don't like the railing because it doesn't work well up here; other than that it is not a natural material; it's not mining theme. Maybe a wire railing instead.
2. Massing and colors; you've changed the color board already.
3. I'm sure it will be fine.
4. Setbacks: I feel like working with your neighbors, you might lose the "corral theme" for the parking lot.
5. Yes on positive points on landscaping.
6. Yes, what Staff thinks.
7. Yes, what Staff thinks.

Mr. Mamula:

1. The vernacular of the glass doesn't fit into the Master Plan design guidelines.
2. The vernacular of the architecture doesn't fit into the Master Plan; in particular, the main entry building looks like a Howard Johnsons to me. It doesn't fit into Town character. I like the fireplace, the skylight but I don't understand why that would fit into the Master Plan criteria.
3. The vernacular is wrong with the neighbors; there is no mountain vernacular on this building at all as the Master Plan describes. I am at a loss as to why this is okay in its current form. For the last 10 years, every consultant has told us why we don't need this much parking and you insist that you need all these spaces. You could lose 15 spaces next to the meeting building and pick up another 10 feet buffering there.
4. I know that there was a deal struck to pay for the 700% amenity mass bonus in the Development Agreement, but to award positive 6 points is a "double dip". I'm not saying yes or no at this point; we've had this kind of thing before.

5. Can't comment on landscaping; like the way the architect has drawn it but I want Ms. Cram to say it will grow.
6. Buffering will be worked out.
7. Circulation is great; it's this problem with the Master Plan.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1. Gondola Lots Master Plan Permit Extension (CN) PC#2009010; 320 North Park Avenue
Mr. Neubecker presented a proposal to renew the existing development permit for PC#2009010 for three years. No other changes were proposed. A master plan is proposed for 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 includes 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 proposal includes the transfer of 93 SFEs of density from the Gold Rush parking lot to the north and south gondola parking lots.

The Applicant requested that the Planning Commission renew the existing Development Permit for three years. During review of an application like this, the Commission should focus on code changes that have happened subsequent to the original permit approval. In this case, staff has found no relevant code changes that affect this application. As a result, no changes are proposed to the Point Analysis; however, since there are some new Planning Commissioners that were not involved in the initial review of this application, Staff included all relevant information on the project in the report.

The visioning process for the site was a collaborative effort between Vail Resorts Development Company and the Town of Breckenridge. The design drivers for the project included: compatibility with Breckenridge, authentic story, integration with the fabric of the Town, balance of transit / transportation issues, world class visitor / resident experience, and sustainability.

Point analysis:

Policy 6 (Building Height)	-20 points for buildings up to 5 stories
Policy 16 (Internal Circulation)	+3 points for good vehicle and pedestrian circulation
Policy 18 (Parking-View)	+4 points for providing parking underground or in a structure
Policy 18 (Parking-Joint Facilities)	+1 point for making parking available to the public
Policy 18 (Parking-Shared Access)	+1 point for shared driveway access
Policy 24 (Social Community)	+4 points for providing 6.51% of density as employee housing
Policy 24 (Social Community)	+3 points for Council Goals, including transportation enhancements, economic sustainability and environmental sustainability
Policy 25 (Transit)	+4 points for improved transit circulation, improved facilities and reduced vehicle and pedestrian conflicts

The result is a passing score of zero (0) points.

Staff recommended approval of this permit renewal with the presented Point Analysis and Findings and Conditions. This application was advertised as a Combined Preliminary and Final Hearing, and the application may be approved by the Commission tonight. Since there have been no code changes in the past three years that would affect this project, Staff had no concerns.

There are still several issues which were not finalized for this application, that have been included as Conditions of Approval. These issues are primarily business issues (i.e. property lines, ownership and construction of public amenities, loss of parking, and construction of the river improvements, etc.) that are not addressed in the Development Code, and need to be approved by Town Council.

Applicant presentation: Mr. Alex Iskenderian, Vail Resorts Development Corporation and Mr. Bill Campie, DTJ Design: Nothing to add; Mr. Neubecker did a great job presenting.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment. Mr. Lee Edwards requested to view the documents and Mr. Neubecker presented them. There was no public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

None.

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Gondola Lots Master Plan Permit Extension, PC#2009010, 320 North Park Avenue. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Gondola Lots Master Plan Permit Extension, PC#2009010, 320 North Park Avenue, with the presented Findings and Conditions. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

2. Vic's Landing Duplex Lots Subdivision (MM) PC#2013001; 22-98 Dewey Placer Drive
Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to resubdivide Tract 2 of Vic's Landing First Amendment Condominium Map (Reception #891469) into seven saleable lots. The use and density associated with this tract remain the same as the approved Vic's Landing Development (PC#2005104) for twelve duplexes.

This application has been advertised as a combined Preliminary and Final Hearing. Staff believes all of the issues relating to this subdivision have been adequately addressed. Staff recommended the Vic's Landing Second Amended Subdivision, PC#2013001, be approved with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Ms. Dudney opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment, and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: When this was approved weren't the duplexes part of the original proposal? Are these open lots for sale?

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Vic's Landing Duplex Lots Subdivision, PC#2013001, 22-98 Dewey Placer Drive, with the presented Findings and Conditions. Mr. Mamula seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Gretchen Dudney, Chair