

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS
TOWN OF MOUNTAIN VILLAGE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2015**

Call to Order

Acting Chairman, David Eckman, called the meeting of the Design Review Board of the Town of Mountain Village to order at 10:05 a.m. on Thursday, January 8, 2015, in the Conference Room at 455 Mountain Village Boulevard, Mountain Village, Colorado, 81435.

Attendance

The following Board/Alternate members were present and acting:

Banks Brown	Phil Evans
David Eckman	Luke Trujillo
Greer Garner	Keith Brown
Kristine Perpar	Daniel Zemke

The following Board members were absent:

Bill Hoins

Town Staff in attendance:

Katie Cox, Planner
Chris Hawkins, Director of Community Development

Public in attendance:

Dylan Henderson	David Craige
Sean Stoger	Jerry Ross
Jason Merrit	Heather Young
Brad Larsen	Randy Edwards
Rube Fellicelli	Lyn Gruss
Bob Saunders	Tim Greene
Lyn Holbet	Noah Sheedy
David Ballode	Jolana Vanek
Scott Pittenger	Greg Pack
Chris Hazen	Katie Singer
Tim Cannon	Stefanie Solomon
Penelope Gleason	Jake McTigue
Tami Huntsman	Corrie McMills
John Kelly	Adam Singer
Deborah Gesmundo	Scot Kelley

Reading and Approval of Summary of Motions of the December 4, 2014 Design Review Board Meeting

On a **Motion** made by Banks Brown and seconded by Kristine Perpar, the DRB voted 7-0 to approve the Summary of Motions from the December 4, 2014 meeting, with amendments.

Consideration of a Design Review Process Development Application for a Porte Cochere and Pool Addition on the Western Façade on Lots OS-1-MVB And Lot 38-50-51R – Continued From December 4, 2014 DRB Meeting

Upon review and discussion on a **Motion** by Greer Garner and seconded by Kristine Perpar, the DRB voted 7-0 to approve the Resolution for the design review development application for a Porte Cochere and Pool Addition on the Western Façade on Lots OS-1-MVB and Lot 38-50-51R.

Community Development Director Chris Hawkins requested the Design Review Board consider hearing item number 6 - Single Family Residence on Lot 250A next, thereby moving item number 4 Subdivision, Rezone, Density Transfer, and Conditional Use Permit on Lot 640A and Tract OSP-35A to be heard after lunch.

Consideration of a Design Review Process Development Application for an Addition on an Existing Single Family Residence on Lot 250A – Continued from December 4, 2014 DRB meeting. Continued to the February 5, 2015 DRB meeting.

Community Development Director Chris Hawkins requested the Design Review Board continue this item till February 5, 2015.

Acting Chairman David Eckman recused himself from this item due to a conflict of interest. Kristine Perpar will be acting chairman.

On a **Motion** by Greer Garner and seconded by Banks Brown, the DRB voted 7-0 to Continue the Design Review Process Development Application for an Addition on an Existing Single Family Residence on Lot 250A till February 5, 2015 to be held in the Conference Room at 455 Mountain Village Boulevard, Mountain Village, Colorado, 81435

Consideration of a Recommendation to Town Council for a Subdivision, Rezone, Density Transfer, and Conditional Use Permit on Lot 640A and Tract OSP-35A

Design review board member Daniel Zemke recused himself from this item due to a conflict of interest.

Upon review and discussion on a **Motion** by Phil Evans and seconded by Banks Brown, the DRB voted 7-0 to recommend the Town Council approve Subdivision, Rezone, Density Transfer, and Conditional Use Permit on Lot 640A and Tract OSP-35A with the findings and conditions as set forth in the staff memo of record as follows:

Rezoning Findings

1. The proposed rezoning is in general conformance with the goals, policies and provisions of the Comprehensive Plan because, without limitation:
 - 1.1. The development applications meet Land Use Principles, Policies and Actions, Principle I because the development will promote a land use pattern envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan that will provide economic and social vibrancy;
 - 1.2. The development applications meet Land Use Principles, Policies and Actions, Principle I, Policy B that requires rezoning, Planned Unit Developments (PUD), subdivisions, special use permits, density transfers, and other discretionary land use applications to be in

- general conformance with the Land Use Plan, the Subarea Plans and their associated principles and policies, and the applicable policies of the Comprehensive Plan;
 - 1.3. The development applications meet Land Use Principles, Policies and Actions, Principle I, Policy C that permits development applications in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan per the applicable criteria for decision-making;
 - 1.4. The development applications meet Land Use Principles, Policies and Actions, Principle I, Policy G that requires a rezoning, PUD, subdivision or density transfer to meet the certain site standards that have been embodied in the CDC as the Comprehensive Plan Project Standards (Please refer to criterion below);
 - 1.5. Meadows Subarea Plan Principle, Policy and Action II.B requires any applicant who proposes a rezoning, density transfer, subdivision to strive to reach the target density outlined in the Meadows Development Table;
 - 1.6. The Meadows Development Table sets forth a target density 91 deed restricted units;
 - 1.7. The applicant is providing a playfield as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan, with the final design and improvements to be shaped and evaluated as a part of the required Design Review Process development application; and,
 - 1.8. A fence will be provided along Northstar property in appropriate locations to prevent trespassing.
2. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Zoning and Land Use Regulations because, without limitation:
 - 2.1. Employee housing is a permitted use in the current Multi-Family Zone District and is a conditional use in the proposed Full Use Active Open Space Zone District;
 - 2.2. The CDC density limitation will not be exceeded because new workforce housing does not count towards the density limitation;
 - 2.3. The platted open space requirements will be met because additional open space is being created; and
 - 2.4. The development will be required to comply with the building height, lot coverage and general easement setback requirements during the required Design Review Process development application.
3. The proposed rezoning meets the Comprehensive Plan project standards as follows:
 - 3.1. Visual impacts have been minimized and mitigated to the extent practical, while also providing the targeted density identified in each subarea plan development table. It is understood that visual impacts will occur with development. The proposed development has been pushed back on the site to mitigate visual impacts to Northstar property owners. The building and roof have been articulated to mitigate visual impacts. Significant landscaping in accordance with the Landscaping Regulations combined with the application of the Design Regulations during the required Design Review Process will further mitigate visual impacts.
 - 3.2. The proposed development has appropriate scale and mass that fits the site(s) under review because, without limitation:
 - 3.2.1. The multi-family use is the same as surrounding land uses.
 - 3.2.2. The building height and four stories are similar to several projects in the Meadows, such as Prospect Plaza, Big Billies and Parker Ridge.
 - 3.2.3. The proposed floor area on the site has approximately the same Floor Area Ratio (FAR) as Prospect Plaza and Big Billies, with the proposed development having an approximate FAR of 0.9:1 and Prospect Plaza and Big Billies having approximate FAR of 0.8:1.

- 3.2.4. Prospect Plaza is located next to the low density projects of The Boulders and Coyote Court that have an approximate FAR of 0.4:1 and 0.2:1, respectively;
 - 3.2.5. Big Billies with an FAR of approximately 0.8:1 is located next to The Terraces and Parker Ridge that have approximate FAR of 0.3:1 and 0.6:1, respectively; and
 - 3.2.6. High density development with higher Floor Area Ratios are located next to lower density development with lower Floor Area Ratios in The Meadows, thus, the proposed development fits within this pre-existing development pattern.
 - 3.3. Environmental and geotechnical impacts shall be avoided, minimized and mitigated, to the extent practical, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, while also providing the target density identified in each subarea plan development table because, without limitation:
 - 3.3.1. Wetland impacts will be fully evaluated with the Design Review Process development application pursuant to the CDC Wetland Regulations and the United States Army Corps of Engineers Clean Water Act requirements.;
 - 3.3.2. A geotechnical report will be required concurrent with any future building permit application; and,
 - 3.3.3. The development is not located in a floodplain.
 - 3.4. Site-specific issues such as, but not limited to the location of trash facilities, grease trap cleanouts, restaurant vents and access points shall have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Town, with a condition of approval requiring trash and recycling facilities to be located to minimize and mitigate impacts to Northstar and Timberview;
 - 3.5. There are not impacts to the skier experience or ski runs.
4. The proposed rezoning is consistent with public health, safety and welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the use of land and its resources because, without limitation:
 - 4.1. The Telluride Fire Protection District will provide fire protection services;
 - 4.2. The Mountain Village Police Department will provide police protection services;
 - 4.3. Water and sewer are available from the Town of Mountain Village;
 - 4.4. The proposed development is envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan to provide for economic and social vibrancy, thus creating a more sustainable community;
 - 4.5. Employers in the Telluride Region cannot find enough employees for their businesses during the 2014-2015 ski season, with this proposed development providing housing for approximately 146 employees;
 - 4.6. The development will reduce the amount of carbon emissions generated within the Telluride Region, with approximately 146 less commuters into the region on a daily basis; and
 - 4.7. The development will reduce the amount of economic leakage out of the Telluride Region, with local employees spending more dollars locally rather than in the surrounding commuting communities.
5. The proposed rezoning is justified because there are specific policies in the Comprehensive Plan that contemplate the rezoning.
6. Adequate public facilities and services are available to serve the intended land uses.
7. The proposed rezoning shall not create vehicular or pedestrian circulation hazards or cause parking, trash or service delivery congestion, because, without limitation:
 - 7.1. A transportation study completed for the Comprehensive Plan showed that Adams Ranch Road has a volume to capacity ratio of 0.41, thus only 41 percent of capacity at build out;
 - 7.2. Russell Drive showed it was only at 8 percent of capacity at build out;

- 7.3. Adams Ranch Road and Russell Drive have a good level of service to provide access for the development;
 - 7.4. The access drives, parking areas, delivery area(s); and trash and recycling areas will be designed to not create any vehicular or pedestrian hazards concurrent with the required Design Review Process development application; and
 - 7.5. Pedestrian infrastructure will be provided to ensure this development is connected to the sidewalk along Adam's Ranch Road and the bus stops located on the north side of such road.
8. The proposed rezoning meets all applicable Town regulations and standards.

Density Transfer Findings

1. The criteria for decision for a rezoning are met;
2. The density transfer meets the density transfer and density bank policies because, without limitation:
 - 2.1. The Town Council may create workforce housing density that is not in the density bank and transfer it to a site because new workforce housing density is not subject to the density limitation.
3. The proposed density transfer meets all applicable Town regulations and standards.

Conditional Use Permit Findings

1. The proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan as set forth under the rezoning findings above;
2. The proposed conditional use is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses and the neighborhood and will not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties or on services and infrastructure because, without limitation:
 - 2.1. The multi-family use is the same as surrounding land uses.
 - 2.2. The building height and four stories are similar to several projects in the Meadows, such as Prospect Plaza, Big Billies and Parker Ridge.
 - 2.3. The proposed floor area on the site has approximately the same Floor Area Ratio (FAR) as Prospect Plaza and Big Billies, with the proposed development having an approximate FAR of 0.9:1 and Prospect Plaza and Big Billies having an approximate FAR of 0.8:1.
 - 2.4. Prospect Plaza is located next to the low density projects of The Boulders and Coyote Court that have an approximate FAR of 0.4:1 and 0.2:1, respectively;
 - 2.5. Big Billies with an FAR of approximately 0.8:1 is located next to The Terraces and Parker Ridge that have approximate FAR of 0.3:1 and 0.6:1, respectively;
 - 2.6. High density development with higher Floor Area Ratios are located next to lower density development with lower Floor Area Ratios in The Meadows, thus, the proposed development fits within this pre-existing development pattern.
 - 2.7. Visual impacts have been mitigated by pushing the development into the hillside and by roof and building articulation.
 - 2.8. Visual impacts will be mitigated by intensive landscape buffering to surrounding uses.
 - 2.9. The development will be evaluated pursuant to the Design Regulations which will further ensure compatibility and harmony with surrounding land uses.
3. The design, development and operation of the apartments does not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood, public facilities, infrastructure or open space;
4. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners and uses as outlined under

- number 2 above since the Meadows has a few examples of high density development adjacent to low density development;
5. The design, development and operation of the proposed apartments shall not have a significant adverse effect on open space or the purposes of the facilities owned by the Town;
 6. The design, development and operation of the proposed has minimized adverse environmental and visual impacts to the extent possible considering the nature of the proposed conditional use;
 7. The design, development and operation of the proposed apartments has adequate infrastructure, with water, sewer, electric, natural gas, telecommunications, police protection, and fire protection all provided to the site.
 8. The proposed conditional use does not potentially damage or contaminate any public, private, residential or agricultural water supply source; and
 9. The proposed conditional use permit meets all applicable Town regulations and standards.

Subdivision Criteria for Decision

1. The proposed subdivision is in general conformance with the goals, policies and provisions of the Comprehensive Plan as outlined under the rezoning findings above;
2. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the applicable Zoning and Land Use Regulations and any PUD development agreement regulating development of the property as outlined under the rezoning findings above;
3. The proposed density is being evaluated and processed as a concurrent rezoning and density transfer development applications;
4. With compliance of a condition set forth herein, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the applicable Subdivision Regulations;
5. As outlined in the rezoning and conditional use permit criteria, adequate public facilities and services are available to serve the intended land uses;
6. The original subdivision for this area was approved by the County based on a geotechnical report that provided evidence to show that all areas of the proposed subdivision that may involve soil or geological conditions that may present hazards or that may require special precautions have been identified, and that the proposed uses are compatible with such conditions. The applicant will be required to submit a new geotechnical report with any future building permit application;
7. Subdivision access is in compliance with Town standards and codes; and
8. The proposed subdivision meets all applicable Town regulations and standards.

Approval Conditions

1. The rezoning, density transfer and conditional use permit is approving the density and the general location of the building, general scale and mass, parking areas, accessways, and the park. The final location and design of the building, grading, landscaping, parking areas, accessways and other site improvements shall be determined with the required Design Review Process application pursuant to the applicable requirements of the CDC, including but not limited to the Design Regulations, Wetland Regulations and the Road and Driveway Standards.
2. The proposed density and the general location of the building shall remain substantially as shown in the final approved conceptual plans.
3. The scale and mass of the building and the associated floor area shall not increase from that approved during the rezoning; nor shall the amount of building articulation change substantially without approval of the DRB during the Design Review process application.

4. Prior to submitting for the required Design Review Process development application, the applicant shall obtain approval for the wetland delineation from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.
5. The park shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Design Review Board concurrent with the Design Review Process application, including but not limited to access, grading, useable park area, play equipment, river access/river park, and other park features. This final design will only be achieved by the Town working closely with the developer and the community to create the best park possible while also allowing for the efficient development of the workforce housing project.
6. Prior to the Town Council approving the development applications, the applicant shall enter into a development agreement with the Town to address the following and other topics that arise during the rezoning:
 - 6.1. Public Improvements (landscaping, park improvements, new bus stop and shelter by Coyote Court, lighting, etc.)
 - 6.2. Density and bedroom mix;
 - 6.3. Snow storage on the park and maintenance of such area;
 - 6.4. Noise;
 - 6.5. Dogs and cats;
 - 6.6. Maximum occupancy of each unit;
 - 6.7. Wetland protection;
 - 6.8. Fence with Northstar;
 - 6.9. Water Quality Protection.
 - 6.10. Meadows Sign Replacement;
 - 6.11. Park Design; and,
 - 6.12. Composite Utilities Plan.
7. Trash and recycling facilities shall be located to minimize and mitigate impacts to Northstar and Timberview.
8. Prior to the Town Council reviewing the subdivision, the plat shall be revised to meet the Subdivision Regulations.

Other Business

With no further business, on a **Motion** made by Daniel Zemke and seconded Kristine Perpar, the DRB voted 7-0 to adjourn the January 8, 2015 meeting of the Mountain Village Design Review Board at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chris Hawkins, AICP
Director of Community Development