

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

### ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher            Jim Lamb                    Ron Schuman  
Eric Mamula                Gretchen Dudney        Dan Schroder arrived at 7:03pm  
Dave Pringle arrived at 7:27pm  
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no changes, the July 16, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

With no changes, the August 4, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

### TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Parking and Transit have been the recent themes. We did some re-designation of lots around Town to create more employee parking. These changes will happen at the end of August. One of the biggest changes is that entire East Sawmill lot will be employee parking with 89 spaces. The Wellington lot will be open to guest parking. The Horseshoe area of Tiger Dredge will be employee. Klack Placer will be a combo with employee and residential and same with French and after 3pm the lots will be open. Ice Rink parking will continue to be a work in progress we are adding 45 new spaces so some designated free employee permit parking here too. There will be an increased fee of \$15 for overnight parking. We are discussing making the rest of the Ice Rink lot be paid skier parking, but it will be looked at one more time by the parking lot task force. We hope to give employees more opportunities to park.
- Big discussion in the Wellington Neighborhood currently around transit issues. We are having an ice cream social in the neighborhood this Thursday at 6:30 pm to discuss transit alternatives. The residents are hesitant to have the buses go through the neighborhood. The arrangement that many want are for the bus route to go down Wellington to open space at the end and then come back, but this is a very costly solution. We don't have a great answer to this right now, but we know that this neighborhood does use transit a lot.
- (Ms. Christopher: What about if the parking lots for employees are oversold?) We don't have a good handle on the different shifts so the Breck PD is working on figuring this out; it will be oversold a little but we are hoping to find the balance and will continue to review to find a good balance. I am concerned that if employees don't park in the East Sawmill lot that they will lose it. The Town is foregoing \$50,000 in revenue by designating this as employee parking. Not sure yet if permits will be for multiple lots or just one designated lot. We are hoping to encourage employees to have a designated space and not be forced to use Main Street.
- Great joint session with Council and Planning Commission last week, thank you.

### PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building (MM) PL-2015-0215, 1595 Ski Hill Road  
Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to construct a 105 unit (units combined into 2 and 4 bedroom rentals) interval ownership resort condo-hotel at the base of Peak 8 ski area with associated amenities and underground parking. Additional off-site parking is proposed at the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 Building to the west and over the Stables Parking lot to the north. A Development Agreement for this proposal was approved by the Town Council on July 14, 2015. (There will be a separate application to modify the Fifth Amendment to the Amended Peak 7 & 8 Master Plan and to create a Subdivision).

In 2008, a proposal for a condo-hotel in this location had been submitted by Vail Resorts Development Company as "Building 804" (PC# 2008032). The Master Plan depicted the general size and general location of this building.

Building 804 was approved by the Town Council on November 25, 2008. The 48-unit condo-hotel included children's ski school, day care, restaurant, ticketing, group sales, ski rental, and support facilities. There was 54,442 square feet of residential use, 9,623 square feet of commercial use, and 22,453 square feet of guest (skier) services. The required meeting spaces and owner amenities (pool/spa, bowling alley, meeting rooms, etc.) for all the base Vail Resort Development buildings were to be located within One Ski Hill Place (shown as "802" & "803" to the east).

In 2010, the Town received a submittal to modify this building from a condo-hotel into a hotel (PC#2010048). Specifically, a 100 room hotel with 57,235 square feet of Guest Rooms, 9,012 square feet of commercial use and 20,757 square feet of guest (skier) services. The application was abandoned during the review process.

This development is subject to the Amendment of the original May 2003 Peaks 7&8 Master Plan and all subsequent Master Plan amendments. Most recently, the Fifth Amendment to the Amended Peak 7 & 8 Master Plan, PC#2013006 was approved by the Planning Commission on February 19, 2013 and the Town Council on February 26, 2013.

On July 14th, the applicants obtained an approval for a Development Agreement associated with this application (Council Bill NO. 21, Series 2015).

Density and Mass numbers are still being reviewed to confirm the exact numbers. Staff believes this application is off to a good start. The building appears to fit into the Master Plan criteria. The added density does not appear to impact the master plan for any future development. Staff would like to return at the next hearing and provide more detail and discussion on the policies listed at the beginning of the report. Staff has received public comment from a noticed property owner (included in the packet). Staff had the following questions for the Commission:

1. Did the Commission have any concerns regarding the view corridors as depicted compared to those of the Master Plan?
2. Did the Commission have any concerns about the proposed TDRs and their impact on the remaining Administration Lot shown on the Master Plan?
3. Did the Commission have additional concerns regarding internal and external circulation and do you support negative points under Policy 16R?
4. Did the Commission believe the building roof forms step down at the ends enough to warrant positive points?
5. Did the Commission support awarding positive one (+1) point for providing density in the roof forms?
6. Would the Commission support awarding positive three (+3) points for the ice rink as a Recreational Facility?

Staff also welcomed any additional comments.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Dudney: Please clarify the Admin lot; how many are left on SFE's? (Mr. Mosher: roughly 77 SFE's.) The additional parking spaces are 0.85 per unit? (Mr. Mosher: Yes, the plans show all the residential parking underneath the building with 27 extra. They have extra parking based on the building form.

Mr. Mamula: When will we discuss the 100-foot tall (+/-) retaining wall? (Mr. Mosher: The retaining wall will come back at the next meeting with Engineering comments and the raising Ski Hill Road.)

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Mike Dudick, Breckenridge Grand Vacations, Applicant: We think that the 701 building made a great start for us in 2008 and helped us know what you liked as a Commission and what you didn't. The rendering is shown for Grand Colorado at Peak 8 that is under construction right now. There will be a pedestrian bridge to the lobby in Grand Colorado at Peak 8 for the new property. Once this bridge is built the pedestrian and vehicular circulation is really well retained inside our facilities. We want to keep the square footage per unit proportional to the rest of the buildings. This new building will be called Grand Colorado on Peak 8. Once all the buildings are done they will be Grand Colorado at Peak 8 South, North and East buildings.

Mr. Matt Stais, Architect for the Applicant: Thanks to the staff and Commission for all of the work. The architectural design priorities were based on the previous built buildings for my clients. Last time we had the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 approved and the plan was to have a future hotel developed by others with the priorities to create the best resort arrival for all skiers, increase functionality and work the best for the ski area overall. The first task for this plan was to relocate the transit function southeast so that the people taking the bus meet at the same location as the gondola. The circulation is unified despite how you arrive. This also creates some delineation between our operations and the ski area. We have some drop off areas but, we have some issues with the road and will be bringing back more detail and revisions.

Another priority is to design a sensible way-finding experience for all the guests at Peak 8. I respected the original 804 design but, we feel the new form responds better to people arriving at the Ski Area. We put the skating rink at this location to show people on the gondola that they are at the ski area. We will put ski school nearby so it also works in the summer for those guests. Substantial public amenities are our priority with new escalators, a fire pit meeting location with sunken seating, the skating rink. All will be will public amenities. Floor plans also show a large public restroom on the plaza level which will help congestion and we are putting in a coffee shop with entrance from plaza and the skating rink.

Another priority was to provide more space between buildings for people arriving at the ski area. We've moved the bulk of the building northward. We are trying to respond better with outdoor conditions and improve pedestrian flow. On the north side we have more room between the south building under construction now and the proposed building will now have 62-feet instead of the previously approved 45-feet of separation. We want to preserve the ability to see the mountain as people drive up Ski Hill Road. View corridors are important to us too. We have tried to make the building forms sympathetic on the east side and improve the views for the guests. We are providing a commensurate amount of amenities like the skating rink and coffee shop that are also different from the South and North building. We have a substantial amount of lockers and a new swimming pool on top of the roof above the ticket office. We are going to have a media lab and more private theaters that are used extensively. And, on top of the 4th floor there will be an additional amenity. We are still working on the concept for this.

The third priority to increase the base area functionality, the main thing we want to do is complete the base area at Peak 8. We will rebuild Ski Hill Road. It is very flat and then gets very steep at the switch backs. The Town staff has been working with my team to come up with schematics. The master plan has a wide shoulder to keep the snow off the road doesn't go into Cucumber Gulch and go into a drain. We would like to add parking to the stables lot and put in a pedestrian underpass under the raised portion of Ski Hill Road to get pedestrians from the stables lot safely. We want to provide a sensible way finding strategy for the pedestrian and vehicular guests.

Mr. Dudick showed the coffee shop, skier services, public restrooms, lockers, ice skate rentals. Kids Ski School is the level below. There will be 22,000 square feet of guest services housed in this building. Our focus for this evening's discussion is on the building and we will next have a more defined plan for parking.

We want to have an interim condition plan for regarding the road and it will take 4 or 5 years to build this project. We want to work closely with the resort. We are taking down 3 buildings and we want to have an interim plan, and this will be the focus of the next meeting with you. Our construction plan:

- 2016 plan installation for temp structures, demo of buildings, re-grade Ski Hill Road, mass excavation.
- 2017/ 2018 Vertical construction of entire superstructure.
- 2019 Continuing Construction: finish exterior of building and deliver space to the ski resort to finish.
- By 2019: fundamentally finish the Peak 8 Base Area with buildings wrapped and most of the ski area uses completed.
- Late Fall: occupancy by ski resort. The ice rink won't be open yet.
- If we can sell our units quicker, then the timeline will speed up.
- 2020-21 Completion of all residential units.

(Mr. Mamula: How does this mesh with other buildings under construction?) The first phase will obtain the Certificate of Occupancy in 2016 and then second phase, the fall of 2017 and then some around May of 2018. Our goal is to continue delivering during those years. (Mr. Stais: We would like to get Ski Hill Road done *before* Phase 1 the building opens in the Fall of 2016.) This is part of the development agreement with Town Council. (Ms. Dudney: You still have construction staging needed after you've wrapped the building? That's the way you've done other buildings?) Yes, that is how it is going right now. We've talked about vertical phasing or horizontal phasing. We've talked about this with the Town Building Department. We've got experience with this phasing as we did it on Peak 7. (Ms. Dudney: The amenities go in the first phase?) Yes.

Benefits (per Applicant, Mr. Dudick):

Grand Colorado completes Base Area of Peak 8 and provides a multitude of neighborhood benefits. 804 guests were going to use One Ski Hill Place; we will be foregoing this concept and have more of an exclusive use for the guests of Grand Colorado at Peak 8. The amenities are a big focus for us that help us sell to families and kids. We will have a check in process and won't be using any vehicular or pedestrian access to One Ski Hill Place. The arrival experience for Peak 8 visitor is vastly improved. Great amenity package at Grand Colorado at Peak 8 expanded to Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East Building; skating rink and coffee shop and rooftop pools and those people will see the ski slopes and the gondola people will see the pools. The Media Lab will allow kids to download their videos for the day and splice their Go-Pro videos. Private movie theaters have been a big hit in all our buildings; we will have a total of 7 in this grouping of properties. And then one more rooftop guest amenity.

Development Agreement is approved. We understand the Commission's concerns regarding how these agreements are interpreted. We have approval for up to 18 SFEs residential and 1.3 SFEs Commercial. All are subject to the Development Code review. We think the coffee shop on plaza level will be great amenity for ski area guests. There are 122.77 SFE's with the Ski Area; we are buying 45 from VRDC and VR is keeping 77.77 SFEs for a potential future hotel by the Ski Area. The density transfer was necessary to preserve hotel option for the Ski Area. We know we have to demonstrate to you that the SFE's fit. We buy the TDR's that we need and should generate over \$1 million to Open Space. The improvements to Ski Hill Road are called out in the Development Agreement. Grand Colorado at Peak 8 will provide early morning uphill skier parking prior to 8:30 am if the added deck over the Stable's Lot is approved.

View Corridors and Stepping of Buildings: (Mr. Dudick showed images illustrating how the proposed building opened up the views from One Ski Hill Place and compared this to the formerly approved 804 building.) We think our new design substantially increased the view corridor, with other 33-feet of view corridor. From perspective of stables lot with bridge still increased this view corridor by other 22-feet.

Density: We have 55% of the density at One Ski Hill Place. We are 69'-5" tall and lower than the 76'-0" of One Ski Hill Place. We feel like the Grand Colorado at Peak 8 East is at the core of Peak 8 Base as the point of ingress and egress of Gondola. Lesser in height and density and we've got the stepped building forms.

Summary:

- We think that we've greatly improved view corridors.
- TDR's and Admin Site: We can demonstrate that this can fit 91 and is under.
- Circulation and Parking: In a future meeting.
- Building stepping overall creates view corridors and we think we should get +1.
- We agree with staff on positive one (+1) for density in roof.
- We think that the positive points for ice rink should be positive six (+6) not positive three (+3) because this will be the only public amenity that we've done.

We want comments relative to density, massing, height, view corridors and general conformance to the Master Plan. This is a big project in relationship to the Community and fixing the Peak 8 base area.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Mr. Mamula: Who owns the escalators? (Mr. Dudick: The Mountain Master Association, everything in Peak 8 and Peak 7 that is.) Does the ski area agree to the 77 SFE's? (Mr. Frank, Breckenridge Ski Area: We are working with Mr. Mosher in a collaborative effort.) (Mr. Mosher: We will have this at the next meeting and it should be buttoned up then.)

Mr. Schroder: I feel like this is the middle of the base area. Mr. Mosher talks about buildings that show interesting stepped down roof forms. The Master Plan shows One Ski Hill Place as the central point. (Mr. Mosher: The Development Code addresses individual building roof forms stepping down. The Peak 7&8 Master Plan addresses overall building masses stepping down as they get further away from the Peak 8 Base core.) (Mr. Dudick: We aren't trying to do the shell game shuffle; we aren't trying to over blow it now in order to step down next meeting. We don't want to lose units.)

Mr. Mamula: This is a one point conversation. (Mr. Mosher: This issue was a concern with the last building (Grand Colorado at Peak 8) and the stepping down of roof forms.) There are multiple levels of conversation, if you don't want the positive one point than you don't have to go for that one point.

Mr. Mamula opened the hearing to public and reminded the public to please keep comments to the topic of tonight's presentation.

Mr. Richard Himmelstein, 19 Peak 8 Place: I submitted a letter (included in the packet) that speaks for itself. I'm concerned about the height of the building; this building has 8 levels, I believe it is one floor taller than One Ski Hill Place and I want some clarification. I heard that they were demoing three buildings and I just want to make sure about the Kids Kastle and the Sprung Structure on the slopes. (Mr. Dudick: The kids building will stay until this is complete.) In Mr. Mosher's report it lists them as one building. The stables parking lot: I know that there is a lot of concern about snow and the view corridor. If I could have my preference, I would rather have an underground parking lot and keep the stables lot the same height as it is. (Mr. Dudick: The stables deck will be deferred until the September hearing.) (Mr. Mosher: We will come back to the sprung structures and temporary buildings. Each will be a separate Class C application.) The actual U.S.G.S. elevations make this building taller than One Ski Hill Place too. (Mr. Stais: Will look at the elevation question raised between One Ski Hill Place and this to clarify for next meeting.)

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

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

- Mr. Pringle: I applaud you. The Commission visited the other ski area base areas and this is what we envisioned as a base area that was loaded with amenities and incorporated with the Town and added to the Town. I think you are building what we had envisioned. These are going to be big buildings but they will also be spectacular buildings. I think the view corridor starts at Four Mile Bridge north of Town and works its way up the valley. I think anything that you've done to allow that view through to the amenities and onto the mountain is good. I am sensitive to this and it just gets better coming up from Town. I don't have any negative comments for what has been presented. I don't think the height issue will be a problem; I think massing is right on the money, work with staff to work on details. I think the TDR thing will work out and has the right intent of the Master Plan. I think 801 and 804 are the apex of the base area and that is where the massing and density are supposed to be. I think you will work with the external circulation. You will work out the negative points of polity 16R, circulation. I noticed that the elevator towers on the elevations seemed a little high, is this the design? (Mr. Stais: These are "chimneys" that my staff added and we will work on this.) You will get the points for the ice rink I will let staff decide between positive three (+3) or positive six (+6) and I wouldn't advocate for either at this point.
- Ms. Dudney: The view corridors do comply with the Master Plan. I have no concerns with TDR's and very positive for the added density. Circulation, we defer on for now. I don't think the roof forms step down in terms of Development Code. I'm in favor for the positive one point for putting density in the roof and I'm in favor of more positive points for putting in the skating rink. The benefits are greater than that of a trail. I'm in favor of positive six (+6) points.
- Mr. Lamb: I think it is a good design. I think view corridors are improved from the previous 804 approval. The TDR's work. Circulation staff will be working on. I don't think the roof forms steps down quite enough for one point. I agree with positive one (+1) point for density in roof. I would lean with positive six (+6) points for ice rink if there is dedicated parking and free to public.
- Ms. Christopher: I have no concerns with view corridors they are better. No concerns on TDR. Circulation will be worked on. Building could step down more per our code...I think it needs to step down more. Positive one (+1) point for density within the roof forms. Positive points of ice rink, but to get positive six (+6) you really need to do more like what Jim said.
- Mr. Schroder: A lot of work has been done on this. I'm glad to see that we are going to conclude this base area. Development here is expected. The narrowing down is desirable; if the building were to step down then the view corridors open. The pedestrian bridge I don't have an issue with it even though no one said anything yet. I'm in support of the vitality that comes with the ice rink but I agree with Mr. Lamb that we need to make it free to the public to really be that type of positive six (+6) point amenity.
- Mr. Schuman: I think view corridors are improved. No concerns about TDR's; I look forward to reviewing Policies 16, 17, and 18 in regard to the circulation concerns. I think the building roof forms do step down and warrant the positive point. I support one positive point (+1) for density in the roof forms. I think that positive three (+3) points works for ice rink. I don't think we should put more parking up there but maybe increase gondola hours or bus service.
- Mr. Mamula: It is a much better plan than I expected; this is a more reasonable approach and I like that you flipped the building form to Ski Hill Road. The justification of this building height as part of the stepping is not there yet; this is a part of Master Plan. I would like to see a view from the Gondola cabs and a view corridor established along here too, this is an important view, the secondary view from the Gondola that tells you how busy Peak 8 is. I want to make sure you can see the corral-line at the two lifts and how busy it is. Nobody stands in the stable lots to view the building. The revised view corridor is good. The TDRs are fine you have a Development Agreement with the Town Council. I want to have a firm idea of what is left in TDRs and density. Roof forms will be fixed and the density works. As for the

ice rink, there needs to be more detail fleshed out for me to decide if this is worth more than positive three (+3) points. This is a great start.

**OTHER:**

1) Joint Planning Commission/Town Council Meeting Recap

Ms. Puester: I thought that meeting went really well. We went over the development agreements and that Council didn't want to double dip and these will be passed to Staff to give them a good idea of points. We will cover those policies with Council. Temporary Tents: we won't do the grandfather clause we will go with the duration of the entirety of the summer and one tent will be tied to a large lot hotel or lodging property we will work on this and a maximum square footage for a tent. We will clarify on upkeep and what "private events" means. Plan to bring this back to you at the next meeting.

*Commissioner Questions / Comments:*

Ms. Dudney: The Mayor summarized that this could be for a certain number of weeks from the end of ski season through September and you pick your number of weeks and try to accommodate. (Ms. Puester: I heard that it would be four months not between November and May. I also heard up to two times in the off season.)

Mr. Mamula: Main Street Station for musicians versus a commercial business wanting a tent for their own music venues.

Ms. Dudney: The Main Street Station anyone can sit down and listen, open to the public. The Burke and Reilly situation that Mark mentioned, you have to go and be a patron. I think it is a public space and the tent should go through the public process. It was my understanding that it was owned residentially and commercially.

Mr. Pringle: I think the one at Main Street Station it's an amenity for the entire area and would hate to see this hung up by a legal technicality.

Mr. Mamula: But the farmer's market is a commercial event; SEPA, not NRO. (Ms. Puester: Legally I think that the Main Street Station event qualifies under SEPA but they would have to take it down in between.)

Mr. Pringle: I never liked the thought of a heated tent up for New Year's Eve celebrations or more; that stretches the intent of what we are doing to allow a deck available in winter as density. (Mr. Truckey: We will do more research.)

Ms. Puester: Site Disturbance is another topic, steep slope sites and retaining walls. We need to schedule our Planning Commission field trip and this could be a topic. Usually this happens in October. (Mr. Truckey: Parking Garages might be another topic too.)

Mr. Mamula: This could be two separate days like one to Highlands and another on parking garages.

Ms. Dudney: Retaining walls in the Highlands are still on the HOA regulations as 4', so if we relax the policy then it will still be that the HOA does not allow. (Ms. Puester: It still affects other places in town that have steep lots.)

Mr. Pringle: A tall retaining wall is forever; multiple retaining walls can be softened with vegetation, I would hate that the tall retaining walls will be ok. (Ms. Puester: I think we are looking at the walls that are behind structures.) (Mr. Mosher: I think we need to look at being reasonable with lots.) (Ms. Puester: We are only going to look, we haven't proposed anything yet.)

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04pm.

---

Eric Mamula, Chair