



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Meeting of the Planning Commission for the Town of Frisco Town Hall, 1 East Main Street Thursday, September 20, 2018 at 5:00 P.M.

Call to Order: Andrew Stabile, Chair, opened the meeting.

Roll Call: Robert Anton Franken, Andy Held, Jason Lederer, Lina Lesmes, Donna Skupien, Andy Stabile, Kelsey Withrow

Minutes: September 6, 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment (non-agenda items): There were no public comments.

Agenda Items:

1. **Planning File No. 062-18-MAJ:** A review of the Sketch Plan step of the Major Site Plan Application for a commercial addition to the Frisco Emporium Building, located at 313 East Main Street / Lots 4 & 5, Block 6, Frisco Town site. Applicant: Robert Philippe

Planner Susan Lee presented the staff report explaining the history and existing and proposed layout of the site. There is currently a shared access drive along the project's western property boundary. This access drive is intended to serve the required residential parking and loading area for the development to the west (located on Lots 6, 7, 8, & 9, Block 6, Frisco Town site). The UDC requires a loading area for the two developments. A shared parking and access agreement will be required at final site plan review.

The plans show the dumpster being relocated and enclosed. More detail is needed to demonstrate that the enclosure complies with Town Code.

Most non-residential standards were met; however, one requirement - the Building Material Standards states that "Stucco, steel, or concrete block shall not be primary exterior materials for the majority of a building." The proposed addition will be sided primarily in Corten steel siding. Staff is seeking comments and feedback from the Planning Commission on the proposed siding material.

At the time of final site plan review, the applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with all elements of the Frisco Town Code including access, snow storage, lighting, landscaping, building height, parking, non-residential development standards, etc.

Commission questions for staff included:

- Are we adding parking?
- Are we removing the boardwalk?
- Is the existing building wood siding, the new addition is corrugated metal?

Applicant, Robert Phillippe, addressed the siding issue and stated that there would Corten metal on the roof and new addition. Applicant will be using new material called green coat and Nordic steel (wider flange metal siding) sparingly. Trying to build storefront in the alley and enclose the railcar.

Commission questions for the Applicant included:

- Clarify what the siding material is?
- Are you proposing 4 entrances off of alley?
- Would internal structure work as it exists now – post and beam?
- Will there be a lot of walls internally or very open like it is today?
- Will you elaborate a little more about the dumpster, Greco's and parking? Will angle parking off the alley so Waste Management can access the same, maybe more pickups.
- Will you add or renovate more wash rooms?
- Will the back wall remain, will the back wall of building be removable, is it structural?
- What are the divisions of space?
- Are their 1-2 tenants off the back of the building – or, one tenant for whole space?
- What will be by the porch?
- What is at the back of the building?

The applicant addressed the Commissions questions to satisfaction.

Public comments:

- Larry Feldman, 605 Frisco Street, spoke in favor of the applicant and the project.

Commissioner discussion included:

- Generally supportive of the project.
- Great project, utilizing the alley is a great idea.
- Acknowledgement that this is a special building, like the sketch, and is exciting.
- Might want to renovate the facilities.
- Great opportunity for frontage presence out of alley and enhance the alley projects – supportive.
- In agreement, parking might be an issue but it looks fine.
- Excited about the alley, trendsetter heading in right direction. Appreciate the change in materials.

2. **Planning File No. 127-18-AJ**: A public hearing of the Major Site Plan Application for the Woodhaven Townhomes multi-family residential project, located at 205 South 2nd Avenue / Tract B, Woods in Frisco Condominiums. Applicant: Little Big Dog, LLC

Planner Katie Kent presented the staff report noting the Sketch Plan was presented in July. The former Woods Inn was recently demolished and the application proposes four attached townhome units. Kent noted changes

made to the application materials since sketch plan review including that the applicant moved one driveway access from South 2nd Avenue to Teller Street Alley, modified the primary color from white to a combination of browns and grays and reduced the bulk plane encroachments.

Dimensional standards are complied with and setback and height ILCs will be required for the project. With regards to access, the property to the south, Mae Belle Townhomes, has brought a section of Teller Street Alley into compliance with the Town of Frisco's Street Design and Access Criteria and the applicant will be required to restore the alley to street standards. A variance has been approved by Public Works for the reduced driveway separations.

Parking is in compliance and the applicant has provided architectural relief from duplication of units including adding small differentiations making units unique to each other. The Community Plan was addressed and is in compliance. Engineered plans did not have up to date surveying on the new alley improvements. The Town Engineer requested proof that drainage would work. Staff recommends a condition be added stating that the Applicant's engineer shall survey the existing alley pan and add to the grading plans. The Town Engineer felt confident this would not be a problem.

Commission questions for staff included:

- Is new paving proposed on the alley?
- Who will maintain the alley?
- When will utility work within alley be performed, mid-October?
- Is there enough strength in new road bed on alley?
- Do the new alley improvements meet all standards?

The Applicants, Mark Harris with S-arch and Holly Hill, Owner/Developer, addressed changes made since sketch plan review. Colors and materials have been modified to go from a modern farmhouse look to a more modern rustic look. Mr. Harris stated that in order to be completely within the bulk plane, it would compromise the architectural look. The applicant reviewed proposed colors and materials including weathered wood, horizontal metal siding and board and batten with metal railing accents.

Commission questions for the Applicant included:

- Are decks big enough to support hot tubs and wired with 220?
- Windows in stairwells could be modified and make the building more interesting; break up the "sameness". Everything seems very vertical.
- Clarification on why window design is different on image shown at meeting and previous submitted elevations.
- Verification on where are they venting the fireplaces? Fireplace looks a little out of place.
- Request for the applicant to walk through the color schemes?

The applicant addressed the Commissions questions to satisfaction.

Public comments:

- There were no public comments.

Commissioner discussion included:

- Planning Commissioners were generally supportive of the project and appreciated the changes the applicant made based on comments received at sketch plan review.
- Still looks monochromatic. Needs something bold, like pop of color on front door.
- Appreciation for addressing symmetry.
- Appreciate the changes made and that the applicant cut back on the bulk plane.
- Appreciate the revisions. Bulk plane is fine. Maybe if something could have a bit more tint such as olive or copper, a little bit more personality? Great project.
- Like the project and appreciate the access reduction on South 2nd Avenue. Don't really have any problem with the bulk plane encroachments since it is minimal. Applicant could fine-tune the project with a little more color.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. 127-18-MAJ, COMMISSIONER WITHROW MOVED THAT THE RECOMMENDED FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2018, STAFF REPORT BE MADE AND THAT THE RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS SET FORTH THEREIN BE TAKEN AND THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEREBY **APPROVES** THE REQUEST FOR A MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR THE WOODHAVEN TOWNHOMES MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT LOCATED AT 205 SOUTH 2ND AVENUE /TRACT B, WOODS IN FRISCO CONDOMINIUMS WITH THE SUGGESTED CONDITION PROVIDED BY STAFF:

1. IN ADDITION TO LANGUAGE STATED IN CONDITION #5, THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER SHALL SURVEY THE PAN WITHIN TELLER STREET ALLEY AND ADD TO THE GRADING PLANS. THE REVISED GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE TOWN ENGINEER PRIOR TO SUBMITTAL OF THE BUILDING PERMIT.

SECONDED BY STABILE

Vote:

FRANKEN	YEA
HELD	YEA
LEDERER	YEA
LESMES	YEA
SKUPIEN	YEA
STABILE	YEA
WITHROW	YEA

MOTION CARRIED

3. **Planning File No. 070-18-MAJ/CU:** A public hearing of the Major Site Plan Application for the Frisco Medical Office Building commercial project and the Conditional Use Permit Application for medical office use and health, recreation, and exercise establishment use, located at 18, 38, & 98 School Road / Tracts A, B, & C, Frisco Heights Subdivision. Applicant: Development Solutions Group, on behalf of Sisters of Charity Health Services, Centura Health

Planner Susan Lee presented the staff report. In the Light Industrial (LI) Zone District 'medical office' and 'health, recreation, and exercise establishment' are both conditional uses, therefore the applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to conduct those uses within the proposed development.

Because the location for the proposed building straddles the existing property lines for Tract B and C, the developer is required to submit a Final Subdivision Plat application to create one legal lot prior to building permit issuance. Staff recommended the Planning Commission apply this requirement as a condition of approval.

The maximum building height for a flat roof in the LI District is 35 feet. The majority of the building is meeting this requirement based on the Code definition. The central portion of the southern elevation (shown as point M on Sheet A-203) is located at 36.42 feet above current existing grade, however, staff found that this is due to a minor irregularity caused by a drainage swale and supports the use of the surrounding typical grade in the height calculation for this point of the roofline as allowed in the Code building height definition.

Staff requested input from the Planning Commission regarding whether the mechanical equipment screening is *"of reasonable, balanced proportions"* in relation to the building. The rooftop mechanical equipment is approximately 47 feet above the average existing grade.

The drainage plan submitted shows storm water being directed to concrete pans and gutters then into a water quality unit. From the water quality unit storm water will be discharged directly to Lake Dillon. Staff recommended the Planning Commission apply a condition of approval requiring the applicant provide an agreement with the adjacent property owner for drainage improvements to be located on their property.

Access and Traffic studies were reviewed by the Town Engineer. The plans show a new access point off of School Road as well as an existing access drive. The existing access point does not meet Town standards. The Public Works Director has requested that the existing access be closed once the new access point is operational in order to comply with Town Code. Staff recommended the Planning Commission apply a condition of approval requiring the developer to close off the existing access drive and complete the sidewalk improvements along School Road prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy.

The traffic study showed this development having impacts on the intersection. Staff recommends the Planning Commission apply a condition of approval that, if required by CDOT, the applicant would obtain a CDOT access permit.

The Non-Vehicular Access Requirements state that every principal structure provide safe and convenient non-vehicular access to a public street or road year-around, and provide access to adjacent trail systems or public open space. The plans show connection to the recreation pathway located on Denver Water Property. Staff recommended the Planning Commission apply a condition of approval that the applicant provide an agreement with the adjacent land owner for the construction and maintenance of the path connection.

Staff also found that the application meets the requirements of the Non-Residential Development Standards.

Commission questions for staff included:

- Does the applicant meet the Green Space percentage? Landscaping requirements?
- Will the existing building stay?
- Will the new building be used for medical offices?
- So the Conditional Use Permit is for the old building?
- So the condition about vacating the one lot line from B and D? Are you vacating the lot line for A and B? Why is that not a requirement?
- Has someone talked to Denver Water? Is there a drainage issue with Denver Water?
- Would the existing access go away?

- Is the sidewalk along School Road new?
- How does code look at the drainage in this situation?
- Confused by access. At Certificate of Occupancy, the access point is going to be curb cuts circulation around building in two places?
- What is the reason for having a fairly high mechanical screen on top?
- Is this standard for a commercial building or unique to the building?
- Where is the main access point?
- Is the new proposed location meeting code?
- With more occupants, does this mean that the light will change at a more reasonable rate?

Applicants present were Alan Main with Development Solutions Group, Jeff Beardsley Project Architect, Kim Kramer Landscape Designer with Norris, and Mark Luna Civil Engineer Martin-Martin. They thanked Town Staff for their interactions and the advancement of the project to the Planning Commission meeting. They presented an overview of the project including that the existing building is to be abandoned and demolished, the configuration and function of the parking lots, and the tenants in the building along Summit Boulevard will be relocated into the new building.

Commission questions for the Applicant included:

- Talk about mechanical equipment and why the screening is 12' tall? Size is not unusual for this type of building. Mechanical screen might be lowered depending on mechanical equipment purchased. Can also be changed to view level.
- Is the mechanical screen covered on top?
- Can you speak about your drainage plan, sidewalk? Have you begun conversations with Denver Water regarding sidewalks/drainage? Why are you proposing the sidewalk in that location?
- So you are using the same pipe and that's why you don't think Denver Water will have an issue?
- So there is an engineering solution to drainage if Denver Water does not agree?
- You're planning on demolishing the existing building?
- Struggling to understand how we need this project to meet the historical code condition? Luna reviewed the proposed drainage on site and historical runoff.
- Did you consider using current landscaping for water quality purposes?
- What is the overall impact for maintenance?
- Will that be in the approved O & M plan?
- Is the erosion control mesh 100% biodegradable? Please ensure 100% biodegradable.
- Is the building being built to the standards of a medical office building and not a hospital?
- Is the land being leased from the Sisters of Charity and not by Centura but by a private developer?
- If something were to happen with Sisters of Charity, St Anthony's Hospital, Panorama what would happen?
- Is the land lease long term?
- Are there any plans or ideas for the west lot?
- Since we have to consider this as a single project, please show how the parking flow will work assuming that building will not come down? Would you connect on the south side?
- If we say no to 11' of mechanical what is your alternative?
- On the north elevation you show a 42" guardrail, is that correct?
- Did you consider using renewable energies on the roof at all?
- What is the height from the ground to the roof of the 2nd Floor? 33.8'; and to the top of the mechanical screening? Close to 43'

- Most of the time we see the applications we see the mechanical on top of the roof. Do you have any types of units?
- Most buildings of this type have two entrances (medical building), how did you get around this with this design?
- Can CDOT address the lot timing due to impact?

Public comments:

- Ansley Erickson, 801 Copper Lane, Fairplay, CO, employed in Frisco with two children at Summit Middle School. She expressed concerns about future traffic congestion and access to the school. Another concern was that the new jobs being created are fantastic, but where are these employees going to live. Lastly, the Summit Stage bus stop along School Road creates many issues with the traffic flow.
- Andrew Rostek, works for Norris Design in Frisco, lives in Silverthorne. The existing blue roofed building on Summit Boulevard is ugly and hurts the architecture of the town. Great that we want to follow standards to get out of hand, but there needs to be an understanding for aesthetics beneficial for community. Housing impacts could be an issue. Adding a sidewalk in along the road that doesn't have one now will not help get kids to the bus stop.
- Sam Waller, St. Anthony's/Centura Health, shared his thoughts on project. This project will bring additional services to the community and maintain current services in a good building. The current building has met its useful life. He understands the concerns of access points and traffic, but it seems most of these issues exist currently. They plan to explore constructing housing with a future building located along Summit Boulevard. This project is a true benefit to this community.
- Bobby Ryan, 371 Forest Drive, Frisco. When you pull into School Road with electrical facilities on one side and Public Works on the right (unsightly) and the blue roofed building right on Summit Blvd., the heart of Frisco. For what's going on all around, with the architecture, landscaping, etc. this project will be a big improvement to this area. He has middle school aged children and the agrees with traffic and pedestrian concerns, but he's not sure that you can impose or reject a project like this based on this concern. He supports the project. When driving through the area, you see what the Middle School has done and it looks really nice – let's bring this all the way out.

Commissioner discussion included:

- The public made very valid points. However, they cannot hold one developer responsible for those issues. To bring jobs doesn't mean a developer brings housing. Not concerned with traffic, as middle school - the light and drive there is a separate issue. I'm comfortable with this application and would like to see it move forward.
- Would have liked to see the developer incorporate employee housing.
- Would have liked to see the height from a person's view level. Is there any way that on the top floor could be extended further to have a false front? Great looking building.
- Happy with the way the building looks. Recommend that the Town Staff discuss with Summit Stage moving the bus stop from the south side of School Road to north side of School Road. To Centura – it's a really wonderful idea for you to consider taking down the existing building and constructing future employee housing. Expressed concerns about any untreated drainage making it into the lake.
- The building has refreshing architecture and will be an improvement to the site. Echoes the comments made about the need for more affordable housing. Respectfully disagrees with our engineer's interpretation of the code concerning drainage. Looking at the environmental impacts, healthy environment – really don't feel like it meets our code and will vote no on this project.
- Architecture is good. Screening seems huge but don't think you will see it so much from the ground. Wish housing was planned in the build. Still concerned that Denver Water is not onboard yet but there is a condition that there will be an agreement. Other than that, I think it's a good project.

- Don't mind the architecture, pretty urban for who we are, not a fan of flat roof but it meets code so that's all I really have to say about that. Would like to reiterate the public comments about traffic and housing concerns. Happy to hear that Centura is looking at building housing in the future.
- It's a little bit urban, but it's a medical building and a nice addition to town. Don't believe the existing traffic and housing issues are the applicant's problem to solve. This is a good use for this lot. The conditions about the path/sidewalk should not hold up the project.
- The sidewalk is important because we should have connectivity through our community.
- If the applicant is showing improvements on the neighbor's land on the plan, then they should have contacted the property owner sooner.
- The sidewalk condition should be revised that if a reasonable and concerted effort is made to get approval from Denver Water to get a connection via sidewalk.
- Modify language of #3 to state that the Applicant shall provide an agreement with the adjacent landowner for any improvements that would be located on their property and the language of #7 to state that the Applicant shall make a reasonable attempt to negotiate a pedestrian path link on Denver Water's property.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. 070-18-MAJ/CU, COMMISSIONER FRANKEN MOVED THAT THE RECOMMENDED FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2018 STAFF REPORT AS AMENDED, BE MADE AND THAT THE RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS SET FORTH THEREIN BE TAKEN AND THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HEREBY **APPROVES** THE REQUEST FOR A MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR THE FOR THE FRISCO MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING AND THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR MEDICAL OFFICE USE AND HEALTH, RECREATION, AND EXERCISE ESTABLISHMENT USE, LOCATED AT 18, 38, & 98 SCHOOL ROAD / TRACTS A, B, & C, FRISCO HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION ALSO KNOWN AS THE FRISCO MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING. COMMISSIONER SKUPIEN SECONDED.

1. Modify language of #3: The applicant shall provide an agreement with the adjacent land owner for the location of any site improvements, including drainage structures or rec path connections, prior to building permit issuance.
2. And add #7: The applicant shall make a reasonable attempt to negotiate a path connection across the property owned by Denver Municipal Water Works to the south in order to connect the Frisco Medical Office Building to the Town's recreation path.

Vote:

FRANKEN	YEA
HELD	YEA
LEDERER	NAY
LESMES	YEA
SKUPIEN	YEA
STABILE	YEA
WITHROW	YEA

MOTION CARRIED

COMMISSION LESMES asked for a break at 7:27 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:34 p.m.

Staff and Commissioner Updates:

1. Community Plan Update

Susan Lee gave an overview of the July 11, 2018 first Community Plan meeting. Over 250 in attendance; 5 stations; polling station; opportunities to give values, vision, what people love, opportunities for growth, development, and change. There was a mapping exercise (no surprises with responses), improvement suggestions were pedestrian bridge/sidewalk connectivity at School Road, increased employee housing; keypad polling demographics important.

Discussion was had for the possible connectivity. Susan Lee will email CDOT regarding GAP proposal.

General comments were positive regarding the Community Plan and Community Values Synthesis on August 6, 2018. Design Workshop was hired to help write goals. Community Development hopes to have draft goals and policies back to the community in early November and adopted by the Planning Commission and Town Council in early February.

Focus Group Meetings held August 28, 2018 regarding Frisco's Economy was attended by TOF Revenue Manager, TOF Finance Director, Finance Dir. from Copper, and other tourism leaders. Some items discussed were economy, sustainability, Housing Diversity and Livability. The Housing Diversity discussed was regarding different price ranges, types of housing, etc.

Community Plan Elements will be reviewed and staff is seeking the Planning Commission's input.

Next Steps will be to envelop plan and hope the Planning Commission comes along with Community Focus Group. This will be added to a meeting when the Agenda is not full. Planning commission agreed the work was good and is definitely interested in outcome.

Adjournment:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:59 pm. Commissioner Stabile made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Franken. Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Mattka, Community Development Department