Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 14, 2018

Attendees: Clark Atkinson, Dom Eymere, Chris Hawkins, Brett Henderson, Margaret Loperfido, Jeff Moffit, Rich Saperstein (via phone), Al Smith, Kevin Van Horn, Pat Wallace, Ben White

Public in Attendance: Wes Bellamy, Ronnie Benson, Wendi Birchler, Ken Buck, Jenny DeFrantes, Karen Fontenot, Cathy Frank, Jeff Hanggi, Jeremy Herzog, Lynn Jagaciewski, David Neben, Patrice Saito, Tom Runcie, Mark Tardiff, Eben Wight, Steve Winter

Dom called the meeting to order at 6:10 pm and welcomed all in attendance. The meeting's format was outlined, noting public comment periods would take place after each agenda topic discussion. The Advisory Group in attendance was asked to introduce themselves to the group. Dom spoke to the project's history, the original scope of work for Special Area Regulations and Commercial Design Standards rewrite and shared the vision statement to provide a brief background for those in attendance.

Strategic Plan Map and Executive Summary Presentation

Dom introduce the recommendations presented last month by consultants, Cascadia Partners along with a Strategic Map. The recommendations were summarized in an Executive Summary document and the Advisory Group participated in a work session to review each recommendation and discuss the impacts, in order determine the Group's endorsements. The agreed upon changes were incorporated into the document being reviewed this evening. After tonight's Advisory Group vote, the document will move on for final review and possible approval by the Board of Directors.

The Strategic Plan Map identifies suggested main street building forms, active ground floors, sidewalk circuit, on street parking, residential as well as public spaces. Building form vs. building use was a proposed therefore removing a mandatory commercial designation percentage while using the strategic zoned areas to determine the level of commercial space. This would permit flexibility for the life of the building, addressing uncertain needs and function for the future. Parking requirements were slightly less than originally proposed for restaurant and residential uses. It was noted that the DRC has authority to change the parking requirements during the established design review process. Dom noted that although the Design Charrette process has been removed, the northern half of Block 6 will still need to go through review since it is currently un-platted. Estimates provided were in the range of 216 residential units and 86 commercial unit based on current proposals. This equals approximately 259,000 residential square feet and 103,000 commercial square feet. Conversations with the Metro District continue and the District has confirmed that water and sewer is sufficient for a maximum population of approximately 4,000 at full subdivision build-out.

Other points of notation, additional green space will be gained through development agreements with the Block 6 Stakeholders and less build out is proposed than in the current SAR. Interactive plazas at natural gathering intersections provide areas for community events and meeting places

which had strong community support in the survey. Also included is connectivity to the main Village Center with sidewalks linking folks to the public spaces and all corners of the Village Center perimeter, meeting another key request of members.

Public Comment and Discussion

Dom opened up the meeting for the first round of questions and comments from members. A request was made for more detailed Strategic Map to identify the building heights. Chris Hawkins walked through each land use zone. The perimeter lots will remain at 32' height, no change is noted, the areas considered the Main Street building zone which include the perimeter of Block 6 and the Main Street cross street are proposing taller building heights. The rear perimeter street of Block 6 is being proposed for residential only, with 35' maximum building height.

The conflict of the existing Covenant 24.03 addressing 2-story structures was raised. Dom noted there are other covenants in which the P.O.A. is operating outside of and that the Board of Directors will need to discuss on how best to move forward.

A question was asked as to what bus service would look like and if it would be relocated to the Village Center. It is a long-term plan to have a bus stop within the Main Street Building Zones.

What is the funding mechanism to create and maintain the interactive plazas and community areas? Will it be paid by the Developer or membership dues? Dom shared that a need for the long term capital improvement planning has been identified and will need to be developed. Infrastructure questions were addressed by Ronnie Benson regarding the Metro District's areas of responsibility. Ronnie reiterated the Metro District has a growth plan that will accommodate approximately 4,000 individuals at full capacity build-out within CB South.

Snow storage was the next topic of discussion with inquiries as to where the snow will be stored and how the snow removal will work with on-street parking. Similar to the current Residential Design Standards, each owner will be required to address the snow removal and storage at the time of design development. Public roads are plowed by Gunnison County which will also require their review. Chris read the specific language written in the Special Area Regulations to help clarify the requirements.

The question was asked if the amended Special Area Regulations requires approval by the community. It is not required to go to a community vote as it is a set of design guidelines for the commercial area. The Board of Directors has the authority to approve the amended language. The document will then be presented to the Planning Commission with final review by the Board of County Commissioners.

Final Recommendations to the Amended Special Area Regulations and Commercial Design Standards

Dom moved on to the Advisory Committee review and final comments of the draft document. Chris started the discussion with a couple noted additions to Sections 7.11 and 7.12. The majority of the Advisory Group's review focused on Section 8, CB South Village Center Design Standards.

Section 8.8 Dimensional Standards - eliminated Dimensional Standards chart and Minimum Unit Sizes chart.

Section 8.9 Minimum Setbacks – Updated to reflect Cascadia recommendations.

Section 8.10 Building Height – All the proposed Cascadia Designs building heights were rereviewed. Dom asked about the comfort level of the Advisory Group regarding the 48" high maximum for a gable roof. Several members commented that they are not comfortable with the dimension. The Advisory Group had a lengthy discussion regarding the function of a building's height as it relates to roof design and traffic impacts. The Advisory Group did not approve the recommended gable roof design of 48' height; it remains an open item. The perimeter building height remains the same as today. A suggestion to modify the unenclosed rooftop mechanical equipment screen from 8' to 4' was approved.

Section 8.11 Building Design – Chris clarified what areas on the map represent the Main Street building zone which determines the requirements for the Active Ground Floor Use Zone. It was agreed to remove the minimum requirement to build a 2-story building. Also updated was a suggestion to remove the percentage of the required glass and add a diagram example.

The Active Ground Floor Use Zone standards discussion focused on the minimum requirement for commercial land use within 30 feet of the front façade. Rich will discuss this with the Pioneer Plaza Board and ownership in order to understand the impacts and obtain approvals. A few revisions were made to Roof Design regarding the requirement to break a ridgeline after 60 feet and update the residential roof slope to coordinate with updates to the Residential Design Guidelines.

Section 8.12 Landscaping - Under Landscaping Plan Requirements, an additional line will be added for "cash in lieu of" when undersized lots are challenged to meet parking and/or fulfill the landscaping requirements. A comment in favor of this option also noted this will provide a funding source for the commercial area public spaces.

Section 8.13 Parking Regulations – On-street parking allowances were discussed as the update includes language that on-street parking may be approved in order to meet parking requirements, only after a specific list of requirements have been met. This includes owner's responsibility to pave the adjoining street and only after all parking has been maximized within the private land. This discussion moved on to a logistical question because roads are not currently paved within Block 6. Chris reiterated that in order to correctly plan the circulation components of roads and sidewalks, it is critical to develop a Master Plan for each entity, Pioneer Plaza as well as the northern part of Block 6. The Metro District provided some additional insights on how they approach paved road projects. Completed development and build-out are key criteria that help identify the prioritizing paving.

Section 8.23 Pioneer Plaza and Remainder of Block 6 Requirements – With the removal of the Charrette Process, Chris outlined the replacement language. A Master Plan for both Pioneer Plaza and the northern part of Block 6 is recommended. Both entities will be requested to enter into a

development agreement with the POA regarding the sidewalks, public dedication areas, etc. Pioneer Plaza will need to obtain approval of their HOA for a covenant change.

The SAR Draft review concluded with a discussion about the ideal floor to floor height as it impacts overall building height. A 15' active ground floor use requirement was debated and the group agreed that they felt comfortable with a lower height, i.e.; 10'-15' in order to lower the overall building height. The Advisory Group will defer to the Board of Directors for a final decision on the building height dimension.

Public Comment and Response

Chris was asked to share his insights on what a Master Plan and development agreement entails. It is a plan that identifies items such as the street and sidewalk network, public dedication areas, required zones for snow storage, etc. The Master Plan is combined with a development agreement that outlines the agreed upon commitment and understandings between Association and Developer.

A timeline question was raised and the overall consensus was that there are several key stakeholders who will need to review and comment on the SAR Draft. Those conversations were encouraged to happen at this time; the outstanding issues should be worked through concurrently as these conversations occur.

The following comments were shared by members in attendance.

- Provide guidelines in order to camouflage the prominence of the HVAC equipment, impacting owners with property directly above the Village Center.
- Encourage the use of window coverings for both residential and commercial first floor applications. Awnings are not practical with snow shed. Window coverings permit night time heat retention for energy efficiency.
- Concerns were raised regarding the proposed building heights and closing in the Village Center if streets are narrow and buildings are tall. Others agreed that the proposed height of 48' was too tall. It would benefit the public to have some type of visual or graphic aid to assist in conveying what is being envisioned.
- Requests for the SAR amendment to provide more standardized language and apply to all property owners throughout Block 6.
- Comments were made regarding independent research of mountain town architecture and building heights found in the range of 30'-35'.
- Some support the efforts to move forward on developing the Village Center however voiced concerns on the conflicts with the current covenants.
- Requests were made for a plan of the proposed street circulation including parking, sidewalks and landscape zoning. Bike racks should be included as a mandatory requirement within the document.
- Clarification on the financial impacts of maintenance to the CB South community was requested.
- Define and enforce the utility easements. Property owners utilize this area for snow storage or landscaping which is an issue for utility work. Requests that detailed review of the plans

addresses the encroachment on easements. It was noted that County subdivision regulation planning process will be involved as they deal with the easements and utility infrastructure.

 A request was made to commission a traffic study. Dom noted that prior cost estimates were in the \$12,000 range. Also noted was a previous discussion to the benefit of having the updated and approved SAR completed prior to commissioning a traffic study.

Dom and Chris thanked those in attendance for attending tonight's session as well as for the valuable comments and feedback.

Adjourn – 8:30 pm