

**TOWN OF WINTER PARK  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, June 12, 2018**

**Minutes**

- I. The meeting was called to order at 8:00 am.
- II. Roll Call indicated present: Roger Kish, Jonathan Larson, Dave Barker and Doug Robbins.
- III. Town Hall Meeting – no comments were received.
- IV. Commissioner Robbins moved, and Commissioner Baker seconded a motion to approve the minutes from May 8, 2018 . Motion carried: 4-0.
- V. Conflicts of Interest – no conflicts of interest.
- VI. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Idlewild FDP Amendment

Gale Schrag, owner of WP Idlewild, LLC presented the project to the Commission.

*Gale Schrag WP Idlewild LLC:*

Thanked the commission for their time on the re-submittal from May 8. Stated that the housing market is robust in Denver, but Winter Park has just come out of the 2008 recession and is mainly a second home market, so if Denver slows, Winter Park will also slow. In order to make this work, he stated the need to capitalize on the current market. He then presented the letters of interest from hotels wanting to build on the Idlewild Property. He stated the hotels will not commit until given approval from the Planning Commission and Town Council on the amended FDP. If approved, this project will bring approximately 225 million to the Winter Park economy over the next 3-6 years.

He stated that the Commission's request for lower heights in the condo buildings eliminated one floor and resulted in a loss of 63 units. The hotel was also lowered by one floor because of the requested maximum height of 75'. In order to achieve 150 rooms the hotel parcel was increased because it now required a larger footprint. Mr. Schrag then invited Dave Williams with DTJ design to come up and describe what they have changed from the May 8 meeting.

*Dave Williams, principle with DTJ Design:*

Mr. Williams stated he would be providing updates based on comments from the Planning Commission meeting on May 8. He started the presentation with the new photos of the existing conditions between Rendezvous property and Idlewild at the property line. He wanted to show updated photos since the previous photos had snow on the ground at the time.

He reminded the Commission that under the original plan, the hotel could have been built at the top of the hill but that with this plan, they are trying to define more specific areas for more predictability. He outlined how the building footprint for the hotel has grown, but still includes underground parking. This new plan also now includes 10,000 sf of conference space as a placeholder until the hotel operators or a study can be more specific on the needs.

He went on to describe how the condos to the left of the hotel are now a slightly bigger footprint and have lost one floor as a result of the height decrease by proposed by the Commission.

He then presented the planning areas and showed how they have changed slightly in their boundaries to accommodate the requests from the Commission. Planning Area 1 is now only single family/townhome units with a maximum height of 43'. The condos in Planning Area 2 were dropped to 55 feet, Planning Area 3 is only hotel and commercial and height is 75 feet and Planning Area 4 is all condos at 65' to maintain the 319 units that are entitled.

Mr. William went on to explain how he interpreted the Commission's requirement to have the townhomes in Planning Area 1 follow the topography of the site. He stated there is quite a bit of disruption to the natural topography for basements, streets, etc. They believed that the intent is to tuck into the hillside as much as possible which is what they will be doing but they are unable to literally follow the natural topography as suggested in the Commission's conditions.

He then presented the view plane studies requested by the Commission. The view from the Rendezvous Fraser site used site plans from the Rendezvous Development that labeled exactly where the first floor was constructed on the site. This created a much more precise study. He showed the elevations at main living level, a 3' elevation above that (someone sitting in a chair) and then 5' (someone standing). He stated the height of the buildings, even at 42 feet has little impact on the existing residences in Fraser.

He then went on to address staff's mechanical equipment screening question and stated they could maybe do a mechanical penthouse on top to hold all the systems and screen from above but that screening couldn't be done without adding more height to the structure.

He went on to state the hotel steps down the hill and is only 40' on the high side, 75' on the lower side. He showed the Commission several renderings of the views at different locations.

He explained to the Commission that they added 10,000 square feet of convention space as a placeholder, but that is only conceptual and they will need a demand study to determine the final square footage.

Regarding the building coverage and gross density comment, he stated that they interpreted the building coverage ratio as being calculated as a whole on the entire site. If seen as calculated planning area by planning area, Planning Area 1 complies, other planning areas don't comply so it is important to treat as a whole for the property.

The Chairman then opened the Public Hearing for comments –

*Bruce Barwick:*

Lives at 162 Lookout Point in Rendezvous. Stated that a month ago everyone met to discuss the project, and thanked the Commission for giving everyone a full month to digest. Stated that there are two separate issues here, hotel use and condominium height. Stated that he did the drone pictures that were included in the Commission's packet. Stated that he understood the height of the hotel, since there is an economic benefit to the community. Did not understand why however the Town would want to increase the condo heights?

Doing a pro/con list, stated he found two positives: Open space (really means space between buildings) and underground parking instead of street parking. Found many

negatives- radical change to the character of the community, no financial benefit to Winter Park and no new income for the height increase, high degree of uncertainty on underground parking because of the water table. Stated there is a real impact to Rendezvous and Hideaway Park. Stated that he commissioned a drone and it was taken up to 80' and he could see it from downtown Winter Park.

He questioned why the Commission would allow the additional height for the condominiums when there is no financial benefit. Stated condo heights only allow a financial gain to the developer with no gain for the town. Clarified that he is talking about residential height increase, including townhomes, not just condos.

*Don Berland:*

Resident of Winter Park Highlands since early 80's, and 76 Conifer Lane now. Stated that he had just a few brief comments, first related to the hotel. Stated that he remembered a few years ago when his son had a wedding at Devils Thumb and relatives came in from out of town and he couldn't find a place for them to stay. Stated that it would have been very nice to have a hotel to accommodate them. Acknowledged that this comment was anecdotal, and may not show a need for a full service hotel, but it does show there could be a need for it and looking at skier visits and biker visits, they all still need places to stay.

Stated that much of this discussion is around height and that many people would not want anyone to build near them, however this property is zoned and entitled for these uses, and they are just seeking to modify height on condos and hotel. They aren't seeking the change in height just for more money, but to make it feasible according to the hotel companies. Stated that this gives a chance for getting a good hotel, without this there is no chance. With respect to the condos, he did not feel the 8' increase was a significant change.

*Chris Beisler:*

Stated his address at 138 Lookout in Rendezvous. Stated that the Planning Commission has a limited amount of info to make some serious decisions. No soil analysis or water analysis. Absolutely will change the character of Winter Park. Stated that the need for hotel and conference space was talked about last time. There is no guarantee for conference space. The impact is great to the town and to Hideaway Park. Stated that they are asking for variances without knowing the environmental ramifications. Asked the commission to please consider this when making a decision.

*Mike Kraehnke:*

Stated his address at 130 Lookout Point. Stated that he would like to reiterate Bruce and Chris's points. Asked why the Commission would provide a blanket approval when there is a 2007 approval and when there is no testing done yet. Stated that there is an active spring on the site right now.

Stated that this plan is conceptual only right now. The engineering and final design have not been set. Also, stated that due process is lacking since they had such limited time to review the new plans. Stated that traffic impact near Hideaway Park is an extreme change. Stated that much more testing will need to be done, otherwise, asked the Planning Commission to stick with the overall plan structure approved in January. No exceptions.

*Gordon Stuart:*

Stated his address at 114 Lookout Point, and 87 Byers view in Rendezvous.

Stated that much has been talked about the hotel, but that high end hotels and convention centers are not successful where they are not visible. Stated that the form letters provided by the hotels are just that, form letters.

Stated that he is most concerned about the lack of storm water retention and proximity of the project to the Fraser River. Asked the Planning Commission how they would prevent the river ecology from being impacted. Stated that he was not against development, he expects development, However he asked the Commission to urge the developer to go back to the proverbial drawing board on this project.

*Kathy Wheeler:*

Stated that she lives north of this proposed subdivision and has been there for 17 years, and prior to that lived 10 years in another location in Town.

Stated that she does not come to planning meetings as much as she should, but that she always comes to town council meetings. Stated that so far, only one person has spoken from the community supporting the project. Stated that she thinks more planning and study needs to be done. Stated that in the town manager brochure they say they want to preserve a small town feel, but this development is not a small town feel.

Stated that just because a variance is granted to one developer in one area, does not mean the next one who requests it can get it too. Each should be evaluated on their own merits.

Stated that there is an easement along their property and under that road is a spring that runs all year. Said that she does not know what they are going to do with that water or if they've done any studies on it.

Asked the Commission to please abide by the rules they set of 35'. Stated that the other issue not addressed is visitor parking. Stated that the Sawmill has a shortage of parking, asked the Commission to come see on a busy day. Stated that she wants assurance that if this project goes through she can go home since her driveway goes right through it.

*Gary Beblen:*

Stated his address at 105 Pinecone Lane.

Stated that he was excited for the project, and he knows the developers and architects have a lot of work ahead of them. However, he believes this amendment allows the Town to have more say in the development than they would have otherwise.

Stated that in Planning Area 1 he is glad to see the condo is gone. In the north corner however, he believes that the roadways should be minimized, not 4 streets in that area. Stated that the trail is important and meets the master plan. Stated that he would love to see them develop that trail to have less street crossings through it.

Stated that he would also suggest changing the access to HWY 40 to connect Rosie's way instead of going through Hideaway Park and maybe adding a traffic signal on 40. Asked that if the Commission does approve additional height, please also ask for additional items from the developer.

*Laurie Chahbandour:*

Stated her address at 204 Friendship Drive.

Stated that she has been working on trails for years and is a licensed landscape architect. Said that she appreciates that the winter trail is being considered for a year-round trail. As an advocate for community wide trails, she challenges the current proposed location of the

trails. Stated that the connection into Rendezvous is tough and people come to this valley for the skiing in addition to being able to get on trails.

Stated that Meara McQuain, the Executive Director for the Headwaters Trails Alliance, is required to approve trails, and that that hasn't happened. Also stated that she would be willing to volunteer her time to make this trail more than an afterthought.

No additional public comments were presented. The Public Hearing was closed.

Director Shockey presented his report to the Commission. The Planning Commission then discussed the application.

Commissioner Larson

He asked when in the process are soil samples and feasibility studies required. Staff stated those are typically required at the time of platting. Mr. Larson stated then there is no need to discuss here? Staff stated that is correct, however, if the Commission is looking to approve the FDP they will need to make sure there are protections for the underground parking if it's found later that the parking is not feasible after soil testing etc.

Mr. Larson stated we will have more requests for height increases in the future regardless of approving or disapproving this one. He stated that given that we are in the process of amending the town plan, maybe we consider changing requirements for heights? He felt the drone study was helpful and renderings were helpful, he would like to ask to have a third party verify where those heights are. Would like to know that a third party could verify what the view affecting Rendezvous and Highway 40 really are.

Commissioner Kish

He stated protection for underground parking with minor amounts of surface parking for guests is important. He asked the applicant why the setback was reduced from 20' to 10' in Planning Area 4. The applicant stated they were trying to maximize land to accommodate the lower heights. Flexibility was needed to get the entitled number of units.

He stated there has been conversation relative to the hotel letters of intent, and the convention space, but leaving it at the demand study level leaves it open to zero being the right number for convention space. He requested the developer talk more about what they feel they are getting for commitment from hotels and likelihood of conference center. The applicant stated the concern here is that a future hotel needs to have it be economically feasible and actually be used. The applicant stated they would be ok with having a minimum of conference space committed to, around 1,000-2,000, but not the full 10,000sqft. Commissioner Kish then asked the applicant how they felt about the hotel chains really wanting to locate to Winter Park. The applicant stated they had received the franchise letter from IHG and they are serious. They requested that there was additional commercial in the plaza. Commissioner Kish then asked what types of retail and food service are being considered? The applicant stated coffee, ski, bike, restaurant retail is all being considered.

Commissioner Kish then inquired about the Wheeler residence connections? The applicant stated access to the Wheeler property is shown in the plans and they will add information to the FDP that requires providing access to the Wheeler property, or require that there be two points of access to the adjacent property and they can work with the property owner to determine these. The access points need to be flexible, so don't want to lock them into a specific alignment. Staff stated the Commission could require language be added to the agreement. The Commission directed staff to add language concerning access to the FDP.

Commissioner Barker

He stated the Commission asked for all parking underground, but there are still surface parking lots shown. Need to be very restrictive on what parking is allowed above. He was expecting all parking on the project to be underground. If guest parking as allowed above, need to be appropriate amount of parking but underground should be the main amount of it.

Commission agreed that they wanted all parking underground.

Commissioner Barker asked for a definition for a convention center space. Asked if 150 hotel rooms is even enough to guarantee convention space? Is IHG interested in building a convention hotel with that number of rooms? Since the applicant did not provide a definition of a full service hotel/conference center it is difficult to know what that is and what we should be asking for.

Gale Schrag (WP Idlewild LLC ) stated Indigo hotel is IHG's boutique hotel brand and includes convention hotels where possible. They are part of the third largest hotel chain so marketing is worldwide and signage/visibility is not as big of a deal for them. They have seen conceptual plans and are comfortable with the location off Main Street. IHG also has implemented a 102 room hotel with conference space in another location, so it's possible.

Commissioner Barker stated it is hard to know if he is looking at accurate information for the height studies. Would like to see a third party study showing them since there are discrepancies between the developers and the drone's measurements.

Commissioner Barker then asked the developer to talk about their plans for stepping up the hill for the townhomes. Dave Williams (principle with DTJ Design) said since they don't know what the final design is, it is difficult to say which measurement will be used.

Commissioner Kish asked if we are talking about limiting surface parking, what would you suggest? Dave Williams (principle with DTJ Design) responded saying driveways could be counted as surface parking? It is unknown right now what the specific street design and road design, grading etc. will be so it is difficult to know what they are able to provide. Also, it's not required by the town to have guest parking at all, but they would like that option without having to create a 4 car parking garages.

Commissioner Larson asked how parking for people not just guests at the townhomes will work? Such as people using food and beverage services at the hotel?

Dave Williams (principle with DTJ Design) stated the parking garage would accommodate the commercial, but can't accommodate non-code required parking for residential.

Commissioner Kish stated Planning Area 4 is set at 65' high, this presents the narrow end of the building to the property to the south at 65'. Also because it's set back from Planning Area 5 that adds foreground, so he could support the additional height. However, what does that say to the developer to the south? How might we say this height is specific to the site and not replicable everywhere that doesn't have that foreground and narrow profile? He cautioned against setting a precedent, since this particular site works well with the open space and narrow end near other areas.

Commissioner Larson motioned to continue the public hearing until July 24, 2018 at 8:00am with the following recommendations being addressed ahead of that meeting –

- A third party shall verify the sight lines shown by the applicant to determine their accuracy. The review shall be from the same locations as requested previously. The third party shall be chosen by the applicant but agreed to by town staff.

- The applicant shall present a town approved traffic study to the Commission to ensure there is adequate capacity on Ski Idlewild Road for the additional density proposed.
- The FDP shall be amended to add a 'proposed minimum square footage' for conference facilities in addition to a definition of 'full service conference hotel'.
- The FDP shall be amended to provide guest parking information as it relates to each planning area
- The FDP shall include language identifying shared access to the Wheeler property and VZF property as shown on the FDP maps.
- The applicant shall investigation of the feasibility of Rosie's Way as an additional access point.

Commissioner Barker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 3-1 with Commissioner Kish opposed.

B. Final Plat – Block E

Block E Condominiums will be located at 433 Iron Horse Way between Base Camp on Jane Creek and the Iron Horse Resort "D" Building. Block E Condominiums will be a 26 unit project consisting of 16 units in Building 1, 1 unit in Building 2, along with 9 boutique hotel suites/rooms also in building 2 situated on a 1.35 acre site. The project design and footprint are essentially the same as the plans and preliminary plat previously approved by the Town and will consist of four floors of dwelling /hotel units of a single level parking structure. The building will total five levels with a maximum height of 65' (height variance previously approved). The Property will also include various resident amenities including common area, spa, fire pit, BBQ, and will offer direct ski in/out access with a connection to the Corridor Ski Trail.

The Planning Commission reviewed and approved, with conditions, the Preliminary Plat at their regular meeting on June 6, 2016. All of the conditions placed on the approval were recommended to be resolved at the time of Final Plat and the only condition that was not met from the previous meeting was the request for a snow removal plan that could be implemented for the site. Staff recommended approval with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The applicant, Mark Unicum noted that they can indeed provide a snow removal plan, however, it would be for a very small portion of the site since most all surfaces has a snow melt system.

Motion of approval by Commissioner Kish to add plat notes for snow storage and melting system maintenance along with the other staff conditions listed in the staff report. Seconded by Commissioner Robbins. Motion carried 4-0

C. Commercial Design Review – Xcel Energy Building – table setting

Director Shockey presented this report. Xcel Energy would still like to build a shed to shelter their equipment in Hideaway Station. They have amended their previous submittal to add 1' overhangs to dress up the structure a bit. If they get too far off the traditional materials, it affects maintenance.

Motion of approval by Commissioner Kish to accept the design review dated 5-17-18 from Xcel Energy, Seconded by Commissioner Robbins. Motion carried 4-0.

Upon a previously adopted motion, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.