



**TOWN OF WINTER PARK  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Tuesday, July 24, 2018 8:00 AM**

**Minutes**

- I. The meeting was called to order at 8:00am
- II. Roll Call indicated present: Brad Holzwarth, Mike Davlin, Jonathan Larson, George Stevens, Roger Kish, and Dave Barker.
- III. Town Hall Meeting - No comments received.
- IV. Approval of meeting minutes – No minutes available.
- V. Conflicts of Interest – No comments received.
- IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Lakota Park Subdivision Exemption No. 5

Planner Owen presented the Staff Report.

PM Winter Park LLC, owner of the Central Village (Tract G) in the Lakota Park Subdivision (see attached map of Lakota General Land Use Plan) is requesting to remove certain interior lot lines currently shown on the Lakota Park Subdivision Final Plat.

Specifically, the applicant is requesting the vacation of certain interior lot lines in the Northwoods (triplex units) and Trailside (duplex units) development areas, and in the Reserve development area in order to create 21 total super lots which will allow for either multifamily residential use or single family residential use (see attached map of the Final Plat for Lakota Park for more detail on each development area).

The creation of these super lots provides PM Winter Park with greater flexibility to develop the land in the future. These lots have not been developed, and this action does not create additional lots but instead combines existing lots to create fewer, but larger lots overall.

The applicant still has the vested right to re-subdivide any of these lots in the future as needed to create up to the maximum number of lots they originally were permitted by the Lakota Ordinance and had originally platted (110 lots total).

Please see attached Lakota Park Subdivision Exemption No. 5 replat maps and page 3 of Exhibit A for a detailed view and comprehensive list of the lots affected.

**Subdivision Exemption Regulations**

Section 8-1-4 of the Subdivision Regulations allows the Planning Commission to exempt property from the subdivision process if one of eight conditions is met. Staff has determined that this Subdivision Exemption meets the requirements of Condition 2 –

2. Is for the purpose of revising lot lines from those shown on a recorded plat and which creates

no more than the recorded number of parcels, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Any lot or parcel created shall conform to the minimum requirements for area or dimension as established by the zoning ordinance or any other related ordinance.
- b. If the lots of the original recorded plan were nonconforming, lots or parcels created shall not increase the existing nonconformity.
- c. Applicable law relating to amendment of recorded plats is complied with.

Section 8-1-4, Subsection B. gives guidance on determining which applications should be approved:

“Exemptions Application Procedure:

3. The Planning and Zoning Commission shall approve only those applications which it finds to be in conformance with the conditions of this Section and with any applicable policies and regulations of this Code.”

Section 8-1-4, Subsection E, gives guidance on denial of applications:

“Denial of Exemption Applications: If the Planning and Zoning Commission denies an exemption application upon finding that the correction or amendment of an existing recorded subdivision plat would result in a plat which does not meet the standards and regulations of this Title, the Commission may require that the proposed exemption be submitted for full subdivision platting procedures.”

The Subdivision Exemption process involves one meeting with the Planning Commission for approval. This does not receive review or approval from the Town Council.

Recommendation:

Staff finds that the applicant has submitted all required materials within the timeframe required and all materials comply with the conditions of Section 8-1-4 of the Town Code and conform with all applicable policies and regulations of this Code.

Staff recommends approval of the Lakota Park Subdivision Exemption No. 5 with the following conditions to be met and/or provided prior to any recording:

1. That the applicant shall revise the submitted plans and documents in conformance with the official red-marked print dated July 18, 2018.
2. That the applicant shall revise plat note number 14 to reflect the language approved by Winter Park Water and Sanitation District.
3. A digital file of the approved plat must be submitted. The digital file shall be in a format acceptable to the Town's System. Requirements for digital submittal can be obtained from the Town's Planning Department.
4. That an executed Exemption Plat Mylar and other supporting documents, as well as recording fees, be provided prior to recording.

Michael Repucci, with Johnson & Repucci LLP notified the Commission that Plat Note 14 has been resolved with the Winter Park Water and Sanitation District, and email confirmation was sent that morning.

Commissioner Davlin made a motion to approve with staff recommendations and Commissioner Kish seconded. Motion carried 6-0.

B. Single-Family Design Review – 50 Idlewild Lane

Planner Owen presented the staff report.

The applicant for this design is Kyle Roderick, owner. This is a single-family home that has a building footprint square footage of 2,178 including a 3 stall interior garage. There is no HOA.

No lighting plan was presented, however exterior lighting fixtures submitted by the applicant will comply with Town guidelines and are dark sky compliant.

Building height complies with Town standards. The building height is 34' 11 1/2" to the highest point of the flat roof which fits into the Town requirement that "buildings with a flat or mansard roof shall not exceed 35' in height".

Adequate parking has been provided in compliance with Town standards. The design includes an interior 3 car parking garage plus three exterior parking areas.

A landscape site plan was submitted and meets standards.

- No site clearing shall be permitted until staff has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.
- Any disturbed areas on the site shall be revegetated with an appropriate seed mix per the Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement.

Staff is satisfied with the overall design and the structure is located within required setbacks. Impervious surface coverage is 37% covered surface to open space which matches Town code that states impervious surface should not exceed 40% of the lot area.

A site inspection of the property has not been performed by staff.

- No site clearing shall be permitted until staff has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.

The driveway is in compliance with Town Standards which requires a grade of 5% or less for the first 24'.

- A stabilized construction entrance shall be installed prior to ground disturbance.

The erosion and drainage plan complies with Town standards.

- Approved drainage and erosion control shall be in place prior to and throughout site preparation and construction and through successful revegetation.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the single-family design for 50 Idlewild Lane with the following conditions:

- No site clearing shall be permitted until staff has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.
- Any disturbed areas on the site shall be revegetated with an appropriate seed mix per the Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement.
- A stabilized construction entrance shall be installed prior to ground disturbance.
- Approved drainage and erosion control shall be in place prior to and throughout site preparation and construction and through successful revegetation.

Required Permits:

- Building Permit
- Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement
- Driveway Permit

Discussion was held by Commission.

Commissioner Davlin moved and Commissioner Larson seconded approval of the design review with Staff recommendations. Motion Carried 6-0

C. Single-Family Design Review – 646 Leland Creek Trail

Planner Owen presented the staff report.

David Kottcamp, the owner, is the applicant for this design review. This is a single-family home that has a building footprint square footage of 3,310 including a two stall interior garage.

The Leland Creek Design Review Committee has received the submittal application but has not finished their review of the application.

- The Town Design Review approval shall be contingent upon verification that these plans have completed and passed the HOA Design Review.

No lighting plan was presented, however exterior lighting fixture locations are indicated on elevations and electrical plan.

- A cut sheet showing exterior lighting fixtures which comply with Town guidelines and are dark sky compliant shall be provided prior to issuance of a building permit (please refer to the Residential Architectural Guidelines and Design Regulations, Guideline 6).

Building height complies with Town standards. The building height is 34' 10" to midpoint and 40' 1 1/2" overall which is permitted based on the building height definition.

- Elevations shall be submitted clearly showing existing grade to confirm the building height is being measured from the correct location per the code which requires that height be “measured from the elevation of the lowest point of an exposed foundation at finished grade or preconstruction elevation whichever is greater”.

Adequate parking has been provided in compliance with Town standards. The design includes an interior 2 car parking garage.

A landscape site plan was submitted and meets standards.

- No site clearing shall be permitted until staff has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.
- Any disturbed areas on the site shall be revegetated with an appropriate seed mix per the Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement.

Staff is satisfied with the overall design and the structure is located within required setbacks. Impervious surface coverage is 19% covered surface to open space which matches Town code that states impervious surface should not exceed 40% of the lot area.

A site inspection of the property has not been performed by staff.

- No site clearing shall be permitted until staff has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.

The driveway slope calculation, dimensions, and culvert locations (if needed) are not currently shown on the plans but shall be revised to include this information.

- Driveway grade and dimensions shall be shown in compliance with Town standards (a grade of 5% or less for the first 24') prior to Design Review Approval.
- A stabilized construction entrance shall be installed prior to ground disturbance.

The erosion and drainage plan does NOT comply with Town standards. No plan included in the submission addresses erosion control methods and locations, defines the limit of disturbance area, soil/material storage area or labels where erosion control devices will be installed.

- Disturbance protection notes shall be added per the Design Review Checklist.
- The site plan shall be revised to note erosion control methods, define the limit of disturbance area, label erosion control devices on the plan, and define the required soil/material storage area.
- Approved drainage and erosion control shall be in place prior to and throughout site preparation and construction and through successful revegetation.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the single-family design for 646 Leland Creek Circle with the following conditions:

- The Town Design Review approval shall be contingent upon verification that these plans have completed and passed the HOA Design Review.
- A cut sheet showing exterior lighting fixtures which comply with Town guidelines and are dark sky compliant shall be provided prior to issuance of a building permit.
- Elevations shall be submitted clearly showing existing grade to confirm the building height is being measured from the correct location per the code.
- Driveway grade and dimensions shall be shown in compliance with Town standards (a grade of 5% or less for the first 24') prior to Design Review Approval.
- Disturbance protection notes shall be added per the Design Review Checklist.
- The site plan shall be revised to note erosion control methods, define the limit of disturbance area, label erosion control devices on the plan, and define the required soil/material storage area.
- No site clearing shall be permitted until staff has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.
- Any disturbed areas on the site shall be revegetated with an appropriate seed mix per the Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement.
- A stabilized construction entrance shall be installed prior to ground disturbance.
- Approved drainage and erosion control shall be in place prior to and throughout site preparation and construction and through successful revegetation.

Required Permits:

- Building Permit
- Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement
- Driveway Permit

Commission held discussion.

Commissioner Davlin made a motion and Commissioner Barker seconded approval of the Design Review with Staff recommendations. Motion Carried 6-0

#### D. Idlewild Final Development Plan Amendment

Gale Schrag, WP Idlewild LLC presented the updates to their FDP amendment application per the Commission's request.

- This updated application intends to be the final application to Planning Commission.
- Addresses all of the questions by both the public and the Commission, but the answers may not be what the Commission or the public wanted to hear.
- Have not addressed all of the changes requested, since the developer believes many are not required or related to the proposed amendment to the FDP

The Public Hearing was opened to the public for comment:

The following language represents the topics each member of the public provided to the Commission.

Bruce Barwick

- Traffic safety, difficulties of underground parking, lack of respect for the Wheelers.
- This FDP amendment does not guarantee a hotel in exchange for the height increase, not a win-win situation.
- Don't deny, just require a commitment with a full service hotel operator before giving the height.
- Precedent being set for future developments asking for height increases, so need to do this right.

Mark Johnson, long term resident and business owner in Winter Park

- Pleased with the proposal for a full service hotel, a needed amenity in Winter Park.
- Colorado Hotel and Lodging rates are extremely low in Winter Park, lower than Grand Junction, could benefit from the boost a full service hotel brings.
- A full service hotel will change the marketing and improve the commercial environment for Winter Park for the better.

Chris Beisler

- Developer has not amended their 2007 traffic study as requested, the Commission needs this information to make an informed decision since much has changed since then.
- Showed several pictures of traffic on Ski Idlewild Road during events, explaining that adding additional traffic to this road would be disastrous.
- Safety for the Park is an important consideration, and the increased traffic directly next to it is a huge safety concern.

David Schrode

- The main objection is about aesthetics from Rendezvous owners since the development will not be hidden in the trees with the beetle kill.
- Development of Idlewild is the last piece of the puzzle to make Winter Park a true destination.

Tim O'Conner

- Maintain the natural beauty of Winter Park through enforcing the existing code, including height and density.

- Winter Park already has traffic problems, and this will only add to it.

Paula Stuart

- This application is incomplete, and little due diligence has been done.
- Concerns about wetlands and river impacts.
- Has had personal conversations with Marriott and Hilton representatives and they say that a 150 person hotel is not a conference hotel.

Kathy Wheeler

- Not opposed to development, but want it to be within the Town Code.
- The impacts of allowing variances to the Code have not been considered for the Town.
- The street is unsafe during events and busy times, people are walking in the street.
- Where are the people working at the hotel going to live.

Commissioner Kish asked Ms. Wheeler if she feels comfortable with the access to her property based on this proposal. She replied that the developers have not been in touch with her in any way, so she is unsure how this will affect her.

The Public Hearing was closed to the public.

Planning Director Shockey presented the staff report.

Idlewild, LLC through WP Idlewild, LLC has applied to the Town of Winter Park to amend the Final Development Plan (FDP) for the 22.005-acre property located generally on Ski Idlewild Road east of the Fraser River. The property has been used as a ski area and resort in the past, and has been generally unused for the past three decades. The property is currently zoned Planned Development (P-D) allowing for up to 319 residential uses, 70 accommodation units (hotel) and an undetermined amount of commercial square footage.

The applicant is proposing to amend the 2007 FDP to allow for additional accommodation units, a greater building height than currently permitted, a reduction in building coverage and reduced setbacks from the original FDP.

Planning Commission Meeting – June 12, 2018

The Planning Commission reviewed the application for a second time on June 12, 2018 and continued the meeting to July 24, 2018 to allow the applicant additional time to revise the application. The Commission recommended the applicant consider the following:

- 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.

In addition to the items identified above, staff requested the applicant address the following items:

- Please add language to the FDP concerning how the townhomes in PA-1 will be constructed along the hillside. While we realize you can't follow the natural topography of the site in the literal sense, you can add language that the natural topography of the site will be considered in the development of the homes and roads.
- Add language in the FDP concerning internal parking (underground or in building) with exception to visitor parking. This should be added to Article Three – Infrastructure.
- Add the maximum gross density to each planning area.
- Language will need to be added about the trail easement. Here is my suggestion – The All-Season Trail shall be improved with an asphalt trail a minimum of eight (8) feet in width, to be located within the All-Season Trail Easement Area. The All-Season Trail Easement Area shall mean a sixteen (16) foot-wide public trail easement area, along with additional widths for areas of cuts and fills necessary for the safe establishment of the All-Season Trail. The Town shall be responsible, at its sole cost, for the design, construction, and maintenance of the All-Season Trail. Following dedication of the All-Season Trail, the Town shall be responsible, at its sole cost, for maintenance, repair, and replacement of any and all improvements situated within the All-Season Trail Easement Area. WP Idlewild LLC, may, in connection with development of the Project and in its sole discretion, relocate any portion of the All-Season Trail Easement Area. In the event WP Idlewild, LLC relocates any portion of the All-Season Trail Easement Area, relocation of the affected portion of the All-Season Trail shall be at WP Idlewild, LLC's sole cost and WP Idlewild, LLC shall be responsible for amending the recorded instruments governing the All-Season Trail Easement Area to reflect such relocation.

WP Idlewild, LLC and the Town shall flag the rough locations of the Dedicated Trail prior to October 15, 2018. Upon completion of field verification and within 90 days, WP Idlewild, LLC shall convey to the Town, one or more relocatable easements for the location, construction, improvement, maintenance, repair, and replacement of the Dedicated Trail. More specific alignments of the Dedicated Trail within each portion of the Property will be determined at the time of first final subdivision platting of any portion of the Project, and those alignments shall be depicted on the applicable final subdivision plat(s), subject, however, to an appropriate plat note indicating the relocatable nature of the easement containing the Dedicated Trail. Actual field-constructed alignments of the Dedicated Trail will be evaluated at the time of construction against site constraints such as wetlands, steep slopes, and rock outcroppings, and following construction, the Dedicated Trail may thereafter be relocated from time to time to facilitate forest management, construction, and maintenance activities so long as reasonably equivalent substitute trails are provided. In the event that any change in the as constructed location of the Dedicated Trail occurs such that the Town's then-current easement grant does not include the as-constructed location of the Dedicated Trail, or any portion thereof, then WP Idlewild, LLC shall amend the Dedicated Trail Easement as necessary to grant the Town comparable easement rights for the as-constructed location of the Dedicated Trail.

#### Staff Review / Comments

The following review comments are based on the Commission's recommendations from the June 12, 2018 meeting and the additional comments sent by staff on June 22.

- 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 the town staff.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant did not meet this requirement. They stated the “views prepared by both the applicant and one of the neighbors appear to reflect relatively similar sight line impacts. Given that the results appear relatively the same, and that the Commission did not provide specific direction, there did not appear to be any significant benefit to pursuing an undefined activity. Therefore, a third-party verification has not been completed”.
  
- 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.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant did not meet this requirement. The traffic study that has been submitted multiple times to staff uses traffic numbers from 2007 and adds the additional 80 accommodation units to those outdated numbers. In addition, the applicant’s traffic engineer has changed methodologies for counting the traffic without providing how they came to such conclusion. An email exchange has been included in your packet to assist in understanding the issues that still have not been resolved as it relates to the traffic study.
  
- The FDP shall be amended to add a “proposed minimum square footage” for conference facilities in addition to a definition of a “full service conference hotel”.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant did not meet this requirement. They state “As has been identified previously both in writing and in public hearing, the amount of floor area for conference facilities provided cannot be determined until such time as a demand study is completed by either the hotel developer and/or operator or the Town of Winter Park. Prospective Hotel Operators will not proceed with such a study until the number of hotel units approved for this site is increased from 70 to 150. It would be irresponsible for both the applicant and the Town to arbitrarily establish a “minimum square footage” that may or may not be responsive to the demand. If the Town requires that a minimum square footage be a condition of approval, the applicant will require that the Town provide a financial guarantee of revenue to the hotel owner/operator for any square footage found to be in excess of what a future demand study indicates, to compensate for the construction and operation of space that is not needed but that the Town required be built. The Town code does not distinguish the level of service of hotels in the way it treats the land use requirements associated with this use”.
  
- The FDP shall be amended to provide guest parking information as it relates to each planning area.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant has added minimum parking standards to the FDP that replicate the Town Standards. They also added the following language concerning guest parking – “The minimum required parking will be included in or below the buildings the parking spaces serve. There is no specific additional guest parking requirement for these uses. Guest parking over and above the minimum requirements may be constructed as surface parking in locations and configurations as approved by the Town as an administrative approval”.
  
- The FDP shall include language identifying shared access to the Wheeler Property and the VZF property as shown on the FDP maps.

- o Staff Comment – The applicant did not meet this requirement. No additional language was added to the FDP concerning access to the Wheeler Property or VZF property. The applicant did add arrows with language stating “potential connection” to adjacent VZF properties. The Commission had requested language ensuring access to adjacent properties.
- The applicant shall investigate the feasibility of Rosie’s Way as an additional access point.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant did not meet this requirement. The applicant states “The traffic analysis and recent Letter of Conformance indicates that the site is adequately served by the proposed improvements to Ski Idlewild Road, along with the connections available through Rendezvous and via River Road. A connection to Rosie’s Way is not required by the traffic generated by this proposal. The feasibility of such a connection is questionable anyway, since it will have an impact on existing wetlands, require another crossing of the Fraser River, and potentially require that the Town condemn property to establish a right of way”.
- Please add language to the FDP concerning how the townhomes in PA-1 will be constructed along the hillside. While we realize you can’t follow the natural topography in the literal sense, you can add language that the natural topography of the site will be considered in the development of the homes and roads.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant added the following language to the FDP – “The natural topography of the site will be considered in the development of the homes and roads”.
- Add language in the FDP concerning internal parking (underground or in building) with exception to visitor parking. This should be added to Article Three- Infrastructure.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant has added minimum parking standards to the FDP that replicate the Town Standards. They also added the following language concerning guest parking – “The minimum required parking will be included in or below the buildings the parking spaces serve. There is no specific additional guest parking requirement for these uses. Guest parking over and above the minimum requirements may be constructed as surface parking in locations and configurations as approved by the Town as an administrative approval”.
- Add the maximum gross density to each planning area.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant has added the following note to the planning areas – “Maximum Density of all Residential uses in all Planning Areas combined cannot exceed 20 DUA. There is no Maximum Density specific to the boundaries of this Planning Area. A total of 319 residential units on the entire site cannot be exceeded”. The applicant has increased the allowed density from 17 units to 20 units.
- o
- Language will need to be added about the trail easement.
- o Staff Comment – The applicant is requesting to wait until final plat to dedicate a trail easement across the property. While staff understands the reasoning behind this request, it could be several years before the property is platted for development. Staff is recommending language be added requiring a trail easement be dedicated this year even if only in a temporary state until such time as the property is platted. This will ensure trail access this winter for the Fraser River Trail Winter Route.

#### Other Items of Discussion

### Condominium Hotels

The applicant has amended PA-3 to add condominium hotels as a use-by-right. PA-3 was originally proposed to only permit accommodation units and associated commercial uses. Condominium hotels permit the applicant the ability to sell units to individual owners that then are required to rent their units so many days a year, thus acting as a hotel.

Staff would recommend this use not be permitted in PA-3. Condominium hotels don't typically get the brand recognition a conventional hotel will have and in the past, condominium hotels tend to convert to traditional condominium units. The Planning Commission initially agreed to permit a taller building for accommodation units with the understanding that it would be a traditional full-service hotel with convention space.

### Open Space

The applicant is proposing to dedicate the area shown as PA-5 to the Town within 180 days of this amendment being approved. This area of the property has wetlands on it that are adjacent to the Fraser River. Acquisition of these high quality wetlands would be a benefit to the community.

### Affordable Housing

The applicant has proposed to amend the affordable housing section of the agreement to address concerns with workforce housing associated with the hotel. The current agreement requires a \$2.00 a square foot payment on all new construction. The revised proposal will require a .25% Real Estate Transfer Assessment be collected on the sale of any residential property in the development. The money collected will be restricted to affordable housing uses within the Town. In addition, the applicant will pay \$2.00 a square foot on commercial square footage and provide a minimum of 30% employee housing for any hotel constructed on the property.

### Vested Rights

The vested rights are proposed for five years with an extension if certain criteria are met within the first five year timeframe. The Council will determine the criteria.

### Public Comment

Staff has received three additional comments on the proposed amendment. The comment letters have been included in the packet.

### Town Plan

The current Town Plan was adopted in 2006 and is currently in the process of being updated. Both plans consider this area as an extension of the downtown that should be developed in a medium density.

The 2006 plan envisioned this area as a potential location for a conference facility with a recommendation that the area around the facility be developed with medium residential development. The proposed density for the site is in conformance with the Town Plan. The 2006 plan does not speak to the type of character the Town would like for this parcel. It is surrounded to the east, north and south by property zoned residential with height limits of 35'. Only to the south is property zoned commercial with a height limit of 55'.

The 2018 Town Plan Update has four draft visions that the Town should strive toward achieving. The vision most applicable to this proposed amendment would be "Our Character and Our Culture". This vision statement centers on creating an inclusive community offering economic

opportunity and viable housing, high-quality services and employment choices for a diversity of ages, incomes and household compositions. It also encourages the use of growth and development as a tool to increase community amenities and economic opportunities. Staff can only analyze this amendment against the vision statements, the draft chapters of the plan are still being created.

#### Staff Recommendation

The applicant is requesting four major amendments to the existing Final Development Plan, additional building height, reduced internal setbacks, increased building coverage and additional accommodation units. The public hearing for this amendment was continued till July 24 to allow the applicant additional time to amend the application. Out of the six recommendations, the applicant fully addressed one of the items. In addition, they have amended the FDP to include condominium hotels in a planning area that was supposed to be used exclusively for accommodation units. This has made it difficult for staff to fully review the FDP against the direction provided by the Planning Commission.

The Commission will need to make a recommendation on the FDP amendment. The Commission can recommend approval with conditions or recommend denial. The Commission should at a minimum, discuss the following items prior to making a recommendation –

- Minimum conference facility space / definition of a full service hotel
- Overall building height of condominiums and hotel. PA-2 (condos) is proposed at 55', PA-3 (hotel) is proposed at 75' and PA-4 (condos) is proposed at 65'
- Updated traffic study for Ski Idlewild Road
- Third-party review of the proposed sight lines
- Feasibility of using Rosie's Way for access
- Shared access for VZF property / access for Wheeler property
- Determination if condominium-hotel is appropriate for PA-3
- Dedication of the trail easement
- Gross density for each planning area
- Following the natural topography in PA-1
- Determination if the hotel should be secured/constructed before additional height is provided for the condominiums (public comment)

The Commission held discussion.

- The Commission questioned site access, not only for the project at completion, but for construction access, event days, and future development.
- The Commission questioned the traffic study and the validity of numbers from 2007.
- The Commission questioned how they could give variances without guarantee of the hotel, especially since the height and density variances are in perpetuity.
- The Commission discussed life safety, and fire access concerns.
- The Commission questioned other access point options including Rosie's Way.
- The Commission discussed the condominium hotel option and likelihood of a full service hotel using a condominium hotel model. Discussed a percentage requirement.
- The Commission discussed requiring a definition of "Full-Service".

Commissioner Barker moved and Commissioner Kish seconded approval of the amended FDP with the following conditions to be added to the amendment prior to final approval by the Town Council:

1. Planning Area 3 shall be zoned as a full service conference center hotel with a height not to exceed 75 feet and 90% of the required parking shall be internal. In addition, no more than 20% of the total units in the hotel shall be condominium hotel units.
2. Planning Area 4 shall have a building height not exceeding 55 feet as measured by the Town Code.
3. Traffic Study – An updated traffic study using today’s current numbers and a methodology acceptable to the town is required before final approval should be granted.
4. The Planning Commission is concerned about access on Rendezvous Way/Ski Idlewild Lane (especially during special events) and suggests that alternate access via Rosie’s Way be considered.
5. Easements – The applicant shall add language to the FDP requiring a shared access point for the VZF property to the northwest. The easement for the Wheeler property shall be described in the FDP.
6. Trail Easement – The trail easement as outlined in staff report from July 24, 2018 shall be added to the FDP. This concerns when the trail easement will be dedicated to the Town.
7. Gross Density – The 20 units per acre is acceptable as proposed.
8. Parking – Planning Areas 1, 2, 4 can have surface parking for guests, to be approved by the town as an administrative approval once all of the minimum parking requirements have been met within the structure.
9. The Commission felt that development of each planning area is not dependent on the development of another, for example, the condos and townhomes can proceed before the development of the hotel.

Motion Carried: 6-0.

#### E. Multi-Family Design Review – Arrow at Winter Park

Planner Owen presented the staff report.

Arrow at Winter Park, Inc. is currently in the process of constructing a mixed-use development on 2.95 acres that will consist of 35 townhome units along Lions Gate Drive and 21,000 sqft of commercial retail/restaurant space with 28 residential units on the second floor along Main Street.

The property is located between Main Street and Lions Gate Drive directly north of Vasquez Creek and south of Miller Road.

Planning Commission Design Review for Arrow at Winter Park occurred on 9-25-17 and the design was approved as presented based on a thorough review of the Town code and design guidelines.

After approval of this design, Arrow at Winter Park submitted plans for their first, second, and third phase to the Building Department in order to start construction on the project. However, in that submittal, several small changes had been made to the design that were not reviewed or approved by Design Review.

These three 9-plexes which make up phases 1,2, and 3 of the project have had the following

changes between their original design approval, and the construction drawings which are currently being built:

- The narrow individual roofs have been shortened and rotated to face the opposite direction.
- Slot windows have been reduced in height.
- Decks have been expanded slightly.
- Timbers and brackets are now constructed of gluglam as opposed to timber and steel.
- Certain slider window types have changed to slide 50% instead of 25% open.
- Entry doors have been updated to have more windows.
- Entry decks have replaced some slab on grade patios where needed due to grade issues.

#### Staff Recommendation:

The Committee may want to discuss the new shortened and rotated roof structures and the repeated pattern of blank walls between the units created by them. It may be possible to include some type of additional interest element on the blank walls. This may not be an issue once phases 4-8 are constructed which could block the view of these from Main Street however could still be worth discussion. Other than that discussion item, staff has no objection to the updated designs as presented.

Jason Ahlers, Arrow at Winter Park presented the reason for the change. They realized that the original design created a long narrow rooftop deck that was a bit cavernous without enough room for the hot tub. Re-organizing the deck allowed for more movement.

Justin Feider, architect presented a side by side 3-D view of the changes and their plans in depth.

Commissioner Stevens moved and Commissioner Davlin seconded approval of the design update.  
Motion Carried: 6-0.

#### V. Staff Update

- Planning commissioner refresher workshop that was held in Fraser PowerPoint is in the packet for anyone who could not attend.
- August 21<sup>th</sup> Training with Town Council, more details coming soon.
- Master Plan moving along, hoping to take to the steering committee next.
- Update on projects moving forward including Lionsgate improvements, Gondola at the Resort etc...

Upon a previously adopted motion, the meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.