

**TOWN OF BASALT  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
MARCH 1, 2016**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Johns called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Commissioners answering roll call were Gary Wheeler, Eric Vozick, Gino Rossetti, Patrick McAllister, Dylan Johns and Alternate Tracy Bennett.

Staff present was Susan Philp, Town Planner; James Lindt, Assistant Planning Director; and Denise Tomaskovic, Recorder.

**APPROVALS**

**Minutes of February 2, 2016**

**M/S VOZICK AND WHEELER TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2, 2016 AS READ.  
THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.**

**AGENDA ITEM**

**Work Session: Interpretation for Cole PUD 153 E. Homestead Drive, Covered Entry Porch Enclosure**

Philp said that the applicant was present and it would be okay to take any comments.

Lindt explained that Staff would like to make an administrative decision on this item but is looking for feedback from the Commission as to whether or not they are comfortable with this procedure. Referring to a posted aerial photo, he explained the location and nature of the proposed project. Staff wants to make sure the proposed changes are in character with the historic structure and has worked with the applicant to come up with a distinct enclosure that still retains the historic character of the building. At Staff's request, the applicant added a window to help distinguish the enclosure from the original building and reduce the look of the building's mass.

Staff said that if the Commission is not comfortable with Staff making an administrative interpretation regarding this application then the Commission can identify its concerns and direct Staff to take the process through the Minor PUD Amendment process, in which both the P&Z and Town Council could review the proposal.

Lindt noted that Kurt Carruth, the applicant's architect, was present and he asked if Carruth had any additional comments. Carruth briefly explained the funky nature of the corner they want to change.

Lindt pointed out that there was no public in attendance and asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Chair Johns asked if there were any other issues associated with the PUD. Philp said that initially there had been a square footage issue but Staff worked with the Applicant to resolve it.

The Commissioners assented to Staff making an administrative interpretation.

**Work Session: Zoning for Our Town Planning Properties**

Philp called Don Elliott of Clarion Consulting, zoning code consultant, to participate in a telephone conference with the Commissioners. She pointed out that the model was in the room and Staff has compiled a Powerpoint presentation of photos to use as reference for the building heights discussion.

Elliott went through the document page by page, reviewing the changes that were made to the Community Serving Commercial (CSC) zoning language since the previous conference call. He then asked for comments on the overall organization of the document. The Commissioners agreed with the format and organization as presented. Elliott said that there is always the ability to add or subtract content as needed.

Philp said that some Town Council members were concerned about the amount of square footage on the CDC parcel that was proposed in the resolution [at the Town Council meeting on February 23]. However, they indicated that they might feel more comfortable with the "up to" proposed square footage language as long as height limits were established. Staff then showed a Powerpoint presentation of structures in Aspen, Willits Town Center (WTC) and Carbondale illustrating 2.5 to four story buildings, with a variety of setbacks and façade treatments. For immediate reference, Philp said that the Ute Center building is 45 feet and six inches at its highest point on the corner of Midland Avenue/Two Rivers Road intersection. The Rocky Mountain Institute Innovation Center is 34 ft., eight inches high at its tallest point.

In response to an earlier question from Commissioner Rossetti, Philp explained that the tallest building on the CDC parcel portion of the model represents 38 feet, with the first floor being about 14 feet high and two more floors at 12 feet high each. However, she added, this wouldn't include the first four feet of an underground parking garage.

On the BCC parcel it was felt that building heights could be the same as at WTC, which is 45 feet.

Commissioner Rossetti said that it would be difficult to have a really interesting top floor use if the height is capped at 12 feet for the top floor. He added that this could also preclude the inclusion of an architectural feature that might be really cool/noticeable from Highway 82.

Chair Johns thought it might be more helpful to delineate floor to floor requirements as well as space for mechanical equipment between floors. Commissioner Rossetti said he would like to see some relief and interest in the roofline, not something that looks like all the other buildings, and limiting the building heights to 38 feet could compromise that ability.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if it would be a good idea to have a PUD process that allows variances. Elliott pointed out that variances require a declaration of hardship, while this sounds like a design issue. He suggested allowing some flexibility in the review process for a higher roof level of up to X amount if certain community serving uses are being provided. Philp added that if we don't want to allow flat roofs we need to state that.

Chair Johns noted that people are concerned with how the buildings will look as viewed from the park, as well as how they appear from the street level. Commissioner Rossetti suggested including compromise language for building height limits ranging from 36 to 42 feet. Elliott suggested setting the outer boundaries of the flexibility being allowed, along with a menu of items that would get a developer to those upper limits. Chair Johns agreed with the suggestion for the allowance of additional height if the top floor is a community serving use or some use where the public is invited.

Moving along, Philp reviewed the anchor use and sizes table. Discussion ensued as to whether or not to stipulate the size of a grocery store or hotel use. The Commissioners and Staff discussed with Elliott ways to wordsmith the language to ensure that anchor use requirements are met without having to state what percentage of the parcel must be occupied by the anchor use. Philp said that it may be possible to add some more threshold language for other uses on the parcels.

The Commissioners struggled with the requirement for a parcel's anchor use to consist of 70% of the allowable use. This is a leftover item from an earlier iteration of the CSC Zone District language and may not be necessary to include. Commissioner Vozick thought that allowing attainable housing as an anchor use on the BCC parcel could preclude locating a hotel there, which might not be a good thing.

Commissioner Rossetti said that more uses need to be allowed on the BCC parcel. The Commissioners then discussed other use options for the BCC parcel. Secondary uses are also important and should be complimentary to the anchor uses on each parcel. Elliott pointed out that there is language already included in the document that allows flexibility for uses and he agreed to include some additional clarifying wording proposed by Commissioner McAllister. Rossetti reiterated that there needs to be a variety of uses on each parcel and as long as the more active uses are on the ground floor, other uses can fit in on the upper floors. Philp noted that the Commissioners were in favor of moving the brew pub over to the BCC parcel [from Lions Park].

Commissioner Vozick said that the CDC parcel should include attainable housing as an anchor use option. In answer to a question Vozick then asked about the resolution, Chair Johns said the Town Council adopted a resolution establishing a recommended maximum of 55,000 sq. ft. of building on the CDC parcel to allow a more volumetric approach on building design.

Tim Belinski, who is interested in the BCC parcel, said he was happy to see more uses added to that parcel. He suggested including a distillery use in addition to a brew pub. He was also concerned with the 70% anchor use requirement. In a large-scale building that gets to be a lot of anchor use. He thought it better to include minimum sq. footage or the number of units required.

Chair Johns noted that anchor uses such as a hotel or grocery store would require a lot of commitment, anyway, so stipulating 70% as an anchor use requirement doesn't really make a difference. In contrast, the Lions Park and Merino Park parcels are so small that whatever use they have would take up most of the parcel. Philp added that it might be a good idea to stipulate a threshold number for a brewpub/distillery use or a sports center and just get rid of the 70% requirement altogether.

In response to a question from Commissioner McAllister, Philp explained that once an anchor use is established on a parcel, applicants could just stick with that one anchor use or they could add other anchor uses, or include some secondary uses.

Chair Johns asked where the parking numbers came from. Philp replied that they are a carryover from the previously-approved CSC Zone District language. Johns was concerned that the parking requirements wouldn't work for the BCC parcel with its irregular shape. Philp said that the upcoming WE-cycle program, bus passes, and shared parking are being used to lower parking requirements.

Elliott added that shared parking formulas are being used by many municipalities now as an alternative to requiring parking studies. He offered to send information on these formulas to Philp.

The Commissioners agreed that the uses table will require more discussion which will happen at their next meeting on March 15<sup>th</sup>. The goal is to have a document for the Town Council to review on March 29<sup>th</sup>.

Belinski pointed out that if a grocery store is a first-floor use, it would need minimum ceiling heights of 17 to 18 feet and he wanted the Commissioners to be aware of this in regard to setting height regulations. Also, the 10% minimum landscaped open space requirement needs to be further refined. Chair Johns thought that requiring view openings and connectivity through the sites could be part of meeting open space requirements. The Commissioners agreed that they didn't want to have useless areas scattered around just as a way of meeting the open space requirements.

Commissioner Rossetti asked how connectivity through private property can be ensured. Philp said that connectivity could be a condition of approval but this is painstaking work and is as much an art, as it is a science. It has to be a public/private endeavor. Legal documents, easements, insurance, snowmelt, and emergency vehicle access are just some of the issues to consider regarding connectivity.

The phone call with Don Elliott ended at 7:27 p.m.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/STAFF UPDATES**

The Commissioners had no comments.

Staff summarized the projects in the development review pipeline.

Commissioner Vozick asked if the P&Z will see the School District's and Habitat for Humanity's plans for affordable housing behind Basalt High School. This is a proposal for about 40 units in which each entity would end up with about 20 units. Philp said that she didn't know for sure because land use regulations are different for school districts.

**ADJOURN**

**M/S VOZICK AND BENNETT TO ADJOURN. THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF 6-0.**

The Planning and Zoning Commission adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

**TOWN OF BASALT  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

By: 

Dylan Johns, Chair

Attest: 

Denise Tomaskovic, Recorder