

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm

ROLL CALL

Kate Christopher	Jim Lamb	Ron Schuman
Gretchen Dudney	Dan Schroder	Eric Mamula
Dave Pringle		
Wendy Wolfe, Town Council Liaison		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The last motion Mr. Pringle made on the last page should have carried (6-0) as Mr. Mamula was not at the meeting. With no other changes, the August 18, 2015, Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Mosher announced that the Nauman Residence had changed to remove the request for a variance. The new listing for the agenda is "Nauman Residence Historic Renovation and Landmarking". With no other changes, the September 1, 2015, Planning Commission Agenda was approved as presented.

TOWN COUNCIL REPORT:

Ms. Wolfe:

- Last Tuesday night was big; we reached an agreement with Vail Resorts that was a 4.5% tax on Breckenridge only lift tickets. This will go to the voters in November and it must pass to be effective June, 2016. A \$3.5 million annual guarantee with a 1% minimum growth rate to a cap of 4%. Vail Resorts commits to \$4.5 million commitment of total effort which is close to what they contribute to the Town of Vail. This was a very compelling offer and we spent time the weekend before and worked hard at the work session and had a large crowd and that showed both sides that it was time to address the parking and transit issue. We can't forget the detail of passing the tax. There is a citizen committee that will do the work to get people to understand the ballot question and hopefully approve it. We don't want to lose momentum on the planning process. The first of the tax monies will come in 2017, but the plan can work on plans and improve transit in the meantime. We intend to continue to work on the planning and transit issues. The parking task force continues to meet. No changes to the 2500 parking spaces or the transit commitments by Vail Resorts. Vail Resorts won't be opposing this tax increase.
- We talked about the financials for the first 7 months and it's a really good story up 105% to 120% in various taxable revenues as compared to year before.
- The parking for the ice arena will be expanded and the work begins September 8 and we are adding another 50 spaces. This will help with some employee parking options.
- Adams and Jefferson Streets will get heated sidewalks and the construction will start this fall. Jefferson French and Adams to Ridge.
- Pro Cycle Challenge was great too.

WORKSESSIONS:

1) Huron Landing (CK) PL-2015-0384, 0143 Huron Road

Mr. Kulick presented. Summit County Government and the Town of Breckenridge are in the process of designing the Huron Landing workforce housing development at 0143 Huron Road. Town and County staff were directed to begin pursuing the project in December 2014 based on an identified need for rental housing in the 2013 Summit County Housing Needs Assessment. The study suggests that between 200 and 370 additional rental units are needed in the Upper Blue Basin by 2017. Since the time of the study, Breckenridge has been proactively working on developing rental housing, including Pinewood II (45 units

by end of 2016) and Denison Placer (60 units by end of 2017). With the completion of these projects, the estimated housing need in the Upper Blue Basin will be cut to approximately 95-220 rental units,

The proposed project site is the 1.708 acre parcel which formerly contained the Summit County Ambulance station, a Road and Bridge facility and the current recycling center which is being relocated to Coyne Valley Road. The proposal is for two buildings containing 26 two bedroom, deed restricted rental housing units. Recommended density is 10 units per acre, the site is 1.708 acres with an SFE multiplier of 1,200 square feet allowing for 20,496 Square feet. Additionally there is a 10% bonus for workforce housing, 2,050 square feet, for a total allowed square footage of 22,546 square feet. The proposed density is 21,192, 6% below the permitted density.

The purpose of the work session is to see if the Planning Commission is satisfied with general direction of the project and is comfortable with Staff's initial interpretation of points. To facilitate the discussion, staff has identified key components of the proposal and Policies where points may be warranted.

Staff Recommended Point Totals:

2/R Land Use: -3
6/R Building Height: -9
9/R Placement of Structures: -3
16/R Internal Circulation: +3
18/R Parking: +2
20/R Recreation Facilities: +3
24/R Social Community: +13
33/R Energy Consumption: +2
Total: +8

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

- Mr. Schroder: We are proposing positive 3 points; is the rec path on this plot? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, it is on the rec path and it does fall under internal circulation because it is in the boundary of the property.)
- Mr. Pringle: My question is on positive points on parking and using Breckenridge Mountain Lodge as a precedent; I think that was a number that we worked together on a development agreement and we came to this as a negotiation. But they ended up providing more than what was negotiated. In terms of precedent, this is recent precedent; most of the time we've give positive points is for screening and such.
- Ms. Dudney: I understand the 10 points for employee housing, but isn't it double dipping to get positive points for workforce housing and be a council goal? (Mr. Kulick: It is two different sections, like historic preservation which is under the code and is a goal of the council. You have to review the two sections independently.) Is this a precedent? (Mr. Kulick & Mr. Mamula: Yes, we have done this in the past.)
- Mr. Schroder: Please show us how the 3 stories go down to 1 story, please show this I want to avoid public backlash. Was this presented to Kennington? (Mr. Kulick: Yes, although staff did not attend this meeting.) (Mr. Matt Stais, Architect: We didn't have a formal presentation.) (Mr. Tim Gerken, Architect: The forms of the buildings; the west building is primarily two stories and we were able to slip in a garden level and then reduce one story on the Kennington side.) (Mr. Stais: It steps from 3 stories to 2 stories on the north side. There are open stairwells between the buildings. There are no internal hallways similar to Pinewood I.)
- Mr. Pringle: One of the things we are seeing after time is to enclose the entries in the guise of energy conservation. Is this something that we should be concerned with? (Mr. Stais: This is the first I've heard of it. We've been working with the Town housing consultant and she said storage is important so we are proposing about 60' feet of storage in the basements of these

buildings. I don't think the landings would be big enough to add storage. This is a community housing project and we don't want to have heated stairwells. This is a good point and we'll take a look at.) Over time, we've seen this occur. (Mr. Stais: I fail to see how enclosing a stairwell is an energy conservation measure.) (Mr. Stais: We are here for a work session and then give a full 7 week review period with a preliminary hearing in November and a final in January, so we are looking for your input. This is going to be a rental property. It won't be an HOA, and this hopefully will keep it more true to it will keep to its true intent.)

Ms. Christopher: Is the basement storage accessible from the outside? (Mr. Stais: Absolutely, and it is accessible from the indoors as well. I also wanted to point out that because the hill slopes up behind, the lower levels will be benched in with bedrooms on the north side but we thought the 3 story element helps putting it up against the slope; takes advantage of the sun and the views. Once we decided to give 2 parking spaces per unit, this was the trickiest part of the design, we could have put more in but the triangle with the existing trees and power lines made it difficult and we wanted to preserve the trees between neighbors.) (Mr. Jim Curnutte, Summit County Community Development: We are very excited to work with the Town of Breckenridge to be working on a housing project. We are about to close on the 40 acre Lake Hill parcel between the towns of Frisco and Dillon and this project is our training ground. We met with Kennington and they provided good input. We have a dire need for rental housing. We tried to put in as many units as we could while being realistic about not overwhelming the site. Overall, I think this is a really good project.)

Mr. Schuman: Is it the County's intent to make that full sidewalk connection? (Mr. Curnutte: We asked Mr. Don Leinweber of Civil Insight Engineering to take a look at the whole road/sidewalk system to develop a plan for the whole street. It is our plan to look at it comprehensively. With this project is to tie in the sidewalk on the front all the way down to the new storage.) (Mr. Stais: Mr. Leinweber has been working on this that pre-dates this project; we are working on trail and sidewalk connections as well as traffic patterns. We know how much room for improvement this may help with on this busy road.) (Mr. Leinweber: There is a process we are involved with, I was approached with a band aid fix a few years ago but now we are trying to see the master plan with no fixed plan yet. This is a narrow right of way and we are trying to secure easements, the right of way is 50' all the way to French Creek. We are working with Xcel to bury power lines and work with other subdivisions to procure easements up to the fence to see what we can do here. We feel like an extension of the separated path, we hope that these improvements will be best realized if the rec path/bike path is cleared in the winter. The goal is to work through a master plan in 2016 and concurrent with this project to complete the larger plan in 2017.)

Mr. Mamula: Will the corner near Kennington be constructed so that those people can get on the sidewalk? (Mr. Stais: Yes.) (Mr. Leinweber: The other problem is the bus stop that is uphill; we would like to see a formalized crosswalk or decide where best to cross.) If there is a way so that the Kennington people can access the sidewalk that would be good. (Mr. Leinweber: We have talks about improving this area.)

Mr. Mamula opened the worksession to public comment.

Mr. Carl Bentley, 223 Huron Road, Kennington Townhomes: I think we voiced most of it and parking is a concern. We have more than 2 spots per unit and we know that there will be times that 2 isn't enough. The place fills up around the holidays and the summer. We are concerned about the views but we will see the more finished plans to make a final decision. We think it is good for the community. We are keeping an eye on the process. (Mr. Stais: Mr. Bentley's wife asked for a before and after rendering view for the central south side so we will be sharing these in the future.)

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

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Ms. Dudney: What is the target market? (Ms. Laurie Best, Long Range Planner: 80% AMI is the target. This equates to max rent of about \$1200 a month for 2 bedroom units, but we haven't set final rates; once we get input on the design, then the Council and Board will work on agreement that defines project cost, financing, management, and roles. From a Council and Commissioners we would like to make this affordable, but different target than Pinewood 2 which serves 60% AMI. Two singles could be eligible or small families. As a rental we will have ability to manage occupancy and parking issues. Two bedroom, two bath is more of a roommate situation and two bedroom, one bath may be more suited to families, but both unit types will be available.)

Staff would like Planning Commission input on the draft point analysis and would also look for any additional comments or concerns before this project moves forward to a preliminary hearing.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

2/R Land Use: -3

Mr. Schuman: Fine.

Mr. Schroder: Analyze commercial versus workforce housing, but I agree.

Ms. Christopher: Fine.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Pringle: Yes.

Ms. Dudney: Yes.

Mr. Mamula: I would say no; give it zero.

6/R Building Height: -9

Mr. Schuman: Yes.

Mr. Schroder: Agree.

Ms. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Pringle: Yes.

Ms. Dudney: Yes.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

9/R Placement of Structures: -3

Mr. Schuman: Yes.

Mr. Schroder: Yes.

Ms. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Pringle: Yes.

Ms. Dudney: Yes.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

16/R Internal Circulation: +3

Mr. Schuman: Yes.

Mr. Schroder: Yes as long as sidewalk is in.

Ms. Christopher: Yes as long as it ties in to pathway.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Mr. Pringle: Yes.

Ms. Dudney: Yes.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

18/R Parking: +2

Ms. Dudney: Yes, I agree to wait to hear about Kennington neighbor input.

Mr. Pringle: Disagree, because of nature of type of use that it should be 2 parking spaces per unit. It is more long term.

Mr. Lamb: I think this is one of the most important parts of this development, but the parking can be so important.

Ms. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. Schroder: Yes it does.

Mr. Schuman: I disagree.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

20/R Recreation Facilities: +3

All 7 planning commissioners: Yes.

24/R Social Community: +13:

Ms. Dudney: Yes.

Pringle: Yes, but don't ask us to explain it.

Mr. Lamb: Yes.

Ms. Christopher: Yes.

Mr. Schroder: Yes.

Mr. Schuman: Yes.

Mr. Mamula: Yes.

33/R Energy Consumption: +2

All 7 planning commissioners: Yes.

Final Comments:

Mr. Schuman: Off to a great start.

Ms. Dudney: I want the neighbors to be happy; the 3D renderings will be helpful.

Mr. Schroder: I prefer the 3 D renderings better than holding up the pvc pipe.

Mr. Pringle: Because Policy 2 and residential uses are discouraged, because of the type of use, any kind of additional storage, like the enclosing the stairwells will be something these year round residents will use. Look at this. The height I don't want to lose site that throwing an additional story on these units isn't something we take lightly we are very sensitive to this, but the back of the hill will help.

FINAL HEARINGS:

1) Nauman Residence Historic Renovation and Landmarking (MM) PL-2015-0152, 211 East Washington Avenue

Mr. Mosher presented a proposal to perform an extensive exterior restoration of the historic house and remodel of the non-compliant addition. The reconstruction of the historic house will include a full basement beneath the historic portion of the footprint and a shelf, less than 5-feet tall, below the window well along the west edge of the site. Local landmarking of the property is also requested.

Staff has found that based on the minor alterations to the nonconforming structure (pulling the 1980's roof form off of the roof of the historic structure) there are no Priority Policies or Design Standards of the Handbook of Design Standards for the Historic and Conservation Districts that would trigger the assignment of negative points or require any need for a variance. The current submittal is seeking approval of the same design as Staff presented on the July 7th preliminary hearing with the exception of the reduction in the

basement density. Most of the changes are internal leaving much of the existing floor plans unchanged.

The applicants are proposing a historic restoration of the original structure as follows:

1. Remove a portion of the 1980's roof over historic main ridge of the historic house and cut the roof addition back approximately 12 feet and add a cricket (for drainage) behind and below the original historic ridge. This will provide an improved separation between the historic structure and the 1980's addition..
2. Remove the west non-historic bay window in the kitchen area (keeping the west facing bay window) on the historic structure, per plan.
3. Restore the original roof form to the greatest degree possible on the historic structure.
4. Restore all original window openings and replace front (north) door with historically compliant door.
5. Full restoration of the front porch with correct post detailing (existing posts to be replaced based on photographs).
6. After locally Landmarking, add full basement under historic footprint (zero lot line on west).
7. On the non-historic addition, correct all windows to historically compliant wooden vertically orientated double hung windows.
8. Correct roof form in non-compliant addition. Notes:
 - a. There will be no changes in the historic floor elevation.
 - b. There will be no increase in rear roofline height.
 - c. The building is to remain in its current location.
 - d. There will be a slight reduction in existing density.

Landmarking Discussion:

At a previous meeting we heard Commissioner support for the following:

Column A: The property is at least 50 years old (1882 per cultural survey).

Column B: 1. The proposed landmark exemplifies specific elements of architectural style or period.

5. The proposed landmark is of a style particularly associated with the Breckenridge area.

7. The property includes a pattern or grouping of elements representing at least one of the above criteria.

Column C: All four criteria.

At final review, staff suggests that the Planning Commission recommend that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark the historic structure based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.

Point Analysis (Section 9-11-7-3): Mr. Mosher clarified that at the last hearing there was actually a 50% / 50% split as to whether award positive three (+3) points or positive six (+6) points for the restoration efforts. At this final review we are asking the Commission for a decision. The project will pass with either assignment. S

Staff has two motions recommended for the approval of this application:

1. Planning Commission recommends that the Town Council adopt an ordinance to Landmark the historic structure for the Nauman Residence Historic Renovation and Landmarking, PL-2015-0152, based on proposed restoration efforts and the fulfillment of criteria for architectural significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance.
2. Planning Commission approves the attached Point analysis for the Nauman Residence Historic Renovation and Landmarking, PL-2015-0152, showing a passing score of positive six (+6) points.

Commissioner Questions / Comments:

Mr. Schuman: I appreciate all of the staff's efforts on this, I still think +3 is appropriate.

Mr. Schroder: I think that +3 is appropriate.

Ms. Christopher: I agree with +3.

Mr. Lamb: I can see the positive 6 because of the basement, but I can live with 3.

Mr. Pringle: I'm leaning towards 3.

Ms. Dudney: I don't feel strongly about it and I was leaning towards 6 but I want to provide incentive, but I guess 3 is better

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

Mr. Pringle made a motion to recommend the Town Council adopt an ordinance to locally landmark the Nauman Residence Historic Renovation, PL-2015-0152, 211 East Washington Avenue, based on the fulfillment of criteria for Architectural and Physical Integrity significance as stated in Section 9-11-4 of the Landmarking Ordinance. Mr. Schuman seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the point analysis for the Nauman Residence Historic Renovation and Landmarking, PL-2015-0152, 211 East Washington Avenue, showing a score of positive three (+3) points. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Pringle made a motion to approve the Nauman Residence Historic Renovation, PL-2015-0152, 211 East Washington Avenue, with the presented Findings and Conditions. Ms. Christopher seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously (7-0).

OTHER MATTERS:

The planning conference (State of Colorado APA) is at the end of September in Steamboat and all of you are invited if you would like to attend.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 pm.

Eric Mamula, Chair