PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

ROLL CALL

Michael Bertaux Rodney Allen

Mike Khavari Leigh Girvin Jim Lamb

Dave Pringle arrived at 7:02 PM Dan Schroder was absent

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Page 5 of 62, Line 6: Mr. Khavari indicated that the minutes should read: "We should be assigning *positive* points" not *negative*.

With one change, the minutes of the July 15, 2008 Planning Commission meetings were approved unanimously (6-0).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the Agenda for the August 5, 2008 Planning Commission meeting was approved unanimously (6-0).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Rivers Residence Garage Addition (MGT) PC#2008089; 125 North Gold Flake Terrace

Ms Girvin would like to call up this application to discuss some issues.

2. Alpen View (CK) PC#2008083; 215 South Gold Flake Terrace

Ms. Girvin: Were the positive three (+3) points for solar due to design or are they symbolic? (Mr. Kulick explained the points followed precedent, and the amount of energy generated from solar panels warranted positive points.)

3. Progar Residence (MGT) PC#2008087; 27 Peak 8 Court

Ms. Girvin: Both the Progar and Murphy houses have a lot of stone. Where do the two different types of stone come from? What talus fields are stripped or what fields are being mined to get this material? The effects of bringing in stone from outside sites can have serious environmental impacts. Lichen rock takes years to develop. (The applicant's designer pointed out the stone can come from a variety of locations and named several from adjoining states.) Ms. Girvin would like staff to explore the environmental consequences tied to the use of these materials, and the way our codes encourage the use of certain materials.

- 4. Leow Residence (MGT) PC#2008086; 1296 Ski Hill Road
- 5. Master Sponsor Sign Plan for the Summit Foundation Duck Race (MGT) PC#2008088; 200 Ski Hill Road
- 6. Murphy Residence (CK) PC#2008085; 359 Long Ridge Drive

Ms. Girvin moved to call up the Rivers Residence, Mr. Khavari seconded.

Ms. Girvin wanted to discuss the idea of making up negative points for a setback encroachment with landscaping. The evil of not meeting the setbacks cannot be mitigated by landscaping. The addition would be destroying a patch of wildflowers too, in order to plant more trees.

Mr. Pringle noted that this was how the code was written and recent changes have required site impacts to be mitigated on-site rather than off-site as well. (Staff indicated they are working on changes to the landscaping policy, and in the future, fewer points may be assigned for landscaping.)

The motion failed by a 3-3 vote.

With no other motions, the consent calendar was approved unanimously (7-0).

WORKSESSIONS:

Eric Mamula, Town Council Liaison, arrived at the beginning of the work session.

1. Village at Breckenridge Remodel (MM & CN)

Mr. Neubecker and Mr. Mosher presented a memo stating that the Village at Breckenridge Homeowners Association is considering an exterior remodel of five buildings. They are currently in the design stages, and are looking for feedback from the Planning Commission on the direction of the project. Once they have your feedback and bids on the project, they would go to the homeowners for a vote this fall. They will still need a development permit, which would be submitted sometime after Tuesday's work session. Work could commence as soon as April 2009.

Considering that this is a very visible property, the architects and HOA wanted to get feedback from the Commission before they continue forward. Also, since these buildings are significantly taller than many buildings in Town, they would have significantly more non-natural material. (Note: The International Building Code requires non-combustible materials above the third floor of the building.) During the meeting on Tuesday night, we will talk more about how this project meets the Development Code, and a bit about the points that might be assigned for various policies.

Tony Wait, Village at Breckenridge HOA / Applicant: Gave a brief introduction to the Commission regarding the proposed remodel. Project does not include Vail resorts owned buildings (Village Hotel, Ten Mile Room or The Maggie). Alex Iskenderian of Vail Resorts supports this design, but Vail is too busy with other projects to participate now.

Tobias Strohe, Architect (JG Johnson): Five buildings are part of the project: three plaza buildings, the Liftside building, and the Chateau. Different stone samples were presented to the Commission for consideration. Stucco and wood panels were also presented to the Commission for consideration. Sprinklers would be added to the remodeled building as part of the remodel. If natural materials were added to the exterior, then sprinklers would need to be added to the exterior decks too, which would create a freezing problem. The stucco color has not been decided yet, but would be earth-tone.

Paul Weimer, Master Planner: Pointed out the Town has encouraged diversity in building design in the past and would prefer not to have all building matching. One idea was to make all buildings different, rather than similar, to help break up the perceived size of The Village.

Mr. Grosshuesch: Suggested Commission separate advisory comments and code based comments. Discussed master plans and Policy 39.

Commissioner Ouestions/Comments:

Mr. Bertaux: What plaza improvements would be made and why? (Mr. Strohe: there is leaking and failure of the snow melt system. A new snow melt system will be installed and new paving will occur.) Suggested private discussions with Vail Resorts to make a sound decision on building design coordination. Not thrilled with quantity of the stucco. Encouraged the concept of a metro-district but not sure about the Town taking it over. What would the Town be responsible for? Would like to see planting material along the Blue River edges on the east. Understood this area is narrow but try to look at all options. Does new exterior material help with heating and cooling the building? Environmental issues need to be taken into consideration regarding the fire feature (exterior fire pit) and any water features. Supported the snow melt system with the quantity of public traffic through the site. (Architect pointed out various snow melt options are being considered for efficiency.)

Mr. Allen:

Sought clarification regarding the future of the property designs with regards to Vail Resorts buildings. (Mr. Strohe: we don't know Vail's plans.) Are there any alternatives to the proposed cement-board siding? (Mr. Strohe: There are alternatives, but not sure of the costs or weight of other products. Heavier products could create a structural problem.) Are the homeowners willing to proceed? (Mr. Wait: pointed out that this is the time for this remodel before the economy worsens. We may not get another chance. He also pointed out that owners will consider an assessment of \$60 per square foot this fall.) Didn't want to penalize the HOA if there neighbor (Vail Resorts) doesn't come to the table and participate on their own buildings. Vail Resorts will be busy at Peak 8 for ten

more years; we can't wait that long. This remodel would be a huge public benefit since many folks in the community use this property. Positive points for public benefit should be considered. Agreed with snow melt/safety issues and thus wouldn't assign negative points.

Mr. Pringle:

Clarified that with this proposal, all materials to be used on the exterior were non-combustible. (Mr. Strohe confirmed all non-combustible material would be used per fire department codes.) Asked the architect if they were familiar with the property and how it operates at peak times. (Mr. Wait discussed the planning which took place to get to this point, which included CDOT and other representatives. The South Side Alliance was also formed to help assist with the best outcome. A metro district has been discussed for future planning. Larger vision includes underpasses to address pedestrian conflicts, extending the Riverwalk, a boardwalk around Maggie Pond, and removing the Ten Mile Room, but these issues are outside the control of the Village HOA.) Would like to see something happen to better incorporate this project into Town and the remaining buildings. This property was developed as a whole, not separately designed buildings. The Commission has preferred other material besides Hardiplank in large areas. We don't know how hardiboard will weather over time, but we know natural materials do; it would be OK on smaller elements, but look at some of the ski area buildings under construction with a mix of natural and non-natural materials. Would prefer another solution. Masonry might be an option but suggested further investigation. Would like to see current contemporary look changed to a more mountain look. Struggling with taking three buildings out of the equation; wanted to see the whole Village updated. Take a remodel of the whole and not parts of it. It would be a disservice to the Town to encourage a remodel when not all entities are at the table at the same time.

Ms. Girvin:

Sought clarification regarding which of the buildings would be remodeled. (Mr. Strohe explained.) Thanked the applicant for making the effort to improve the property. Vail Resorts needs to understand that this project will set the precedent and thus they should take interest in what's going on. (Mr. Wait pointed out the Vail has sent representative to the table to provide input. The architect pointed out Vail Resorts was aware of what's going on and was supportive.) Pull in some more detail from existing neighboring buildings regarding specific design elements and visual interest, such as Der Steiermark and Park Avenue Lofts. Take into consideration what other developments are doing.

Mr. Lamb:

What percentage of the building is stucco? (Mr. Strohe: unsure of the percentage.) This is a window of opportunity to improve some ugly buildings. From a code standpoint the stucco is pushing the envelope regarding it being used as an "accent".

Mr. Khavari:

Understood the Vail-owned buildings were not included with this application. Have discussions with them taken place? (Mr. Wait did point out they have a financial interest in the improvements being proposed due to their fractional ownership in the subject buildings. They are contributing about \$3 million to the overall project, which included the plaza improvements.) Has an engineer been consulted regarding the foundation? Would like to see a view or model from Park Avenue. Suggested metal siding etc.

Mr. Mamula: Large uses of Hardiplank have been used above the third floor in the past on similar buildings in Town. Would be nice to get rid of the stucco look this building has which creates somewhat of an eyesore currently. Echoed Mr. Pringle's comments regarding a partial remodel of the buildings without all parties at the table. Sought clarification from Mr. Wait regarding the appetite for a metro district. (Mr. Wait: many of the homeowners have expressed support for this project, but we have not yet had a vote.) Ten Mile Room is the eyesore and therefore he suggested Vail Resorts do something with at least the front.

Jan Radosovich, Citizen: Saw plans for these improvements in January but no costs have been discussed to date. A lot of supporters may be more cautious due to the struggling economy.

Mr. Grosshuesch: Noted that the applicants have the right to process a Development Permit for their property and not be subject to directly tying into the neighboring buildings that are not part of the application or owned by the applicants. Policy 39 (Master Plans) allows portions of the master planned area to request changes to their property without requiring approval from other land owners within the master plan.

OTHER MATTERS:

Town of Breckenridge Planning Commission – Regular Meeting Date 08/05/2008 Page 4

Mr. Mamula: discussed the Grand Hotel/Gondola Lot Master Plan and BEDAC's suggestion to go with all underground parking and the issues involved. This would involve too much density subsidy from the Town, and he did not believe the Council would support it.

Mr. Bertaux: told Mr. Mamula that the Commission struggles with energy issues.

Mr. Pringle: discussed Green building as well as sustainable building. Window orientation and positive and negative points assigned was discussed in depth.

Mr. Khavari: brought up carbon footprints regarding various topic including solar panels, stone usages, etc.

Mr. Grosshuesch: pointed out the recently adopted sustainability codes address topics such as this.

Ms. Girvin: the idea of offsetting an evil by landscaping bothers me.

Mr. Bertaux: had an issue when the landscaping fails down the road. (Mr. Neubecker indicated that where we know of landscaping covenant violations, we would contact the property owner, but we do not systematically drive around looking for dead landscaping.)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:41p.m.	
	Mike Khayari Chair