



PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

October 26, 2020, 1:00 PM

Virtual

75 S. Frontage Road - Vail, Colorado, 81657

1. Call to Order

- 1.1. Register in advance for this webinar:
https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Y9jQ4H5gQnGFCWw-TbcG_g

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

1.2. Attendance

Present: Ludwig Kurz, Karen Perez, Rollie Kjesbo, Brian Gillette, Henry Pratt, Pete Seibert, John-Ryan Lockman

Absent: None

2. Main Agenda

- 2.1. A request for a recommendation to the Vail Town Council to establish a new 60 min. Special Development District, (Alura Vail), pursuant to Section 12-9-A Special Development (SDD) District, Vail Town Code, to allow for the development of 24 multifamily residential units in eight (8) buildings with associated site improvements, located at 1472 Matterhorn Circle/Vail Park Meadows Subdivision, and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC20-0028)

Applicant: Alura Vail LLC, represented by The Brown Studio

Planner: Jonathan Spence

Commissioner Pratt: Recused himself due to working on a project neighboring this property.

Planner Spence: Introduced this project as a preliminary review for the former Park Meadows site. Today's item will mostly be for the applicant to introduce this project and idea. Staff, including Fire and Public Works, has conducted a preliminary review and shared comments with the applicant. Spence then began to describe the scope of the project. There are three deviations from the Town Code to be requested. These deviations are for setbacks, parking count, and parking location.

Lina Shahhal with the Brown Studio: Introduced the other members of the project at the meeting. She then began to describe the project scope. There will be 8 buildings. Total required parking spaces are 40, but they are asking for 36 for better landscaping and storage on site.

Commissioner Gillette: Asked where the setback variations are being requested.

Spence: Specified that relief is being requested on the north, east, and west side of the property. He also mentioned that this project had gone in front of the DRB for a conceptual review in the previous week.

Commissioner Perez: Asked about the landscaping proposed.

The applicant and planner Spence showed and discussed the landscaping using a presented map.

Franklin Boyer(applicant): went on to discuss the setback deviation request as well. Surrounding neighbors have a large space between their development and the applicant's lot lines.

Spence: Brought up a concern that Fire had about potential illegal parking blocking the fire lane.

Gillette: Asked a question about possible neighbor concerns.

Franklin: Have not heard anything from any of their neighbors and didn't expect to hear concern from them due to the distance from this development to neighboring development.

Chairman Kurz: Asked how easy it would be to find the property lines should PEC members want to visit the property in person.

Spence: Recommended that the PEC bring a map shown on screen as there is not clear marking on site.

Commissioner Lockman: Asked about the parking count deviation. Asked if the applicant will be managing the parking. Also asked about snow storage

Franklin: Yes. Parking will be managed. Also pointed out the proposed snow storage area on a map.

Lena: Further explained that the parking provided will be for one space per unit and some additional guest parking spaces. Also stated that this location has close proximity to the bus system and bike path.

The applicants continued to explain the proposed design of the site using shared materials and drawings.

Kurz: Asked if any additional red flags came to light as a result of staff review.

Spence: Again mentioned the fire lane concerns.

Gillette: Asked if there were similar projects that this could be compared to.

Spence: Responded by saying generally, no. Each SDD is different in their needs and deviations.

Seibert: Asked about the employee housing units.

Franklin: The project overall is aimed at employees in Vail, but in order to make sure it work financially, not all units could be EHUs.

Seibert: Stated concern that seasonal rentals are more likely to create

parking issues.

Perez: Asked if they would prohibit short term rentals.

Franklin: Said no, but said it was possible that they would limit how many times individual units could be rented for this purpose.

Commissioner Kjesbo: Had a number of concerns. Concerned about the reduction in parking for the long term. Concerned that the intended use may change after some number of years. Most buildings around this property has covered parking. Likely would not be in favor of an SDD currently.

Kurz: Asked a question about storage for outdoor gear.

Franklin: Indicated that there is storage for each unit. There is additional storage space inside the units themselves as well.

Public Comment

Greg Baldwin: Owns a second home near the southeast side of the lot. Concerned about looking down on the development and is interested in seeing more tree screening. Would like to see a mountain feel maintained and doesn't want the area to feel like a suburban subdivision.

Connie Kincaid-Strahan: Owns Vail Property Brokerage and represents an owner to the south of this development. Wants to know the height of the retaining wall on the property.

Robbie (applicant): The top of the wall shouldn't protrude much higher than the grading itself. The wall will mostly be on the southeast end of the property, this wall shouldn't protrude more than a few inches above the grade on the south end.

Connie: Had a question about access to the rec path.

Robbie: This path is the city's land and the applicant has no intention of messing with it. No path is proposed specifically to access this rec path. Between the rec path and the project, trees are proposed for screening.

Connie: Asked about the total project height.

Lena: Project is currently at 29ft. The maximum allowed is 45 ft.

Robbie: Didn't want the project to have the feel of a condominium complex by maximizing height.

Connie: Asked about when the applicant anticipates approval and the construction timeline.

Franklin: Would like to be under construction by April if possible.

Mitch Karlin: Asked about an elevation drawing for the southeast corner.

Robbie: Currently does not have an elevation for the retaining wall on that side.

Russ Craney: A representative for Coldstream. Had a question about the previous Park Meadows height.

Franklin: That was around 26 ft. but would need to double check. This project should be similar in scope. Stated that he would stay in contact with Russ/Coldstream.

Rollie Kjesbo moved to table to November 23, 2020. Brian Gillette seconded the motion and it passed (6-0).

Abstain: (1) Pratt

- 2.2. A request for review of an Exemption Plat, pursuant to Section 13-12, Exemption Plat Review Procedures, Vail Town Code, to establish utility and driveway easements at Red Sandstone Elementary School, located at 545, 551, & 559 North Frontage Road/Block 2, a portion of Lot 8, Vail Potato Patch Filing 1, and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC20-0029) 10 min.

Applicant: Town of Vail

Planner: Erik Gates

Planner Gates introduced the project and the purpose of the application. Erik provided a brief history of the site and referenced ERWSD as having reviewed the plat.

Rollie Kjesbo moved to approve. Brian Gillette seconded the motion and it passed (7-0).

- 2.3. A request for review of an exemption plat, pursuant to Title 13 Chapter 12, Exemption Plat, Vail Town Code, to allow for increases to the allowable Site Coverage and Gross Residential Floor Area (GRFA) allotment for individual lots within the Spraddle Creek Estates subdivision, and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC20-0015) 30 min.

Applicant: Spraddle Creek Estates Homeowners, represented by Zehren and Associates

Planner: Jonathan Spence

Spence: This is largely the same proposal as the one seen by the PEC two weeks ago. Spence then went on to describe the history of this proposal at the PEC. Additional photos were included as part of this review session.

Zehren: As mentioned in other meetings, they would like to increase site coverage to avoid maxing out building height all over.

Seibert: The idea of expanding building envelopes to keep building height down makes sense.

Zehren: To clarify, they are not proposing to increase building envelopes, just to be able to use more coverage within them.

Spence: Doesn't feel that the relatively modest request will have a significant impact on the visibility of these homes.

Gillette: We have not done a comparison to Forest Road site coverage here have we?

Spence: Due to the shape of developments on Forest Road, this would not be applicable or useful.

Gillette: Concerned that because of the way the code is written that additional GRFA at Spraddle would all be above ground and create a larger

apparent bulk and mass. Whereas, at Forest Road additional floor area often has to be placed underground.

Spence: Generally doesn't see this as an issue as Forest Road homes are allowed a similar proportion of bulk and mass.

Kurz: Any additional changes still go to DRB?

Zehren: That is correct.

Gillette: Still concerned about additions making use of additional site coverage and creating very long building frontages.

Zehren: Willing to look into making increases in site coverage proportionally smaller.

Gillette: Asked for either a mock-up of the worst-case scenario of build out or an analysis of Forest Road site coverage and GRFA in comparison to this request.

Pratt: It appears that Spraddle is proposing a smaller proportion of site coverage to GRFA than Forest Road.

Spence: That is correct but feels that comparing Forest Road to Spraddle Creek in this way is not comparing apples to apples.

Gillette: The way Spraddle was platted originally was to avoid huge, highly visible houses. Concerned that this proposal may lose that intent.

Zehren: Showed some example lots and building envelopes to show that many lots are limited in how much longer they can grow. Most lots have homes that reach from end to end of their building envelopes currently.

Gillette: Felt much better about the proposal after seeing these examples.

Lockman: Generally ok with it based off of staff's analysis.

Pratt: Feels that modeling out potential buildouts isn't helpful as different architects will have different designs and solutions to lot restrictions. Feels that seeing existing buildings and their envelopes is more helpful here.

No public comment.

Perez: Stated that her comments from the last meeting had not been addressed in this application.

Rollie Kjesbo moved to approve. Brian Gillette seconded the motion and it passed (6-1).

Ayes: (6) Gillette, Kjesbo, Kurz, Lockman, Pratt, Seibert

Nays: (1) Perez

3. Approval of Minutes

3.1. October 12, 2020 PEC Results

Rollie Kjesbo moved to approve. Brian Gillette seconded the motion and it

passed (7-0).

4. Adjournment

Rollie Kjesbo moved to adjourn. Brian Gillette seconded the motion and it passed (7-0).

The applications and information about the proposals are available for public inspection during regular office hours at the Town of Vail Community Development Department, 75 South Frontage Road. The public is invited to attend the project orientation and the site visits that precede the public hearing in the Town of Vail Community Development Department. Times and order of items are approximate, subject to change, and cannot be relied upon to determine at what time the Planning and Environmental Commission will consider an item. Please call (970) 479-2138 for additional information. Please call 711 for sign language interpretation 48 hour prior to meeting time.
Community Development Department