

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

STEAMBOAT SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES May 24, 2018

The regularly scheduled public hearing of the Steamboat Springs Planning Commission was called to order at approximately 5:00p.m.on Thursday, May 24, 2018, in the Citizens' Meeting Room, Centennial Hall, 124 10th Street, Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

Planning Commission members in attendance were:

Chair Rich levy, Vice-Chair Brian Adams, Lee Calihan, George Eck, Michael Buccino and alternate Paul Weese.

Absent: Kingston, Ptach

Staff members present were Staff Planner Kelly Douglas, Principal Planner Rebecca Bessey and Planning Director Tyler Gibbs.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

#1: DPV-18-01, Ski Hill Subdivision, Lot D

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kelly Douglas:

The proposal before you tonight is a development plan with a major variance. It's at the Ski Hill Subdivision, Lot D, more commonly known as Bear River Grill. This property is zoned Open Space and Recreation, located in Gondola Square adjacent to the Sheraton and across the plaza from the gondola. They're requesting approval of a new structure and location for the BBQ building as well as a ski storage structure with seating on top.

One major variance to side setback standards has been requested with this application. No public comment has been received. Staff is recommending approval.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Eric Smith, Applicant Representative:

The proposal in front of you is for the portion of the upper patio that would be constructed outside of the existing Bear River expansion that we're currently working on as well as relocation of the BBQ building to the other side of the retaining wall and the removal of the Umbrella Bar.

The outside seating we're proposing would occur on the south side of the Bear River expansion. What you see under construction out there today is the 1,500 square foot expansion to Bear River, and we're proposing to build this patio on top and out from the existing retaining wall to create seating at plaza

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

level with the Bear River expansion. We're trying to create ADA access to all of the outdoor seating from the existing Bear River interior space.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Levy:

Is the BBQ now being located on the same lot as the Bear River Bar and Grill or on a separate lot?

Smith: The expansion that previously went through a minor modification was expansion to the Bear River space. That essentially is on the Sheraton property in the lower level of the Sheraton. The deck expansion we're proposing to add essentially is on Ski Corp property because the property line between Sheraton and Ski Corp runs essentially on the north edge of where we're expanding this patio seating. The Bear River Barbeque currently sits on Ski Corp property and will be relocated to Ski Corp property.

The reason for the variance is that this site is a little bit of an anomaly. The OR zoning, which is the entire ski hill, has a little thumb of property that includes the gondola building and goes back out. Why it was ever zoned that way, we don't know. The OR zone has larger setback requirements than the G2 zoning that surrounds this property. Where we're planning to locate this patio structure is essentially right up against the Sheraton so we have a continuous connection between the Bear River interior expansion and the outside patio. That's why we're here is because of that technicality with the setback.

Levy: Staff, you're saying we're allowing this as an accessory use. I'm having trouble understanding that this BBQ is an accessory use to the gondola; I certainly believe it's an accessory use to the Bear River, and that's how we're allowing this use on the OR property.

Douglas: Yes. Per the use table, there is an accessory use table. That accessory use table does not include a use that meets the description of what will be occurring here with the BBQ building. So we go by the accessory use standards, and this proposal meets those standards. It's partially the director's discretion and also meets those accessory use standards.

Levy: My question is not with the use standard but the fact that we're defining this as an accessory use to the gondola building. I find that a bit of a stretch. It's not being run by the ski area; it's being run by the Bear River Bar and Grill.

Smith: Bear River Bar and Grill is run by Ski Corp. It's a tenant that rents that space from the Sheraton. They will also run the BBQ building.

Levy: And because they're on separate lots we can't consider it an accessory use to the Bear River Bar and Grill.

Douglas: It is not. It's completely separate. There's no wait staff at this location. It could be likened more to a concession stand similar to how the rodeo functions, which is also zoned OR. They operationally function a little differently, however, they are a similar use and we feel that they meet the accessory use standards and also function in a way that is accessory to the ski area operation.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Gibbs: The ski area operates a number of food service facilities; that's just part of the amenities provided by the ski area.

Levy: Does the BBQ operate independently? Or is all the cash and transactions through the Bear River Bar and Grill?

Douglas: I can't speak to that. I don't think that necessarily impacts how we would classify the use.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Commissioner Eck:

I think the lots and setbacks referenced here don't make conventional sense. This setback is encroaching onto the walkway up to Slopeside Grill, so I think it meets all the variance criteria.

Commissioner Eck moved to approve DPV-18-01.

Commissioner Calihan seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Commissioner Adams agreed with Commissioner Eck.

Adams: The zoning setbacks in that area are the confusing part to me. Rich, I think you asked some good questions there to make sure we understood the accessory use.

Levy: I'm a little skeptical of the interpretation of accessory use, but I'll probably support the motion; it is a minor change.

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

#2: FDP-17-07, Crawford at Burgess Creek

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kelly Douglas:

This is a final development plan application for The Crawford at Burgess Creek. This property is zoned G2; it's located off Burgess Creek Road adjacent to Ski Time Square Condos; also very close to the Torian Plum. This request is for approval of a 5-unit multi-family development. The conceptual development plan for this project, known as DP-16-18, was before you and approved in February, 2017. No public comment has been received. Staff find this development to be consistent with the approved conceptual development plan, and we're recommending approval.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Eric Smith, Applicant Representative:

This is the existing site plan that was approved as part of the development plan. What we're proposing is essentially in the same footprint, the same circulation, alignment. The primary thing that has changed on this property is that in our original approval, we had taller elements on the ends of those five units. We've changed to lower elements on the ends to drop the stories down on the ends of the buildings, so we end up tapering the structures down to a greater extent on the ends and keeping the taller structures in the middle.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Adams: When they're found to be within substantial conformance of a conceptual development plan, why is an applicant still required to come through a full development plan public hearing process again?

Douglas: The approval of a conceptual development plan is limited to the scope that the applicant sets. So when you reviewed this proposal last year, your approval was limited to the conditional use, site access and vehicular circulation, the site plan, density of five units, the mountain modern building design (including form, height and massing,) amenities for the project. So they were asking for approval of variances and a conditional use, and that's what they got approval for. They weren't required at that time to have full construction drawings like they will be with this approval. So the final development plan is what gives the approval to move to building permit.

Adams: Right. And because a conceptual doesn't have to include everything, you still need that public process to pick up the rest of it. So we're not making them jump through unnecessary hoops.

Gibbs: The conceptual development plan is a way to test and insure that you're getting a green light on some of those variances.

Levy: Being a G2-zoned property, one of the key requirements is being integrated with the gondola area. Because there's no development below them in the old Ski Time Square area, how is that being addressed for future connections?

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Douglas: There is a walkway coming down to the rear lot line. One day, that will connect through to Ski Time Square when the property below it redevelops. This property will be prepared for that connection to be made because that walkway as well as the staircases down and through the site will be public access easements with signage letting the public know that they are allowed to use them to go down to Ski Time Square.

Levy: Are we building that lower sidewalk with this development? Or is that at a future date?

Douglas: The developer is proposing to build that with this proposal.

Levy: And how does that restrict future development below? What if the project below doesn't have a sidewalk that matches with that one? How do we ensure that the connection actually happens?

Douglas: They have a blanket easement all across the bottom of that property anticipating that we don't know exactly where the connection will be made. So there's been some flexibility built into their proposal to accommodate these future connections.

Eck: So you said you're going to be building the sidewalk now?

Smith: We would construct the sidewalk now down to the property line. We're up above that old wall a considerable amount, but with this easement across there, we'll make that connection wherever that adjoining property ends up putting a walkway if and when that develops.

Eck and Buccino wanted to make sure people would be protected from falling the 15 feet down to the undeveloped property.

Smith pointed out that the wall is on the adjoining property and hence this applicant has no control over what they do with the wall.

Smith: Getting this sidewalk built at least to the south property line was a request in terms of completing what we could complete on this site. We'd be happy to stop short, but it seemed to make sense to at least get it down to the property line. More likely than not, we think the connection is going to come somewhere over in this corner.

Smith showed why they think that is the case.

Eck: I don't think that it's necessary to build a sidewalk now as long as it's bonded. I think there are some serious safety concerns. You guys aren't going to have a fence down there or anything while the adjoining site is undeveloped?

Smith: The only thing I think we would probably do is fence the lower edge of this end of the sidewalk, because from a practical standpoint nobody is going to use that sidewalk to go anywhere until we've got a connection to the south. The lower section down towards the wall is a little flatter.

Eck: I recommend from a liability perspective that you guys consider putting a fence in there.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Adams: I agree with staff's assessment that this project was in substantial conformance. I like the rest of the development. I do like the applicant's reduction on those sides; I think that's a terrific improvement from the conceptual plan.

Commissioner Adams moved to approve FDP-17-07 with conditions 1-11.
Commissioner Buccino seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Eck: Brian, what do you think about bonding that sidewalk and not requiring it until there's a second development so it can flow better?

Buccino: Part of it is you're going to have a staircase with a snowmelt system there, so you're going to have the second snowmelt tying in the whole thing.

Smith: I think from a practical standpoint because of access, our feeling is it would be pretty easy to make a connection here coming from the bottom side when those improvements are done. But we'd like to get this landscape completed so when we construct that portion of the sidewalk, we don't have to disturb near those units in future.

Eck: Okay.

Adams: I understand your concerns, but I think the applicant's assessment that the topography is a little bit shallower there and that you're not going to accidentally slip and immediately go off the edge makes me feel a lot better. That's an ongoing safety hazard, but it's not this applicant's doing.

Weese: I think it's going to increase foot traffic there in general. I've seen a lot of folks on Burgess Creek hiking up in ski boots. It's going to increase the number of folks who want to traverse from the gondola to their unit. That being said, I have no idea how to fix that. I don't know that it's really up to the applicant to worry about that. I think they've done a lot to mitigate slipping, and with the way-finding signs, it will really be beneficial to foot traffic. We'll probably see a natural trail created by folks who are wanting to hit that sidewalk and stairway. We'll know where that natural line of traffic is going to be by the end of this season.

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

#3: CU-18-03, Dream Island Plaza

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kelly Douglas:

This is a conditional use application at Dream Island Plaza for buildings addressed 1313, 1317 and 1319 Dream Island Plaza. The property is zoned Community Commercial. It's located off Lincoln Avenue between West Lincoln Park and the Transit Center. They are proposing 30 deed-restricted workforce units. The conditional use request is attributed to modification of the use standard precluding workforce units from being within the pedestrian active building frontage. Typically, this use is a limited use in this zone district.

No public comment has been received. Staff is recommending approval.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Bill Rangitsch, Applicant:

I'm here representing the owner. Kelly has done a good job of explaining what it is. What precipitated this is there was one small retail space in there. It had been operated as a short-term residential project for the last almost 30 years. For us, this is just to make it all legit and get the other retail spaces the same use as the existing ones.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Adams: What are the existing conditions right now? How is that building being used?

Douglas: Currently, we have 23 residential units, 1 garage unit, 1 retail unit and 1 storage unit. These are in three buildings, and they want to make all 30 of those units into workforce units.

Adams: What's the age of the buildings?

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Rangitsch: As near as we can figure out, they were built sometime in the late 40's. Part of what we're doing right now is redoing the mechanical/electrical systems bringing the interior up to code, because nothing's been done to it since then other than some tenant modifications.

Adams: So those buildings still need a conditional use to be brought to this? What's the transition between its current state to why it needs this approval tonight?

Douglas: It's because they want to make them workforce units, and they want to deed restrict them. To do that, it's a limited use in this zone district. Because of the modification on the pedestrian frontage, they have to be processed as a conditional use. This conditional use approval would bring them into conformance; they'll be legally approved through this process. The uses that exist there, some have been permitted; we found some files that indicate that the retail space was permitted at one time. The residential use we don't have a record of it; it's nonconforming, which is not surprising given the age of the building.

Eck: What exactly are the terms of that deed restriction?

Douglas: I believe they are that the person has to live and work in Routt County.

Eck: The pedestrian active building frontage seems to be a parking lot. When you think frontage downtown, you're along the road.

Douglas: We generally consider that to mean the ground floor where a person can walk by.

Levy: You said the deed restriction is with the units, but the definition on Page 3-2 specifically says: A workforce unit is a dwelling unit that is restricted in perpetuity on the deed of the property.

I ask that since we've seen redevelopment plans for this area before. Are we only deed restricting the structure or the property?

Douglas: There's many units on this property; it's part of a much larger parcel with many dwelling units on it. I understand these deed restrictions would be limited to the workforce units.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Levy: In my mind that doesn't meet the definition that we have for workforce unit.

Douglas: I believe it does. The name of the use is "workforce unit" so we anticipate that they will be small and not standalone structures – that they will occur in multi-family structures. I think that it talks about "restricted in perpetuity on the deed of the property." These are not for ownership is how I understand it; I believe they're for rental.

Rangitsch: They are set up for workforce rental. The company that owns it is not in the nightly rental business; they're not looking at people subletting their properties out. They have rented it as a workforce facility since they owned it. When they bought it in 1990, it was already pretty much used the way it is right now.

Levy: I understand that. I have trouble matching what the city is saying the deed restriction states and the listed definition of a workforce unit. Usually, people do workforce units to get some kind of break with the code. They're already being used that way. You could say who's going to live there without it being registered as deed-restricted with the city. You could just ask for residential units. I don't have a problem with how it's being used; I have a problem with the workforce unit designation and it actually meeting our code.

Rangitsch: They really don't want it to be residential or confused with nightly rental or anything like that because that's not the business that they're in. They just want to keep it like it is right now – for workforce housing.

Levy: Do you understand my dilemma?

Douglas: I do. However, I believe this is the correct application for that use.

Eck: So it's in perpetuity as long as that structure exists.

Douglas: Correct.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Weese: So we have different addresses on these buildings. Would the deed restriction go with those addresses? Or is it that the entire property is deed restricted?

Douglas: I understand the deed restrictions will be based on the unit. I don't know how exactly they'll be addressed, but they will have to have a unique identifier in order for the deed restrictions to reference the units.

Weese: I understand. So let's just say it's ten years down the road and the property transfers into another company's hands, and they want to put large retail there. Is there a way for them to do that with the deed restrictions in place? Would they have to come in and tear down the buildings and wait a year?

Rebecca Bessey:

The deed restriction for workforce units will have to be reviewed and approved by the city attorney. So I think that how they're crafted and how they describe the property and the units and what they apply to – we'll take care of that in the actual document that gets recorded. Then we can consult with legal about any options for the expiration and/or termination of those deed restrictions. So I don't know that we can definitively say whether they could or couldn't do what, but I would imagine that it will be laid out in the document to be reviewed by the city attorney.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Eck: I think this is suitable for the conditional use of workforce units.

Commissioner Eck moved to approve CU-18-01 with staff's recommended conditions.

Commissioner Buccino seconded the motion.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Weese: I'm going to trust Legal to take care of my questions because I've seen these properties change in other communities, and I think they'll have the foresight to care for that.

Calihan: This seems like a great redevelopment of a property, and we need more workforce housing. So I'm excited to see a property like this come through.

Levy: I would have been happy to see another way. I agree with George's question; I'm not sure this is really pedestrian active front. And I certainly wouldn't want this property to be deed restricted for workforce housing. It's zoned CC. In the redevelopment plans I've seen 5-6 years ago, it should be more of a commercial, mixed-use property to be more in line with the community vision. So I hope we're not hamstringing this property in the future. That's really my concern; not that I don't want these guys to be able to do workforce housing.

Weese agreed.

Eck: I think Council should be sure about that. My understanding is they can knock this down and do something else, and that's why I'm moving to approve. If that's not the case, I'd take another look at it.

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

#4-#5: PUD-17-03, Riverview PUD Amendment; PUD-17-10, Riverview Preliminary Plat

STAFF PRESENTATION

Rebecca Bessey:

This was a planned unit development that was approved back in June of last year. That approved PUD includes five subzones as well as one tract for infrastructure and some open space.

The PUD established dimensional standards for each of the subzones as well as the uses that are permitted; it also modified some of the development standards for the entirety of the PUD.

The applicants are proposing an amendment to that approved PUD mostly focusing on subzones C and E and making some minor additions of some clarifying language with regard to the PUD amendment process.

Subzone C: They're proposing to eliminate the average plate height requirement.

Subzone E: They're proposing some changes to the front, side and rear setbacks. They're proposing to eliminate the average plate height standard, revise the lot coverage and FAR standards, and they're also proposing some additional design standards to address the ground floor that would face the river and abut the public pathway that would be on that side of Lot E.

There are some additional revisions to the exhibits. These are really for clarity purposes; they've changed some wording at our request as well as changed some illustrations to do a better job depicting the standards being proposed. They are also updating the subzone map to reflect the additional open space and infrastructure tracts that would be created with the preliminary plat.

Prior to this going before City Council, we'll be updating all of the code references to reflect the new code standards for ease of application in the future. Those are not changing the intent or standards of the PUD itself.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

We did receive one letter of public comment from Tom Sharp. He is opposing the side setback standard that would abut his property along the alley.

We have reviewed the proposed PUD changes. We feel that it's in keeping with the overall intent of the original approval. We find it to be consistent with the criteria of approval of a planned unit development.

Levy said that the applicant had asked if the PUD and preliminary plat amendments could be reviewed simultaneously.

Bessey: The applicants are proposing to make some changes to the preliminary plat that was approved last year, primarily splitting Lot C into six duplex lots; the previous plat included that all as one lot. In addition, they proposed some additional open space and infrastructure tracts. Those spaces were included on the approved plat, but they were included as easements; this would break those out into separate tracts that would be owned and maintained by the metro district.

The only other change to the plat they're proposing is to eliminate an internal access easement that crossed Lot E to provide access to Lot A. They don't feel that they need that any longer, so they are proposing to remove that from the preliminary plat.

I've provided you with some revised conditions of approval. #6 is the only one we're proposing to amend tonight. On both the PUD and the plat, the conditions before you tonight are intended to replace the previously-approved conditions in their entirety. We didn't want there to be confusion about the prior approvals and amendments that are being proposed tonight.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mark Scully, Applicant:

Recapped the history of the property since 2006.

Scully: The PUD is a zoning, so we didn't plan any buildings; we did plan massing. It's lower-density residential on the river, mid-density residential on Site E, higher-density on D and B (hopefully D is a hotel,) and A is your more traditional mixed use. We're correlating this with a number of public benefits: Plaza on 5th and Yampa, 12-foot-wide multi-modal trail, dedicated

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

open space, dedicated 10-foot-wide repairing buffer, dedicated 5-foot surface trail; all the things Rebecca put in her report.

We're going to clean up the riverbank. We'll have a 0.25% transfer fee on all residential sales, which will hopefully be well over \$100,000 a year to the preservation and maintenance of the river downtown. Privately funded internal loop road; view corridors at 3rd and 4th; 25 new parking spaces and \$36,000 towards Lincoln Avenue signal timing.

On the heels of those approvals, we started planning some buildings. And of course, we found some things that we needed to revisit. We'll call them minor amendments.

Scully showed the changes to Subzone E with additional setbacks encouraged by Planning staff.

Scully: The site is smaller; it went from 27 to 22; the FAR goes up partly based on math and partly based on getting rid of this alley. The height has not changed. There would be the potential to add about – gross FAR is 45 and this is 43. The changes to Site C decrease the max FAR by about 9,000 feet, so the net change of the two is about 3,000 feet. I would submit that this is a better plan.

I talked to Tom Sharp yesterday. His issue is a snow storage easement. He claims he shoveled snow on our property for a number of years, and that gives him a prescriptive easement. We will work it out, but I would submit it's a civil matter and not a planning matter. We'll have to have dealt with that by the time we come in for a building on Site E.

Ryan Spaustat, Landmark Consultants showed an image depicting the changes that Rebecca specified in her presentation.

Spaustat: There are actually two CY zone districts – a Yampa River side and a Lincoln alley side. On the Yampa River side, there's two measurements related to height: One is the overall height, which is 36 feet, and average plate height is 24 feet.

The simplest way to think of average plate height is when you have a vertical wall of a building, and where it intersects the sloped roof of a building is your average plate height. Under the current CY zoning, you can have a building that's 36 feet tall and two pitched roofs, one towards the river and one towards our internal alley. What we're proposing to do is swap those two roof pitches. How we codify this is we would eliminate the average plate height and create an overall plate height along the river of 24 feet; then we impose a 55-foot setback on the third story; right now the third story setback is 30 feet from the ordinary high watermark.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

What we feel this does is reduces the overall impact to the public, river users, people on Howelsen Parkway looking at the project from the other side. The increased massing on the internal loop road will only really impact the B building; it won't really be visible from Lincoln Avenue or anywhere outside the PUD boundaries. It also allows the building to have a flat roof, which is more urban, more consistent with the buildings you see downtown and more consistent with the other buildings that will be proposed as part of the Riverview PUD.

We think this is a minor tweak – a procedural step, we hope, for us to come forward with some actual buildings that we want to present to you in a couple weeks on the C lots.

Spaustat illustrated the FAR comparison between the approved PUD and the new proposal.

Spaustat: That's an increase of about 3,000 square feet largely due to the elimination of the secondary access road. Ultimately, we think that is duplicative of the alley; this results in a better overall project by allowing us to eliminate that duplication and provide additional setbacks along the river and minimize the impact on those sides of the buildings.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Eck: In Tom's letter, it says that in the prior filings for the change to the PUD there was a 10-foot setback for the south boundary of his parking lot. I'm trying to find the existing. Isn't it currently a 0-foot setback?

Bessey: Yes, it is a 0-foot setback. They are proposing now to retain that 0-foot setback on the side for buildings above 14 feet, so pretty much above the ground floor it would be set back 10 feet. I think what Tom is probably referring to is that there was the access easement across there which would have effectively pushed that building back from the Riverview property line. I think he still had issues with that. He submitted the same objection for the previous PUD. I would agree with the applicant that it's a civil matter and not for planning.

Eck: The snow issue is a civil matter. It makes sense now. I forgot about the access road.

Bessey: They're proposing to increase the side setbacks for the upper stories. I also believe that while they are proposing some additional floor area allowance in Subzone E, I think the

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

modifications to the setback standards, as well as the addition of some design criteria for the façade facing the river, is a benefit. I think this proposal overall provides a better set of standards for Subzone E than the previous approval.

Adams: We had some conversation about that access easement when it came to the original PUD last year. I could've sworn that was a pretty key access easement that the city was requesting. Can you walk me through the reasoning on why it's okay to not have it now?

Bessey: You'll see in the conditions of approval of the PUD a condition that states that for Subzone A, no access shall come off of 5th Street for the plaza. The applicant is still confident that they can provide access to it off the alley. That's fine if that's achievable. Our concern was that we didn't want to have a need for access points to Lot A off of 5th Street.

Adams: I don't think I understood Ryan's explanation of how the new Subzone C overall height was going to work. I don't think I saw that within the packet itself. Is that codified within the packet on how the setback of this much can be 24 feet overall height and the other is 36?

Bessey: If you look at Page 4.4 of your packet, and you look at the column for Subzone C, you'll see that the rear setback is really what we're looking at. So buildings up to 24 feet, those first two stories, have a 30-foot setback; above that, which is effectively a third story, has a 55-foot setback. By eliminating the average plate height, they're not changing that setback, so you're still going to achieve that step-back of the mass of the building on the rear side facing the river.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Eck: I think this is an improvement over the first PUD. I remember on E, we were talking about how this was going to feel like you're in a canyon when you're on a bike going through between those buildings, so I'm happy that setback is going to be increased. The density maximum possible is under 3,000 square feet for a big property, so I don't think that's an issue. The plate height I think is going to make a better view from the river.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Commissioner Eck moved to approve PUD-17-10 with staff's superseding conditions.

Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Adams: I'm excited to see that change, too. When we did the first plat, I was still a little concerned about the shape of E. So the fact that this just incrementally increases the square footage but cleans up that southeast corner, I'm excited about that change.

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION

Commissioner Eck moved to approve PUD-17-03 for the same reasons as elucidated regarding the above motion with staff's superseding conditions.

Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Adams: I'd agree with staff's assessment and George's explanation. This is in-kind with the original PUD approval, and I think it's well thought out.

Calihan: This seems in line with the original intent of the PUD.

Levy concurred.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

#6: Approval of Minutes: April 9 Public Work Session

Commissioner Eck moved to approve the April 9, 2018 meeting minutes; Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

#7: Approval of Minutes: April 16 Public Policy Work Session

Due to the absence of Levy, Eck, Buccino and Weese at that meeting, there is no quorum to approve the minutes.

#8: Approval of Minutes: April 12 Public Hearing

Commissioner Eck moved to approve the April 12, 2018 meeting minutes; Commissioner Buccino seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

FINAL MINUTES

Planning Commission Minutes
May 24, 2018

Director's Report

Bessey said the drafting of the amendment to give Planning Commission increased final decision authority is ongoing and will be completed soon.

Eck: What was the recommendation from Council?

Bessey: They concurred with your recommendation with the exception of variances, I believe.

Adjournment

Commissioner Buccino moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:07 p.m.

Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.