

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher Ron Schuman Gretchen Dudney
Dan Schroder Eric Mamula Dave Pringle (arrived at 7:12pm)
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison
Mr. Lamb was absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Wolfe: On page 1 on the tax topic, please change the phrase “to a cap of \$4 million” to read “to a cap of 4%.” Under Heated Sidewalks, please change “Jefferson goes to Ridge and Adams goes to French” to “Jefferson to French and Adams to Ridge.” With no other changes, the September 1, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Staff recommended moving the Huron Landing Annexation Recommendation up on agenda to after the Town Council report.

Mr. Mosher announced that the address for the Welk Resubdivision was incorrectly listed in the original packet. The correct address is 87 Shores Lane, and the agenda and packet posted to the website have been corrected. With no other changes, the September 15, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- CR 450 Annexation: Preparing for that; had first meeting on it.
- Working on Welcome Center updates; improving front of house to start. Breckenridge Tourism Office taking lead. Breckenridge Heritage Alliance will be evaluating and coming up with proposal for rear and museum later.
- Parking and transit task force continuing to meet. Working on some transit solutions. Work a little more to understand south end traffic flow, how a pedestrian bridge would work, etc. Putting out an RFP to bring on consultant to study these issues.

OTHER:

- 1) Huron Landing Annexation and Land Use District Recommendation (LB) PL-2015-0384, 0143 Huron Road

Ms. Best presented. The Town of Breckenridge and Summit County Government are partnering on the development of workforce housing on the Huron Landing property located at 0143 CR 450 (Huron Road). The project is planned as 26 stacked apartments which the Town and County intend to make available to local workforce most likely targeting the 80% AMI households. The Summit County Recycling facility which is currently located on the property will be relocated to Coyne Valley Road and construction of the residential project is scheduled for next spring/summer.

The property is owned by the County and is located in unincorporated Summit County, but both the Town and the County have agreed that the site should be annexed prior to development and that the project should be reviewed under the Town’s Development Code. Staff will be running the planning review/entitlement process concurrently with the annexation/ zoning process.

The subject property is eligible for annexation as it meets the contiguity requirement and the owner (Summit County) has requested annexation. Staff supports the annexation prior to development in order to insure the

project is developed in accordance with Town standards as opposed to County, and also to insure municipal services, including water, are available. Furthermore, even though this property is currently unincorporated, it is included in the Town's Master Plan subject to Land Use District 5 which allows service commercial at a 1:5 FAR and lodging at 10 UPA. The current County zoning on this property is Industrial which would allow different uses and significantly more density and height than the residential project which is proposed. Upon annexation, staff supports the placement of the property into the designated Land Use District 5. This District is compatible with the adjacent uses and can accommodate the residential project that is proposed.

Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission make a recommendation supporting the annexation of the property and the placement of the property into Land Use District 5.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to recommend the Town Council support the annexation of the Huron Landing, PL-2015-0384, 0143 Huron Road. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried (5-0), with Commissioner Pringle abstaining.

Mr. Schuman made a motion to recommend the Town Council place the property into Land Use District 5. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried (5-0) with commissioner Pringle abstaining.

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS:

1) Casey Residence (MM) PL-2015-0310, 108 South Harris Street

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to remodel the interior and exterior of the existing house. The applicant and agent are approaching the remodel to bring the original house and the additions into better compliance with the Town's *Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts*.

Overall, the 'laundry-list' of improvements is numerous. The agent has cooperated closely with staff to take what is a very complex and confusing building into better compliance with the *Handbook of Historic Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts*. Generally, all windows are vertically orientated double hung, the doors are 1/2 to 3/4 light, the roofs are shed and gable forms with asphaltic or rusted metal finishes. The center portion has been approached as a 'connector' element and the garage/master as an out building. The main house will have painted horizontal cedar lap siding with a 4-1/2" reveal. The center portion will also have horizontal cedar siding. The Garage/Master will have vertically oriented cedar siding with a semi-transparent stain.

Staff questions the standing seam roof on the main house and the transom windows, but is otherwise pleased to see these changes to the house. Staff also believes that, with these changes, the historic rating of the house might be raised from 'noncontributing' to 'contributing with qualifications'.

This project is off to a good start for what is a fairly difficult remodel. Efforts have been made to bring the house into better compliance with the Town Code and have a design that is compatible with the other homes along the block.

At this review, Staff had the following questions:

1. Did the Commission support moving a portion of the front façade 18-inches west to better define the entry and module width?
2. Would the Commission support changing the proposed rusting standing seam metal roof to a rusting corrugated metal?
3. Staff welcomed any additional questions or comments.

The Planning Department recommended this application return for final review.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: Does applicant want historic designation? (Mr. Mosher: No, There's not much fabric left, if any, and it's not contributing to the district. But, it is possible with the changes that it could become eligible as contributing structure to the district.)

Mr. Mamula: Explain easement on adjoining property, apparently for solar access? (Mr. Jon Gunson, Architect for the Applicant: Reason for easement, from the previous owner of both properties wanting to protect the solar access for passive solar.)

Mr. Mamula opened the hearing to public comment. There was no public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I appreciate undertaking; like the front façade stepping forward; support the low-profile standing seam at the front porch and the rusted corrugated in back.

Mr. Schroder: I support the front façade stepping and the detailing defining the rear as outbuilding.

Ms. Christopher: Yes on façade stepping forward and would support low profile standing seam roof on front.

Mr. Pringle: I appreciate the effort and bringing into more historic compliance. I support moving the front façade up and the standing seam roof. Caution to not get too cute with too much difference from neighboring buildings.

Ms. Dudney: I like the project. Yes to front façade step and the standing seam roof.

Mr. Mamula: I agree. Yes on staff all questions.

2) 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. The Town Council approved a Development Agreement for this proposal on July 14, 2015. (There will be separate applications to modify the Fifth Amendment to the Amended Peak 7 & 8 Master Plan, create a Subdivision and review any extensions or updates to the existing Sprung Structures.)

Changes since the August 4, 2015 Planning Commission meeting

The applicant has provided the following changes since the last preliminary review:

- The skier drop off / short-term parking was increased from 10 spaces to 21 spaces.
- The bus drop off area was enlarged to support more busses and shuttles.
- The number of curb cuts along Ski Hill Road and the Grand Colorado East property was reduced from 4 to 3.
- The proposed pedestrian underpass below Ski Hill Road has been eliminated.
- Pedestrian crosswalks have been added for access from the upper and lower Stables Parking structure.
- All proposed plantings have been located outside the Ski Hill Road ROW.
- The skier plaza access has been adjusted to accommodate snow cat use above.
- The third stair access from the Garden Level to the Plaza Level has been eliminated.
- The ice rink access has been provided via Plaza Level from the gondola platform area.
- Additional parking deck information has been provided.
- The layout of the short-term parking at Grand Lodge at Peak 8 has been cleaned up.
- The Peaks 7 & 8 traffic study update has been provided.
- The ice rink / Breckenridge Ski Resort (BSR) ski school area has shifted north to open up the space from the bus drop-off to the stairs / escalator as well as to center on the overall building mass.
- BSR childcare and mechanical space has been moved from below the gondola platform to the within the main building on the garden level.

- Owner amenity spaces – added rooftop aquatics area to 4th floor level; relocated theater amenity from 4th floor to 3rd floor.
- Lowered chimney height.
- The maximum building height has been lowered to 68'-1".
- The building elevations have been articulated with fenestrations (overall massing has changed very little).
- The view corridor photo renderings have been refined and an additional view corridor rendering from gondola has been provided.
- Overall mass and density calculations have been revised per VRDC feedback.
- The total parking numbers have been updated.

Since the last review, Staff has researched areas of the Master Plan notes and illustrative plans as they relate to the required parking and impacts of the total units (not SFEs) being provided at the base area.

Staff is working with the applicants (Peak 8 Properties, LLC; and Vail Resorts Development Company (VRDC) to review the use and location of the 200 or more spaces within Planning Areas A & B as described in the Master Plan as they relate to all of the surface parking at Peaks 7 & 8. We note the Skier Drop-off and the added parking deck to the Stable Lots address some of the spaces lost from past developments. Additionally, the upcoming traffic study plans (future meeting) to address the impacts of the number of units exceeding the noted 446 units at the base area.

We anticipate this returning for Commission review with the planned amendment to the Master Plan (and the other items identified by the Development Agreement). We will have more information at a future meeting.

This proposal involves several interrelated and complex issues besides the building. The retaining wall along Ski Hill Road and the added parking deck to the Stable Parking Lot will each need variances for impacting the PMA. Further details will need to be reviewed and presented related to rebuilding Ski Hill Road, providing the added parking level to the Stable Parking lot, the amended Master Plan, Re-subdivision, traffic study, and project signage.

Staff also noted that, unlike the last presentation, the applicants are seeking positive points for providing added shuttle services with this application.

Staff had the following questions for the Planning Commission:

1. Did the Commission have any comments related to the functionality of the vehicular circulation along Ski Hill Road?
2. Did the Commission have any concerns with the impacts of the enclosed bridge between the buildings as it relates to the view corridors towards the mountain?
3. Would the Commission support awarding positive six (+6) points for the added amenities for this proposal?
4. Would the Commission support awarding positive two (+2) points for the proposed landscaping?

Staff welcomed any additional Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Fit test for parking 200 spaces or more for 7 and 8. With this plan how many spaces are provided? (Mr. Mosher: Still under analysis; question of what counts, such as drop off spaces, etc. We will have more information with the Master Plan modification.) In 2003 we were talking less parking up there because of gondola. Updated traffic analysis coming? (Mr. Mosher: At the next meeting.)

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Matt Stais, Architect for the Applicant and Mr. Mike Dudick, Applicant, Peak 8 Properties, LLC.

Mr. Dudick: As noted in the staff report there are unresolved items we are working on with staff. Building height: we anticipate negative ten (-10) points. It may be taller than one inch over. Target height is 71-feet, not 68-feet as this allows more flexibility in construction.

Mr. Stais: Circulation; we attempted to consolidate the driveway for the skier drop-off, guest arrival with the service entry for the west building. The guest access will be key-gated. Transit loop expanded for only busses and shuttles. (Showed view corridors from Ski Hill Road and gondola.) The connecting bridge between the west (under construction) and east buildings will not be much of a factor from the gondola view of mountain; won't impact it much. Ski Hill Road redesign: main goal to average the grade along the road from One Ski Hill Place and Ski Watch drive and avoid any steeper sections. A tall retaining wall next to the Gulch will be required to re-grade road. Want to match the existing retaining walls up there in terms of appearance.

Mr. Dudick: Parking: The site is tight to get to 200 parking spaces; the current number is close to 200. With design we will provide 124 parking spaces associated with this building (underground); only 100 spaces required in development agreement. We are over parking by 24 spaces. 88 surface parking spaces were contemplated at Peak 8 in the 2003 master plan. With the new spaces in the upper level of the Stables Lot and at the skier drop off we have provided 87 spaces. Landscaping: we believe positive two (+2) points are warranted as Staff suggested. Amenities: The area is six times greater than required by Code and warrants positive six (+6) points based on past precedent. Transit: we are seeking positive points for providing additional shuttles. We will add a proportionate number of shuttle busses for the increase in rooms. We are typically at 98% occupancy in the winter. Feel we should get the positive four (+4) points. Energy conservation: will beat the IECC standards by 20 % - maybe more. Should achieve positive three (+3) points. Negative three (-3) points for heated snowmelt: will take it, but in future the Town should consider not dinging applicants for melting what essentially a public place. Ice rink: think it deserves positive six (+6) points for recreational facilities. Will be open to public but there will be small charge for skates (operating at a loss). After 5 pm there will be ample free parking available in the Stables lot. Temporary structures: sprung structure in place for 16/17 ski season. Then reduce its size in half as we put in foundations. Fall 2019 all of BSR spaces are in place and sprung structures are removed. In addition to Staff's questions in your report, we would like Planning Commission comments on +6 points for amenities, positive four (+4) points for transit, positive three (+3) points for energy conservation, positive six (+6) points for the ice rink/recreation facilities.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schroder: Ever thought of keeping the gondola open longer into the evening, past 5 pm? (Mr. Dudick: It would be up to ski area.) Retaining walls: how do we overcome negative points because of height? (Mr. Mosher: This is along a Town right-of-way and the PMA and needs to include ability to stack snow next to the road, not into the gulch. This should come back and get flushed out for future meeting.)

Ms. Dudney: Is there any assurance of the positive six (+6) points staying with the property for rec facilities/ice rink? (Mr. Mosher: These could be a covenant recorded that requires it to stay as ice rink.) Concern about long term financial viability. (Ms. Puester: Would covenant be HOA or Breckenridge Grand Vacations?) (Mr. Dudick, not sure maybe the base association.)

Mr. Schuman: Energy conservation? (Mr. Stais: We are going through Green Globes certification and will have documentation and have it approved by Building Department.) (Ms. Puester: Would require a third party draft assessment to ensure that the points can be obtained prior to final planning submittal.) Why no underpass? (Mr. Stais: Difficulty of constructing over/through water and sewer mains plus costs would outweigh the benefits. Not used by that many people too.) (Ms. Puester: Temporary structures: we need to run by Building Department

about constructing around the structures while there is public access.)
Mr. Pringle: Snow melting any public places; I like it for safety purposes. We should be able to explore no negative points for uses like this.

Mr. Mamula opened the hearing to public comment. A letter from the neighbor is on record. There was no more public comment and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Pringle: No comments on circulation. We're moving along well. May be some room for massaging points. OK with +6 for amenities, +2 for landscaping, problems with +6 points for ice rink; not sure if it's a big enough benefit, get temporary structures worked out with Building Department.
- Ms. Dudney: Very supportive of project. Curb cut along Ski Hill Road consolidation is much better. No concerns with connector bridge between buildings or the view corridor. +6 points amenities good and +2 for landscaping is matter of precedent. Transit: in favor of more busses; that benefits the Town. In favor of +3 points for energy conservation if they can demonstrate to staff. Ice rink: deserving of some positive but not sure about +6.
- Mr. Schuman: Support the improved vehicular circulation on Ski Hill Road: But I'm not in favor of the added parking at the Stables Parking Lot. +6 for amenities good, +2 for landscaping; yes, likes their plan. Transit: supports +4. Likes +3 points for energy conservation if staff validates. Not supportive of +6 points for ice rink.
- Mr. Schroder: Ski Hill Road: burden on applicant to improve road? (Staff: Yes; But this has always been part of the master plan and was to be completed at this time.) In support of road and vehicular circulation. Yes on +6 for amenities and yes on +2 for landscaping; transit yes for +4 points, energy conservation, with support, +3 yes, recreation/ice rink: it could be worth something (more than a single-track trail) but not as much as Stephen West Ice Arena, with all its facilities; I support +3 points.
- Ms. Christopher: Yes on vehicular circulation and view corridor. Yes on +6 points for amenities, +2 points for landscaping, +3 for energy conservation, +4 for transit, but only +3 points for recreational facilities.
- Mr. Mamula: Ok with vehicular circulation but 21 spaces for drop-off; don't make it confusing and dangerous like the one downtown at the transit center. It's not monitored. Make sure it will work better. Bridge is fine with view corridor. Would like to see a visual of what it would look like from within plaza after walking off the gondola. Amenities, landscaping, energy points good. Not sold on the ice rink positive points yet. Transit: ok with +4 points. As mentioned before, I'm a little concerned about double dipping for positive points when the development agreement reduced your parking requirements. Not sure about whether road design is worth the effort we are going with. I know the Town wants improvement to Ski Hill Road and they committed to it but wonder if it's worth it.

COMBINED HEARINGS:

1) Welk Resubdivision (Tract W-1 into Lots 1-4) (MM) PL-2015-0364, 87 Shores Lane
Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to re-subdivide Tract W-1 at the Shores at the Highlands into Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4. This re-subdivision will simply divide the development area associated with the approved Welk Riverfront Resort, Breckenridge Condo-Hotel (PC#2012044) into four lots for development phasing purposes. There is no change to the approved density or uses associated with this property as a result of this subdivision. The four lots being created by this re-subdivision will separate the Accommodations Building, the Workforce Housing/Maintenance Building, the Meeting Facilities Building, and the remaining common area surrounding the three lots to accommodate financing option phasing for the applicant.

Staff has added a Condition of Approval regarding how Lot 4 is described and used. Typically properties with

this function are called “tracts” as they function to benefit the abutting “lots”. The submitted plans are missing this information. Staff has added: *Applicant shall submit to the Town, in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney, a revised plat delineating Lot 4 as “Tract A” as a tract for the benefit of Lots 1, 2, and 3 with plat notes identifying the allowed uses to include: pedestrian and vehicular access, common area for the benefit of Lots 1, 2, and 3, utilities, grading, or any other specific uses for the benefit of Lots 1, 2, and 3.*

Mr. Mosher announced that the address for the Welk Resubdivision was incorrectly listed in the original packet. The correct address is 87 Shores Lane, and the agenda and packet posted to the website have been corrected.

This subdivision proposal is in compliance with the Subdivision Standards. Staff recommended approval of Welk Resorts Re-subdivision, PL-2015-0364, 57 Shores Lane, with the presented Findings and Conditions.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Pringle: Comfortable with Condition 2? (Mr. Mosher: Yes.)

Mr. Schroder made a motion to approve the Welk Resubdivision, PL-2015-0364, 57 Shores Lane, with the presented Findings and Conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously. (6-0).

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Eric Mamula, Chair