

AGENDA #4
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

**STEAMBOAT SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
June 28, 2018**

The regularly scheduled public hearing of the Steamboat Springs Planning Commission was called to order at approximately 5:00p.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2018, in the Citizens' Meeting Room, Centennial Hall, 124 10th Street, Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

Planning Commission members in attendance were:
Vice-Chair Brian Adams, Lee Calihan, George Eck, Michael Buccino and alternate Paul Weese.
Absent: Levy, Kingston, Ptach

Staff members present were staff planners Toby Stauffer, Bob Keenan and Kelly Douglas, and Planning Director Tyler Gibbs.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

#1: DPP-18-05, Howelsen Hill

STAFF PRESENTATION

Toby Stauffer:

This is a Howelsen Hill transmission line relocation proposed by Yampa Valley Electric Association. It's the relocation of some overhead transmission lines because they're in a landslide area of Howelsen Hill.

There are two lines on Howelsen Hill that provide primary service for Steamboat Springs and connect to the Brooklyn substation nearby. The continued sliding of that area has caused an untenable situation for maintenance and operation of the existing lines. Overhead power lines are a conditional use in all zone districts, so this is a conditional use and a development plan application.

The proposal is to remove the two existing lines from the landslide area and relocate one set of poles to a new location on Howelsen Hill. The new series of power lines will also provide additional power service to the top of Howelsen Hill. Mainly the conditional use is for visual impacts. There will be a 30-foot clearing of vegetation on each side of the centerline of the poles. The area will be revegetated, but it will take a little bit of time to do that. The poles in their new location will go over the top of the hill and will be a little bit less visible from most areas of town.

We have found that it met all the criteria for conditional use; we are recommending approval. We have an updated set of conditions; Condition #6 changed a little bit, and we added two additional conditions. The applicant is aware of those. We haven't had any public comment to date on this application.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

None.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Eck confirmed that this project was endorsed by the Parks and Rec Commission and that staff believes the visual impact will be less over time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Eck: I think this is consistent with the conditional use criteria.

Commissioner Eck moved to approve DPP-18-05 with the latest conditions of approval.
Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

None.

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

#2: DPF-17-12, County Shop Road Verizon Tower

STAFF PRESENTATION

Bob Keenan:

This is a development plan/final development plan application for a conditional use to allow a 60-foot-tall telecommunication monopole. It also has a variance to skyline development standards because the subject property is on a skyline ridgeline.

The application is being processed under the previous code because we received the application in 2017. Most of the standards are the same, and it's still a conditional use under the existing code.

This seems to be the least impactful type of tower or pole that can be built. It's proposed to be just tall enough to get the appropriate signal and reach those areas that they're trying to reach. It also has the capacity to collocate another carrier, which is another part of the criteria in the code so we can reduce the amount of these towers in the community.

As one of the conditions of approval, they need to enter into a development agreement addressing maintenance and also that they will allow collocation. It's on the County Shop property, which is a great location for them given the topography. However, it conflicts with the skyline ridgeline standards. Staff is recommending approval.

There is an exemption per 26-141 that City Council may waive the requirements of this subsection upon finding that strict application of this subsection may interfere with other objectives of the CDC and the Community Plan. Planning staff included this as a potential avenue for exemption. If the recommendation is to exempt that, you don't necessarily need to approve it under the variance criteria.

We've received public comment all in favor of this application from our IT Department, the fire chief and the police chief about how better service in that area will be a benefit to public safety. We also received public comment from Yampa Valley Electric as well as a property owner in that area that talked about the need for better connectivity in that area for his business.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Irene Cook, Applicant Representative:

The reason we're here tonight is to improve the 4G LTE capacity for Verizon customers in the west area of Steamboat Springs. Everyone from the police chief to the business owners on Elk River Road to the neighbors in the vicinity have made us very aware that there is lacking capacity and coverage in that area.

The two drivers that dictate the need for a new cell site are coverage and capacity. Coverage is the need to expand wireless service in an area that has either no service or poor service. Capacity is the need for more resources – the bandwidth to handle voice calls and data volume. Existing resources are tapped out. During the day, the user experience dips to an unacceptable level.

We need to provide for the dramatic increase in capacity demand in the coming years. Between 2010 and 2016, mobile data usage increased 35 times. In 2015 the average data usage was 3.7 gigs per device. Between 2015 and 2017, data usage increased 238%. By 2021, the expectation is that data usage will be 22 gigs per device per month per user. When you consider the fact that most households have multiple devices and most businesses have multiple devices, we have to plan for a dramatic increase in capacity demand in this neighborhood. It also becomes a public safety issue. 76% of 911 calls in this country are made from cell phones; more than half of our households no longer have a landline.

The sheriff has confirmed to me that their office is also very strongly supporting this application. We also have received 293 text messages from Verizon customers in this neighborhood emphasizing the need for and supporting this tower. There's quite a bit of commercial development going in up there. It was just a year ago that the paper called Steamboat's west side a cellular dead zone, and it's not getting any better.

We've provided various maps that show the coverage that will be provided from this tower.

There are three existing major sites for Verizon in Steamboat: One is at the top of the gondola; another is on a condominium building on High Point Drive; one is at Colorado Mountain College. This would be augmented by this proposed site, Steamboat Airport, and what's known

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

as a small cell site that's proposed for the Wal-Mart City Market complex. There's also a site at the base of the gondola that's shared with AT&T.

We were asked to provide photo simulations to help assess the visual impact of the proposed tower.

We've gone through all the criteria for review and approval of a conditional use permit. The application is clearly compatible with the Community Plan, the land-use goals, natural scenic area goals and economic development goals as well as capital facilities and utilities goals. It's consistent with the surrounding uses; we're at a county road and bridge maintenance facility; the adjacent uses are industrial and commercial, and the improved capacity will definitely enhance the existing uses and activities in that area. We feel the monopole design mitigates the visual impact, so the adverse impacts are definitely minimized. The proposed access is by the existing County Shop Road. No adverse environmental impacts are identified. Phasing is not applicable. Compliance with other standards – this definitely meets all the requirements of the CDC, state and federal law.

We have also applied for a variance to the skyline standards. We would submit that the site is not in an area identified in the CDC as an important view corridor. This monopole does not extend above the ridgeline behind where it is located. The only ridgeline where it is exposed is from the intersection of Elk River Road and Highway 40. That is a commercial/industrial area where the existing structures minimize the visual impact.

We feel that strict application of the skyline regulations would interfere with other objectives of the CDC, primarily the health, safety and welfare of the community but also adequate infrastructure, fostering the economic base and encouraging the most appropriate use of land. This is on an existing maintenance lot, and we feel it's a good place for this site to be located.

We would respectfully request that you recommend approval of the conditional use permit and the variance.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Buccino:

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

I think visually this looks least impactful. I think there's one in Yampa sitting on the top, and it looks like a noticeable, triangular pine tree. This would be a bad location for something like that. Can you address that?

Cook: I addressed this in the application narrative that there are definitely good places for monopines, but those are in areas with other trees around so they don't stick out like a sore thumb.

Commissioner Adams asked why this particular tower is not attached to a building as are the others.

Cook: I would've given anything to find a good building to put this on because that would have been an administrative approval. None of the Verizon site acquisition consultants I work with in the Denver market has ever done anything but an administrative approval. We have been able to accommodate the antennas on existing structures. But there just wasn't a place for it here.

Adams: Bob, with this exemption that you brought up a couple times, if it is a City Council having the power and authority to waive this requirement, does that give us an avenue to do that ourselves as a recommendation? Or does that tie their hands in a weird direction if we were to consider anything like that.

Keenan: I think they would appreciate a recommendation from Planning Commission whichever way you'd like to go on that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sean Dering, 2585 Abbey Road, Secretary, West End Village HOA:

The West End Village Homeowners Association initially voiced our opposition to this proposal in a June 30, 2017 presentation to the Routt County Planning Board of Commissioners. We are still concerned with the height variance regarding the tower for the following reasons:

A telecommunications tower 60 feet high would obstruct eastern views of West End Village residents. We are confident of this because last year's construction of the Routt County Weed

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

Mitigation storage shed at 30 feet in height is already impacting the views of West End Village residents. We would like to know why the applicant in their photos did not include commentary from a West End Village vantage point. The West End Village Homeowner's Association understands the necessity of proper cell phone reception for all residents of west and northern Steamboat, especially if it involves better service for public safety officers. We are proposing a possible suggestion to the proposal of a 60-foot tower for constructing a lower, camouflaged telecommunications tower similar to the faux-rock outcropping that was shown earlier on the CMC campus. The application also mentions a monopine-tower construction. We're curious to see what that would look like.

We look forward to discussing possible alternative resolutions to this issue.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Eck asked about the diameter of the proposed pole.

Cook could not find the specific value measurement but said it was less than four feet non-reflective grade galvanized metal, which she said generally creates the least visual impact possible.

Cook: In your packet, we did provide another set of photo simulations that were done in 2014. There is a visual image of the tower taken from the open space at the West End Village subdivision. The tower does not extend above the ridgeline in that photo simulation. It is definitely buffered by the mountain in the background. The only reason I didn't include that in the presentation was that I specifically included the views that were requested by the city.

Adams: Are we able to rely on the coverage analysis? Is that a guarantee that they're providing, or how do we look at that as a commission?

Keenan: I think we need to assume that the coverage indicated in the coverage maps is the coverage that's going to be provided. It looks like West End Village already has pretty good existing coverage, so they may not directly benefit from this new coverage. So the cost-benefit to the particular neighborhood may not be there, but for the greater community it certainly seems to be a benefit from staff's perspective.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Eck: I think the comments from public safety officials are particularly helpful here. With all the development on the west end, it's become a life safety issue. A 60-foot pole seems big, but looking at this it really is not a visual impact of any significance in my opinion. I think it would be applicable for the waiver for life safety, or if that didn't go, I think the variance criteria to the skyline would apply for the same reason.

Commissioner Eck moved to approve DPF-17-12 with conditions.

Commissioner Buccino seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Commissioners indicated that they are cognizant of the need for this facility and stated that they did not believe the visual impact to be substantial.

VOTE

The motion carried unanimously.

#3: CU-18-07, 424 Lincoln Avenue

STAFF PRESENTATION

Keenan: This is a conditional use application at 424 Lincoln Avenue for approval of a three-year temporary use for a dormitory. This is an extension of previous requests from 2015 and 2016 where they both were approved for temporary use of a dormitory. The applicant is asking again for a three-year approval. They have stated in their application that they are working with an affordable housing developer to potentially come in with a proposal down the line for apartments. They are requesting additional time to go through that process and to continue to provide housing for the workforce here in Steamboat Springs. It has been rented out by Resort Group in previous years. It has been helpful in that regard to provide housing to our workforce here – particularly in the winter. It does come into use in the summer as well.

Planning staff has done an analysis, and as with previous applications, we are not able to make a recommendation for approval. We found that it doesn't comply with the Community Plan directions and policies and is not consistent with the zone district. The Community Plan and the zone district call for more active uses on the pedestrian level. The dormitory use is a prohibited use in the Commercial Old Town zone district where this is to be located. So this is the only way that it could be approved is as a temporary use.

With that said, Planning staff certainly understands the need for housing and the benefit to the community. If Planning Commission were to recommend that this was in conformance, we would recommend that it be approved with the attached conditions which limit the time period for approval.

We've had public comment provided by the applicant that was in favor of this proposal.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Ryan Spaustat, Landmark Consultants, Applicant Representative:

There's two of the four criteria that Planning staff didn't think we met. The Land Use chart in the Community Area Plan does have some very specific uses. I would argue, though, that you can

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

cherry-pick things out of the Plan. There are a number of goals and policies and strategies outlined in the Plan that this project does provide with this dormitory use.

The Plan talks about integrating and balancing residential uses. Think of mixed uses on a horizontal level instead of a vertical level where you have residential next door to restaurants and shops and things like that. Strategy 2.1 talks about mixed-use development patterns. Policy LU5-1 talks about densities that support transit; most of the users in there now are using public or employee-provided transit to and from their job. This is located on the bus lines and is convenient to transit.

I think there is a case to be made that this application does meet a large number of goals and strategies and policies in the Community Area Plan.

This is in the CO zone district, which does encourage activity on the street. But it also talks about traditional development; this building has been there since 1967. So it is very much a traditional development for Steamboat.

The use is dormitory now instead of hotel or lodge as it was previously, but as it functions I don't know that it's really all that much different. If it was a hotel, the front office is where you'd check in and have breakfast in the morning; now it's a place where people stay and it's a communal kitchen.

I think there's also a case to be made that this already fits into downtown; the building has been there for 50+ years. The use is different but not that different.

There are two separate developers looking at strategies to redevelop the property. One of the proposals would involve tax credits from the state and federal government which they cannot apply for until 2019. Depending on when they're actually awarded, there's potential that this could stretch out to three years before they have funding in place and come to you guys with a proposal.

The Routt County Housing Committee, in their December 13, 2016 final report, identified the need for 34 new seasonal beds per year to meet the 2020 goals. The community is currently not

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

generating those, but removing the 30+ that the Alpiner does provide certainly doesn't help meet that goal; it makes it more unachievable.

So as opposed to having the property stay unused while these development strategies are flushed out, I think it makes sense to use it as seasonal workforce housing.

The Downtown Plan is currently being drafted. There is a shift in how we shop. Also, people want more of an experience when they go out, so it's causing a huge shift in retail. One of the things the Downtown Plan is looking at is from 3rd to 12th streets along Lincoln Avenue, there's 715,000 square feet of potential commercial space. That's the equivalent of 13 Wal-Marts. It seems unlikely that we could sustain that much retail. So the Downtown Plan is looking at not requiring retail east of 6th and west of 10th. They'll have a report sometime the end of this year. It will be up to you as the city to adopt zoning amendments based on that. But I think there's a distinct possibility you will see a recommendation to eliminate the requirement of retail on the first floor outside of some core downtown area.

Chris Paoli, Applicant:

I think it was three years ago we started working with Mountain Resorts. In the beginning they leased 100% of the building in the winter and just the upstairs in the summer. Then two years ago they started leasing the entire property. They had more off-season demand than they originally anticipated. Since this process began, we've made a pretty significant investment in the property for the benefit of the community in general. Our thought process was that the money we were making was probably better spent making the property look good and being a good neighbor. We put on a new roof, redid all the mechanical systems, did sidewalks in front of the property as a condition of approval. Last year we redid the parking area, painted the exterior, fixed some trim, added a sprinkler system. So we've been doing our best to be a partner with the community.

As you saw from the letters, all the neighbors were pretty supportive. When this was a hotel, we had a lot of varied guests, which created lots of varied experiences for our neighbors. I think they were all happy with the consistency and cleanliness. All the people who have been there have been great. Resort Group has done a good job managing the property.

As an active realtor as far as leasing and selling goes, I can tell you that I have far more owners saying I need a new tenant than I do tenants saying I need to find a new space. The idea of creating a more active environment and using these spaces to create vitality with businesses

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

doesn't really exist in our market because nobody is excited to open anything, especially on that side of 5th Street.

If it was redeveloped, the problem regarding first-floor residential use would be parking spots. So it's not like we're going to create an entire ground floor of active area; we're going to create a 600 square foot commercial space with a parking lot behind it.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Eck confirmed that hotels are a conditional use; multi-family residential is a use by right as long as the residential units are not on the pedestrian level. He verified with Keenan that the reason this is proposed as a dormitory rather than a hotel use is due to the presence of a communal kitchen and the lack of kitchens in each room.

Keenan: A hotel use would have more turnover and is seen as a more active use for the ground floor. We do have a hotel definition and a dormitory definition in the Code. A dormitory is for residency for a defined period of time; a hotel is meant to be more of a nightly or weekly type of occupancy.

Eck: So a dormitory is a temporary conditional use. Criteria 1 is compatibility with the Community Area Plan and other plans. Does the fact that it's temporary make it more compatible because it's only there for a little while?

Keenan: I think you have to look at the use itself and compare it to the Community Area Plan and zone district purpose and intent to draw those conclusions. The only thing staff can rely on is what's in the code for that zone district to see whether it's an appropriate use, temporary or not. We wouldn't even be able to have this conversation if it wasn't coming through as temporary. Maybe the temporary nature of it makes it acceptable given other alternatives and considerations. It's just some flexibility that's built into the code because the code can't anticipate all the possible scenarios that we might face. This is a somewhat unique circumstance where you've got a hotel that went beyond its useful life and has been vacant; there's a housing need; I think this is why the code can contemplate these things. But in our analysis, we've also found things that directly conflict with this typically prohibited use in downtown; the reasons why are somewhat explicit in the code. That's why we're not able to make a recommendation for approval even though we understand the need and it's temporary.

Eck: You would think that someone without a kitchen probably contributes more to the vibrancy of the area if they're running across the street to grab a taco, which is one of the objectives.

Adams: During that hearing in 2016 when you asked for two years, there were a lot of comments from commissioners that didn't want to see this again in two years. Now instead of coming in with a plan, we're asking for three years. You say that maybe there is a plan coming, but why isn't there one yet? What kind of plan is there? How do we resolve this?

Paoli: I was really hoping that Commissioner MacArthur was telling staff to let us have it for a longer term as opposed to two years. That's how I was interpreting it. He knew it would come back because nothing is changing in two years. Right now we have an asset and we have demand; this is the way to meet that demand and help solve a problem in our community. I can say with 100% confidence that there is no other option that would be considered by any lodging person who we've met. We have an active real estate market, but there's no construction except for single-family homes; and there's a reason. We haven't gotten to the point in the cycle where those kind of activities make sense. Our best hotel option at the base of the ski area turned into a points residence system. While we're trying to find ways to make money, this is an asset that – it's beyond its useful life. Everybody would love to have it be something different, but the options we have in front of us are all residential. One of them is from the affordable housing developer that came to us. He put a proposal in front of the Housing Authority. We've had another developer reach out to us and also it's going to be a housing option. There isn't anybody out there talking to us on the commercial side, and they're definitely not looking at this site to go to a hotel.

Adams: This may be the highest possible use of this parcel in your opinion, but if it's an illegal thing we can't just keep approving a temporary use; we need to be trying to find a permanent solution.

Paoli: Our code just needs to be reexamined. We're stuck in a situation where we have an asset; this is the highest and best use I think for us and the community. We're meeting a community need. The three years was not only tied to the conversation with people that have been talking to us but the guys at the mountain who have been talking about trying to solve their housing problem on their own. If they haven't put a plan in front of you guys yet, there's no way they're going to have anything on the ground in less than three years.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

Adams: I feel like what I'm hearing is that there's no better alternative so let's just keep doing this temporary use forever until there is a better alternative. We need to make a way that this is not going to be temporary anymore.

Weese: So say we're three years down the road and we've accumulated six years of use of this structure, is there something that would cause this to be a permitted use thereafter?

Keenan: No.

Buccino: Could this be used as a hotel right now?

Keenan: A hotel is a conditional use, and it's been more than six months since it was last used as such, so they would need to come back for approval for a hotel as well. I also think they have some other hurdles with the building around making it a hotel.

Adams asked if Paoli could speak more toward the long-term options.

Paoli: Anything that happens would be similar to it is now. Affordable housing would be putting a kitchen in each room so you can technically call them apartments. You're not going to see anybody show up with a bulldozer, tear that down and build something that looks nice and call it a residential project. It might have a different look to it, but it's basically going to be the same structure and they're going to be talking to you about turning them into apartment units. Until we make some changes in the way things operate, you're not going to see significant, dynamic developments occur.

Buccino confirmed that the applicant has owned the parcel for 10 years.

Buccino asked what they were planning to do with the building when they bought it.

Paoli: When we bought it, we were...

Buccino: You bought it at a time of optimistic growth.

Paoli: When we bought it, every single hotel room in this town was occupied by a contractor because they were building One Steamboat Place and Edgemont. People were talking about paying 800-\$1,000 a square foot for a condo downtown. At that rate, the math works. Our intent was to have it full with employees and workers for a couple years and probably present a plan to redevelop. But then the market changed and we have not gotten back to where we need to be. I can't forecast when that's going to happen.

Spaustat: The reason The Reserves project worked on Elk River Road is because the state gave the Housing Authority \$11 million in tax credits to sell through American Express. Then suddenly the math worked. That sat for 10-15 years before that point. Similarly, they bought that lot at the wrong time, couldn't find anything to do with it, worked with the bank to stretch things out repeatedly. Then they were able to get tax credits.

This is a similar situation where it's not for lack of effort that they haven't found a partner on this site. The Housing Authority did put out an RFP. This was selected as one of those projects. If they are able to get tax credits in the next two years, the math changes quite a bit.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Buccino: The building looks better on the outside than it did two years ago. You have added the sidewalks and updated the infrastructure, and now that building is part of the downtown community. I wasn't for this project giving you guys any more time, but reading all the comments from all of your neighbors speaks volumes to me in a public arena. If the guy next door said, I'm sick of the people that are in that place, that would carry a lot of weight for me. I

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

have to accept that same kind of weight when most of those neighbors are saying they like it. We definitely need housing. If you're not going to use this building downtown, then it becomes dilapidated and even worse because there's no vibrancy because physically, there's nothing they can do. They're not going to tear it down. So we're kind of in a quandary as a commission because the alternative is a building that's going to be boarded up. Forcing them to sell it to someone who will redevelop it is not a reality; it just doesn't happen; if they could, he would.

I understand as a temporary use it's not part of our code where we can approve it in the CO district. I don't know what the code will change to in the next five years, but I have to consider this where we are right now. I would say that this is the greatest and best use as a community.

Commissioner Buccino moved to approve CU-18-07 for a duration of three years.

Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Eck: We might have some changes in 2019 with the Downtown Plan. I think because of that I can justify two years. I don't know strictly from a code application if I can justify three years. I think what comes with the downtown study is the basis for a temporary approval.

Adams: I tend to agree with you, George. The fact that we are trying to take this broad, new look – somehow this magical change with this downtown plan that's going to make everything economically viable – is great. I want to be able to have a code that does reflect the economy as the applicant spoke to. I would love the code to catch up so that we can say we have a brand-new perspective with public input that this is the direction downtown would like to go; let's weigh this project on the updated code. That speaks very heavily to me. I'm thinking we should be taking another look at this under the new code sooner rather than later. I think the idea of approving this as the highest and best temporary use with the outdated code makes sense. I kind of think three years is too much.

Buccino confirmed that any code changes as a result of the Downtown Plan would probably be brought forward early next year.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

Calihan: I don't expect anything that comes out of this plan to radically change our concept of what's happening downtown in Steamboat. So three years makes sense to me that we could have a fully adopted change in code in that timeframe and then have the best look at this. I don't love this proposed recurrent use, but I would hate to see us lose any more workforce housing or housing in general; we are kind of at a crisis point.

Weese: I agree with Lee and Mike. I think having this building being used is going to be a bigger benefit than having it vacant in any way. I'm very pessimistic about seeing a code change within three years that's going to really benefit downtown. There is definitely going to be some sort of a market change. Looking at retail spaces and how often they change, it happens quite a bit. What we're essentially talking about is that in three years, the lower floor is going to be commercial and the upper floors are going to be multi-family. I'm reluctant to say that if I'm here in three years, I would approve this again. What I don't want to see is this use be done in perpetuity without a bigger plan.

Adams reiterated that he will be voting against this motion because he would like to review it under any code changes initiated by the completion of the Downtown Plan. He said he agrees with this particular temporary use.

Gibbs: I want to temper expectations a bit about what a plan can do or changes to the code. A plan or code changes doesn't instantly change the market, the economy, the cost of construction, which I think are all far more important in what's going to happen on any site downtown. Certainly we'll do things with the code to try and make it easier to accomplish the things that the plan envisions.

Adams: Or you could look at is a code catching up to market; maybe the market already wants to do something like this and we just need a code that reflects that so it doesn't have to be temporary use anymore.

Eck: We are going to be talking about where first-floor commercial should be required. I don't know if dormitories are on the agenda, but I think they should be given our mountain resort nature.

Adams: What I'm excited about with the new Downtown Plan is getting public input.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018
VOTE

The motion carried with commissioners Adams and Eck opposing.

#4: CU-18-09, Snow Bowl Plaza

STAFF PRESENTATION

Kelly Douglas:

The application before you tonight is a conditional use application; they're requesting approval of two temporary shipping containers to be used for storage for a period not to exceed two years. They're located adjacent to Riverside Plaza; this is the Snow Bowl bowling alley. The property is zoned Commercial Services. No use standard modifications are requested. No public comment has been received.

Staff is recommending approval. Condition #1 has been updated per our discussion at work session on Monday.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

None.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Adams asked Douglas to walk the Commission through the updated condition of approval.

Douglas: Per our conversation on Monday, we wanted to be a little more specific about what would trigger the CO, since there's more than one aspect of this project that could want one. Their goal is to stay operational as long as possible, so we want to help support them doing that.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

So the CO trigger would be for any improvements that expand the footprint of the existing structure. We're talking about the development plan addition that you'll see a little further down the line.

Eck: So they're doing inside renovations now. They want to have these containers so they can operate inside while they do outside work. The containers are going to be going away because the new expansion is going to be performing the functions.

Applicant: Within the existing footprint that we have, to try to maximize the space for customers and have that function better, we do not have the storage we need for dry storage and refrigerated storage. So these two storage containers would house that storage for us. So it would be critical to the operation.

Eck: At some point you're going to have to knock out these containers because you're expanding where they are, correct?

The applicant confirmed.

Applicant: The anticipated expansion would be a separate structure that will be attached to the existing structure. The hope is that if we're closed down it's a fairly limited amount of time. How operations go over the next year or year and a half will help us determine what that future expansion looks like.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONER DELIBERATION/MOTION

Commissioner Buccino moved to approve CU-18-09 with the updated conditions as reflected in the memo.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018
Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA #5
FINAL MINUTES APPROVED
Planning Commission Minutes
June 28, 2018

#5: Approval of Minutes: June 4 Work Session

Commissioner Eck moved to approve the June 4, 2018 meeting minutes.

Commissioner Weese seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

#6: Approval of Minutes: June 7 Public Hearing

Commissioner Eck moved to approve the June 7, 2018 meeting minutes.

Commissioner Buccino seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Director's Report

Gibbs: On Thursday, July 12 we're going to be having two public meetings concerning the Downtown Plan. They're both going to be held at the Steamboat Art Museum. We'll have one in the morning between 8 and 10 and one in the afternoon being co-sponsored by the Pilot as part of their Community Conversations series; that will be from 5 to 7. The consultants will be here; there will be a number of stations set up in the museum for discussion of different topics. We're going to present what we've learned so far from our conversations with the working group as well as the first round of public meetings and the responses we got through the online survey. We got 634 individual responses to the online survey. We'll have some initial thoughts on strategies on how we respond to some of those comments and goals that we heard from the public. I would very much encourage you to attend one or both. Please encourage folks that you know with an interest in downtown to attend.

Adjournment

Commissioner Eck moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

Commissioner Buccino seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.