

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Regular Meeting of the Estes Valley Planning Commission

January 15, 2008, 1:30 p.m.

Board Room, Estes Park Town Hall

Commission: Chair Betty Hull; Commissioners Wendell Amos, Ike Eisenlauer, Bruce Grant, Joyce Kitchen, Doug Klink, and John Tucker

Attending: Chair Hull; Commissioners Amos, Eisenlauer, Grant, Kitchen, Klink, and Tucker

Also Attending: Director Joseph, Planner Shirk, Planner Chilcott, Town Board Liaison Homeier, and Recording Secretary Roederer

Absent: Town Attorney White

Chair Hull called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

The following minutes reflect the order of the agenda and not necessarily the chronological sequence of the meeting.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ron Norris/President of the Association for Responsible Development (ARD) provided information on the history and goals of this local non-profit organization. The purpose of ARD is to preserve the unique mountain character and natural beauty of Estes Park by fostering appropriate and responsible development in the Estes Valley, including development that enables the community to have a more sustainable year-round economy. ARD promotes collaboration and intends to communicate actively with the Planning Commission and town staff. Commissioner Tucker requested that Mr. Norris provide ARD's definition of "unique mountain character." Mr. Norris stated he will seek input from the ARD membership and provide a specific definition at a future meeting.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approval of minutes dated December 18, 2007

It was moved and seconded (Eisenlauer/Klink) that the consent agenda be accepted, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. DEVELOPMENT PLAN 08-01, RIPPLING RIVER, Metes and Bounds property located in the SE ¼ of S34-T5N-R73W of the 6th P.M., 2025 Moraine Avenue, Anne Toft/Owner, Steve Eck and Steve Williams/Applicants

Planner Shirk summarized the staff report. This is a request to build nine residential condominium units on a parcel that is approximately 2.5 acres in size and is zoned A–*Accommodations*. This is an allowed use in the Accommodations zoning district.

There has been some confusion about the address of this property (2025 Moraine Avenue) because a different parcel across the road is addressed 2025 W. Highway 66. The road is no longer considered a state highway and addressing issues will need to be reviewed by Larimer County Building Department staff.

In May 2007, planning staff disapproved the previous Rippling River development plan #07-07, which met the guidelines for staff-level review, due to non-compliance with Estes Valley Development Code (EVDC) standards for setbacks, development within required landscape buffer zone, development within riparian corridor and floodplain, and proposed driveway spacing and curb cut standards set forth in EVDC Table 4.7. Failure to meet limits of disturbance standards was the primary reason for denial. The applicants had the option of appealing to the Planning Commission but chose to modify the development plan and reapply.

Under the terms of the EVDC, the applicants' proposal is not required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission; however, given staff's previous disapproval of a development plan for this property, the applicants have chosen to request a public hearing before the Commission.

The plans submitted for today's hearing include less grading work than the previous plan. The entry location has been moved and the driveway redesigned with retaining walls to help reduce fill material. Much of the proposed development on the site is within the existing floodplain. The applicants propose the addition of fill material and a retaining wall to shrink the existing floodplain; additional landscaping proposed along the river corridor is intended to mitigate development within the riparian corridor.

The applicants' density calculations state the proposed density requires 63,000 square feet of net land area, where 65,232 is available. The gross land area has been reduced to account for right-of-way dedication and for the floodplain, as required by the EVDC. However, the calculation uses post-fill floodplain calculations. It is the opinion of planning staff that use of the modified floodplain would result in an increase in density beyond what is allowed; therefore, this application does not comply with the density requirements set forth in the EVDC, including Section 1.9.C.4, which states "the number of dwelling or accommodation units allowed on a site is based on the presumption that all other applicable standards shall be met."

It is also staff's opinion that the proposed fill in the floodplain does not comply with limits of disturbance criteria set forth in EVDC Section 7.2, specifically riparian habitat and floodplains, floodways, flood fringes, and flood hazards. The proposal calls for significant amounts of fill in the floodplain—three to four feet deep and up to 90 feet wide. This fill would be buttressed by a retaining wall and requires FEMA approval of an amended floodplain map; this approval has been granted.

The applicants were granted a setback variance by the Estes Valley Board of Adjustment on October 2, 2007 to allow portions of the drive to be located within the required arterial street landscape setback of 25 feet, provided that the applicants meet district-buffer landscape requirements along the road frontage. It is staff's opinion that the district-buffer landscape requirements, which are more robust than arterial-street landscape requirements, are not met in the applicants' proposal; five additional evergreens are needed.

This request has been submitted to all applicable reviewing agency staff and to neighboring property owners for consideration and comment. Comments were received from Town Attorney White, Town of Estes Park Light and Power and Water departments, Fire Chief Dorman, Upper Thompson Sanitation District, Larimer County Engineering Department, and the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

Comments from Fire Chief Dorman were received after the staff report was distributed; these comments indicate the need for several changes to the driveway design to provide an adequate turning radius for emergency vehicle ingress/egress.

Correspondence opposing the proposed development was received from neighboring property owners Jay Lykins and from Cheryl Wagner and Stan Wehrli. A phone call was received from adjoining property owner Dave Ranglos opposing the proposed development and expressing concern about high water flowing across the property during spring runoff.

Planner Shirk showed a portion of a video submitted by Mr. Ranglos showing runoff waters standing on the property in the area proposed for development. The video was taken from Mr. Ranglos' property on May 29, 2003, following a very large snowstorm in March of that year.

Planner Shirk read the staff findings from the staff report and stated that the proposed development plan does not comply with applicable standards set forth in EVDC Section 1.9.C and Section 7.2.D, nor does it comply with the variance granted on October 2, 2007. Staff recommends disapproval of the proposal based on limits of disturbance standards.

Discussion followed regarding the slope of the access drive into the proposed development, which has a slope of 10% adjacent to Moraine Avenue but immediately falls away to a slope of 13%, and whether street standards or driveway standards should apply. The EVDC allows a maximum slope of 12% for driveways.

Public Comment:

Lonnie Sheldon/Van Horn Engineering was present to represent the applicants. He contended that the EVDC Appendix D guideline for multi-family driveways allows up to 120 vehicle trips per day; therefore, the slope standards for driveways should apply. Planner Shirk pointed out that the property is zoned *A-Accommodations* and the standards for accommodations development should apply. Mr. Sheldon went on to discuss staff's reasons for recommending disapproval. He stated the applicant is willing to provide five additional trees to meet the district-buffer landscape requirement. He distributed a sheet labeled "Density Details" to the Commissioners, which shows four drawings: the floodplain on the property prior to and following FEMA's approval of the letter of map revision, the amount of fill FEMA will allow on the property, and the amount of fill the applicants propose for the property given the required road right-of-way dedication. He provided the history of the FEMA map revision process for this property, emphasizing the applicants have already spent approximately \$10,000 on flood map revisions; FEMA has accepted and approved the proposed changes; Larimer County has local jurisdiction and has approved the changes as well. The proposed changes will raise the water surface by approximately 2 $\frac{7}{8}$ inches. The proposed development meets density limits based on post-fill conditions, which is what should be considered. Very minimal development would be allowed on the site without fill in the corrected floodplain; the applicants should not be subject to FEMA's original error in determining the floodplain. The applicants do propose development within the floodplain, floodway, and flood fringes; the proposed retaining wall, which FEMA has approved, will be within the floodplain. Proposed plantings will improve the stream corridor/wildlife corridor. Limits of disturbance standards set forth in EVDC Section 7.2.D are subjective. The applicants will preserve trees; those that are removed will be mitigated by landscaping. Retaining walls are allowed within the 50-foot setback buffer from stream corridors. No wetlands exist on the site. The riparian habitat is limited to a narrow area directly adjacent to the stream. The applicants agree to the eight recommended conditions of approval.

Celine LeBeau/Van Horn Engineering stated she has nine years of experience in wetland and wildlife habitat consulting. It is her opinion that the riparian habitat extends, at most, to four to five feet from the banks of the river.

Dave Ranglos/Adjoining Property Owner spoke in opposition to the proposal. He commended planning staff for listening to neighbors' concerns. An appropriate development could be designed for this site. He expressed concern that the proposed location for the retaining wall is very close to where water flows during peak runoff in the spring and how that may effect his property and others downstream. He stated his belief that staff is interpreting the development code appropriately and encouraged the Commissioners to do likewise.

Ron Norris/Association for Responsible Development stated from his background as an engineer, "That's a lot of fill." He commended staff and expressed appreciation for the reasoned, thoughtful process and their time spent in reviewing the applicants' proposal.

Anne Toft/Owner stated her family has paid taxes on the property for over 100 years. She has walked the property for 30 or 40 years and never had to wade; there is quite a bit of bank left when the river is full. She questioned why other developments, including the one immediately downstream, were allowed to build closer to the river than the applicants are allowed to build.

Lengthy discussion was held between Commissioners, planning staff, and Mr. Sheldon, and is summarized as follows.

- Director Joseph: There is precedent for considering corrections to errors in FEMA mapping, whether it adds or reduces available density on a site. However, there is no similar precedent for allowing fill within a floodplain for the purpose of adding density. FEMA regulations provide the minimum standard and are designed solely to prevent

flood damage; they are not meant to address other concerns. FEMA provides incentives for local governing bodies to set more restrictive standards. The cumulative effect of fill in the floodplain is to decrease flood storage area; this area has value. The site-specific balance of property rights versus the EVDC limits of disturbance standards requires judgment. It is planning staff's opinion that the applicants' proposal for fill is too much.

- Planner Shirk: In determining whether the retaining wall is considered a structure, the EVDC allows patios within the river setback; staff was applying the same standard to the proposed retaining wall. Based on the allowable land area and required right-of-way dedication, six duplex units could be built on the site. The proposed fill in the floodway would result in additional density of at least two units. EVDC Chapter 1 requires floodplain area to be netted out, which implies that an applicant can not add fill in the floodplain for density purposes.
- Commissioner Klink: Minimization of cut and fill on any piece of property is appropriate.
- Commissioner Tucker: the retaining wall should be classified as a structure—it holds back water. Questioned whether placement of the retaining wall should meet the 50-foot setback requirement.
- Mr. Sheldon: EVDC Section 7.2 allows natural grade to be raised or lowered by as much as ten feet; the applicants propose a change of three feet. The applicants were surprised by staff's recommendation for disapproval. Town regulations defer to the Larimer County Stormwater Management Manual, which defers to FEMA. The applicants' proposal is appropriate for this site. The location of the retaining wall will help the downstream property, which is in a bit of a flood hazard area. The development on the adjacent property, Rambling River Condominiums, has a greater number of units per acre and greater limits of disturbance, although fill was not necessary for development on that site.
- Director Joseph: The EVDC states that the river setback should be unobstructed from ground to sky; however, it provides an illustration that contemplates a less restrictive standard. It is not so much a question of the placement of the retaining wall as whether the proposed fill is too much fill in the floodplain. Rights of development of the property must be balanced with protection of the natural character of stream corridors, which enjoy a special status in the land use code. Staff has repeatedly emphasized to the applicants that units with a smaller footprint and more compact parking area (or fewer units) would fit more appropriately on the site.
- Commissioner Kitchen: The applicants have made an effort to comply with EVDC requirements. FEMA approval indicates that a flood would not endanger the proposed development. Proposed fill does not encroach into the river. Motioned for approval.

It was moved (Kitchen) to approve Development Plan 08-01, Rippling River, for the Metes and Bounds property located in the SE ¼ of S34-T5N-R73W of the 6th P.M. and addressed 2025 Moraine Avenue, with the findings and conditions recommended by staff. The motion failed for lack of a second.

At the request of Commissioner Amos, Chair Hull polled the Commissioners.

- Commissioner Grant: There is lack of precedent regarding fill in the floodplain. Questioned why development was allowed closer to the stream corridor on other properties. Local entities can tighten restrictions provided by FEMA. Staff's analysis has credence.
- Commissioner Tucker: Primary concerns are "mother nature," placement of the retaining wall, bringing in fill material to keep the water back.
- Commissioner Klink: Also questioned why development was allowed closer to the stream corridor on other properties. Would prefer to see a development proposal with less fill.
- Director Joseph: Explained that there is a quirk in the zoning code—properties with existing structures that were built prior to the adoption of the EVDC in 2000 require a river setback of 30 feet. If no structures existed on the property in 2000, a 50-foot setback applies. The property under consideration does not have any existing structures; thus, a 50-foot setback is required.
- Commissioner Eisenlauer: Expressed concern regarding the proposed fill and retaining wall and whether flood waters overtopping the retaining wall would wash fill material away.

- Chair Hull: There have been “200-year” floods in the last 25 years; expressed concern the units would not be safe.
- Commissioner Amos: Expressed appreciation of the honesty of his fellow Commissioners. Given the concerns expressed, he moved disapproval.

It was moved and seconded (Amos/Grant) to DISAPPROVE Development Plan 08-01, Rippling River, for the Metes and Bounds property located in the SE ¼ of S34-T5N-R73W of the 6th P.M. and addressed 2025 Moraine Avenue, because the development plan does not comply with applicable standards set forth in Estes Valley Development Code Section 1.9.C, *Density Calculation*, and Section 7.2.D, *Limits of Disturbance*, and the motion passed.

Those voting in favor: Amos, Eisenlauer, Grant, Hull, Klink, Tucker.

Those voting against: Kitchen.

Chair Hull called a recess at 3:15; the meeting reconvened at 3:28.

4. REZONING REQUEST and PRELIMINARY CONDOMINIUM MAP, ELK RUN CONDOMINIUMS, Lot 9, S. St. Vrain Addition except 1507-875 & 1617-816, 1370 S. St. Vrain Avenue, Donald & Bonnie Cito/Owners, Ed Peterson/Applicant

Planner Chilcott summarized the staff report. This is a request to convert an existing four-plex to four condominiums. The 0.52-acre property is currently zoned R–*Residential* and is within an existing single-family residential neighborhood.

Conversion to condominium use requires review for compliance with subdivision standards, including adequate public facilities standards. The structure was built in 1979; any required public facility upgrades must be completed or financially guaranteed prior to filing the final condominium map. The existing water service line is a ¾-inch line, where the current standard calls for a one-inch line. The water department has agreed to review a flow volume test; if the results show compliance with current standards, the applicant will not be required to upgrade the line. No additional fire hydrants are required.

The sanitary sewer service line must be upgraded from a four-inch line to a six-inch line. The applicant must also provide a shared-sewer-service-line agreement to the Upper Thompson Sanitation District. The Public Works Department requires that the applicant provide a drainage report for their review. Any required drainage upgrades must be installed as part of the adequate public facilities requirements. Public Works has also requested that a tree in front of the stop sign at the driveway/Highway 7 intersection be limbed to improve visibility of the sign.

Two of the units on the property are accessed from the north side of the lot via Holiday Lane, and two of the units are accessed from the south side of the lot via a driveway (proposed Sixth Green Lane). The proposal includes a redesigned parking area to provide the required nine parking spaces and a slight redesign of Sixth Green Lane, which will remove the encroachment onto the adjacent property. Staff recommends that the applicant work to obtain a driveway maintenance agreement for the proposed 20-foot-wide easement serving the neighboring property at 1140 Holiday Lane. It is the responsibility of the property owner and future condominium association to maintain the driveway from the condominiums to Holiday Lane; this includes snow removal and any other necessary maintenance.

This is also a request to rezone the property from R–*Residential* to RM–*Multi-Family Residential*. Multi-family use is not a conforming use in the R zoning district. Planning staff recommended the applicant apply for a rezoning in order to extend the life of multi-family use on the property and because RM zoning is more appropriate for the existing use of the property. Although the lot meets the minimum lot size for the R zoning district, it would be nonconforming in lot size and density if rezoned to RM.

This request has been submitted to all applicable reviewing agency staff and to neighboring property owners for consideration and comment. Comments were received

from Town of Estes Park Building and Water departments, Town Attorney White, and Upper Thompson Sanitation District. No comments were received from neighboring property owners. Planning staff recommends approval of the rezoning and preliminary condominium map requests.

Public Comment:

Tom Bergman/Van Horn Engineering was present to represent the property owners and the applicant. The owners and applicant have reviewed staff's recommended conditions of approval and are in agreement with them, with the exception of condition #4, which requires compliance with comments found in Chris Bieker's [Upper Thompson Sanitation District] letter dated December 18, 2007. Following a meeting with Upper Thompson Sanitation District, the applicant has agreed to install an eight-inch public service line with a clean-out to be maintained by the sanitation district. This negates the need to upgrade to a six-inch line and provide a joint sewer maintenance agreement as referenced in Mr. Bieker's December 18th letter, and meets the intent of condition #4.

Commissioner Tucker questioned why the applicant should be required to upgrade the sewer infrastructure when the current six-inch pipe is functional. Planner Chilcott explained that the development code requires new subdivisions (condominiumization is considered a subdivision) to meet adequate public facilities standards. Doing so ensures that new owners have sewer, water, and drainage service that are up to current standards and prevents any existing problems from being passed on to a new unit owner.

Jeff Hodge/Upper Thompson Sanitation District Manager stated the sanitation district has adopted the minimum state standards. The building is being converted from single ownership to multiple ownership. With a shared line, if one unit owner did not pay their bill, the sanitation district could disconnect all the units. He thanked the applicant for agreeing to install the eight-inch line; this will allow the district to service the line in public right-of-way, which enhances the serviceability to the area.

It was moved and seconded (Klink/Amos) to recommend approval of the Rezoning Request and Preliminary Condominium Map, Elk Run Condominiums, Lot 9, S. St. Vrain Addition except 1507-875 & 1617-816, to the Town Board of Trustees, with the findings and conditions recommended by staff and condition #4 modified as shown, and the motion passed unanimously.

CONDITIONS FOR REZONING:

1. Town approval of the Elk Run condominium map application and recordation of the map and declaration by the Town.

CONDITIONS FOR PRELIMINARY CONDOMINIUM MAP:

1. Compliance with the comments in Will Birchfield's memo to Alison Chilcott dated December 21, 2007. Also, the applicant shall obtain approval for the proposed address change and condominium unit numbering from the Building Department.
2. Compliance with the comments in Jeff Boles' and Mike Mangelsen's memo to Bob Goehring dated December 20, 2007.
3. Compliance with the comments in Greg White's letter to Alison Chilcott dated December 20, 2007. Also, the dedication statement shall dedicate all new easements shown on the plat and only those new easements.
4. Compliance with Upper Thompson Sanitation District's requirements for upgrading the sanitary sewer service line. Also, the preliminary condominium map shall note/show that the existing sewer service line is a shared line and shall show the required upgrades.
5. Utility locations shall be planned so as not to remove or damage existing significant vegetation and to minimize disturbance to root systems.
6. The applicant shall work to obtain a driveway maintenance agreement for the proposed new twenty-foot-wide access easement serving 1140 Holiday Lane.
7. The eight-inch ponderosa tree in front of stop sign shall be limbed to improve stop sign visibility.
8. The Reception number for the five-foot-wide access easement is 2004-0104688, not 2005-0091842 as shown on the map. The map shall be revised.

9. A drainage report shall be submitted to the Public Works Department for review and approval. If based on this review Public Works determines that improvements are required, they shall be completed or guaranteed prior to map recordation.
10. Ten-foot-wide utility easements shall be dedicated along all property lines.
11. Surveyor's Note #3 refers to a manhole elevation of 7987.76. The plan shows this elevation as 7678.76. The two shall be consistent.
12. Grammatical and spelling errors in Surveyor's Note #4 shall be corrected.
13. The density calculation shall include both gross and net land area.
14. The preliminary map shall demonstrate that the proposed storage shed and dumpster locations comply with the minimum required setbacks.
15. The subdivision name shall be provided for 1160 Holiday Lane.

5. DEVELOPMENT PLAN 08-02, YMCA OF THE ROCKIES – CORE AREA, Metes and Bounds property located at 2515 Tunnel Road, YMCA of the Rockies Estes Park Center/Owner, BHA Design/Applicant

Planner Shirk summarized the staff report. This is a request to redevelop the central portion of the YMCA campus by renovating the Ruesch Auditorium, adding a conference center, and constructing three new lodges. The area proposed for this redevelopment encompasses approximately fifteen acres; the YMCA campus is approximately 900 acres. The redevelopment will occur in an area that has been disturbed for at least 100 years.

The renovation of the auditorium would include a 3,075-square-foot expansion of the lower-level cafeteria and the addition of a second-level, 5,375-square-foot, wrap-around deck/porch, as well as the addition of roof elements and covered walkways, which will make the exterior of the building more closely match the appearance of the administration building. The conference center would be attached to the south side of the Ruesch Auditorium and would provide a meeting/banquet facility for approximately 800 people; it would be serviced from the existing YMCA kitchen. The three new lodges (Grand Lodge, East Lodge, and West Lodge) would replace or relocate 26 buildings, including staff lodging, laundry facilities, and a maintenance facility. The three lodges provide a total of 200 rooms—a net addition of 100 rooms. Multiple driveways will be removed or consolidated, and new buildings will have specific addresses, which will assist with the provision of emergency services.

On March 19, 2007, the Larimer County Commissioners approved the YMCA of the Rockies Master Plan, which included waivers to EVDC standards such as sidewalks and modifications to street design standards. It also included several special requirements, including additional parking lot landscaping and a limit on parking lot lighting. This development plan proposal was reviewed for compliance with standards outlined in the master plan.

A primary component of the master plan is a new loop-road system, which will limit vehicular access in the core area and create a pedestrian campus. Planning staff recommends construction of the loop road be completed early in the redevelopment process. A portion of Mountainside Drive immediately west of Ruesch Auditorium will be removed, and the existing service drive will be upgraded.

The master plan calls for additional signage and a lighting plan; these are included as recommended conditions of approval. Although the Estes Valley Development Code allows lighting in large parking lots to be up to 25 feet tall, the master plan limited lighting height to fifteen feet, which will reduce light pollution. The applicant will comply with this requirement. Bollard lighting will be used where new sidewalks are installed. The master plan requires landscape plantings for parking areas exceed the amount required in the EVDC by 20%, and the applicant's plans comply. The applicant proposes a large detention area central to the parking lots for the new lodges; this type of design is encouraged in the development code.

The proposed Grand Lodge, East Lodge, and West Lodge buildings were granted height variances by the Estes Valley Board of Adjustment on December 4, 2007. Portions of the ridgelines of these buildings will be above the height limit due to fill material that will be used on the site to allow the buildings and connections between buildings to be ADA

compliant, which was an important component of the master plan. The proposed buildings will be located at least 1,700 feet from all property lines.

This request has been submitted to all applicable reviewing agency staff and to neighboring property owners for consideration and comment. Comments were received from Town Attorney White, Town of Estes Park Light and Power Department, Upper Thompson Sanitation District, and Larimer County Engineering and Building departments. Planning staff received two phone calls from neighboring property owners who inquired whether the development would be along Tunnel Road; no concerns were expressed about the proposed development in the core area.

Planning staff had originally recommended continuance of this application based on comments received December 21, 2007 from Upper Thompson Sanitation District. However, new comments from the sanitation district were received just prior to the meeting. Planning staff now recommends approval of the development plan with a recommended condition of approval being that the applicant comply with Upper Thompson Sanitation District comments received January 15, 2008. Finding #1 shown in the staff report should be struck.

Public Comment:

Mark Holdt/Vice President, YMCA of the Rockies stated the YMCA brings approximately 250,000 visitors to Estes Park every year; the proposed redevelopment will greatly improve the guest experience. Twenty-six buildings currently located in the area for redevelopment will be replaced with four. This development proposal closely mirrors what was envisioned for this area in the approved master plan, although the location of the buildings has changed somewhat in order to meet ADA accessibility requirements. Following encouragement from Planner Shirk, work on the loop road will not be delayed. The YMCA agrees to comply with the revised comments received from Upper Thompson Sanitation District and with staff's recommended conditions of approval.

Roger Sherman/BHA Design reiterated that the development plan is consistent with the master plan vision. Upgrades to the Ruesch Auditorium and the proposed new buildings will fit with the architectural style, scale, and character of key existing buildings such as the administration building and Hyde Chapel. Plans were designed with sensitivity to the environment; trees will be preserved wherever possible. Implementation of the proposed plan will provide safer circulation for vehicles and people.

Bob Wisan/Architect with Neenan Co. stated the proposal concentrates heavily on the mountain-stick architectural style and incorporates green building practices. A fourth lodge is planned in the core area in the future; additional parking may need to be installed at that time. The entire loop network of roads will be improved. The applicant will install a deceleration lane at the Tunnel Road entrance to the YMCA grounds, with future work planned on the bridge. Stormwater drainage in the core area will be addressed with this development plan.

Jeff Chamberlain/RLH Engineering provided information about the planned phasing of the proposed redevelopment. He stated the work will be completed in multiple phases, continuing through May 2010. The applicant has three additional requests of the Planning Commission:

1. An extension of the deadline for submittal of mylar plans from the required 30 days to 60 days following approval.
2. Flexibility for minor changes in the development plan to be approved at staff-level.
3. An extension of the vesting period from the standard one year to three years.

Planner Shirk clarified that the new turn lane to be installed along Tunnel Road will not be constructed prior to or during the summer of 2008. The requirement for installation of the turn lane is triggered when there is an increase in density, which will not occur until the lodges are constructed.

Commissioner Tucker noted two of the companies the YMCA has retained worked very successfully on last year's public school improvements. Commissioner Grant commended

the YMCA for its commitments to the principles of green building, reduced environmental impacts, and lighting. Director Joseph stated the YMCA has made a commitment to developing a sound master plan and is following through to make a real improvement on its campus. Although the new buildings are large for Estes Park, this effort to rebuild the heart of the campus is a contraction of their footprint on the land. He commended the YMCA for its efforts.

It was moved and seconded (Tucker/Grant) to approve Development Plan 08-02, YMCA of the Rockies – Core Area, a Metes and Bounds property located at 2515 Tunnel Road, with the findings and conditions recommended by staff, and the motion passed unanimously.

CONDITONS:

1. The “loop road” shall be fully constructed and Mountainside Drive from Friendship Lane south to the Alpen Inn parking entrance shall be fully abandoned and revegetation begun (seeded and hydromulched) within one year of issuance of final certificate of occupancy and shall be included in the form of guarantee for this development plan.
2. Compliance with the letter from Upper Thompson Sanitation District received January 15, 2008.
3. Compliance with memos from Greg White, Karlin Goggin, and Traci Downs.
4. Final construction plans shall be approved by the Larimer County Engineering Department prior to issuance of the grading permit and/or first building permit.
5. A Development Construction Permit shall be issued by Larimer County Engineering prior to issuance of any permits.
6. The overall lighting plan discussed in the Master Plan shall be developed and submitted to Community Development Staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Lighting shall be turned off when not necessary, and the plan shall outline reduced lighting hours and/or season.
7. Existing lighting and the Kallenberg Drive/Tunnel Road intersection shall be made code compliant, and an entry landscape feature shall be included in the landscape plan. These improvements shall be done at the same time as the bridge repairs and shall be accounted for in the improvement guarantee.
8. The wayfinding system as outlined in the Master Plan shall be submitted for staff review and approval prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.
9. Trash receptacles, bench and table locations, and wayfinding maps shall be delineated on the site plan and shall be subject to review and approval of Community Development Staff.
10. The development plan includes many examples of “cleaning up” the road system, which shall be accounted for in the development agreement.
11. The following note shall be added to the development plan: “All exterior lighting shall be shielded and directed downward. Compliance with Section 7.9 of the Estes Valley Development Code is required.”
12. Bollard lighting shall be included at all sidewalk intersections.
13. Existing trees to remain shall be fenced for protection prior to any site work and shall be delineated on the development plan, landscaping plan, and grading plan.
14. ADA ramps shall be delineated on the site plan.
15. Bike rack locations shall be delineated on the development plan (one for each lodge).
16. Hydrant locations shall be included on the development plan.
17. The Land Use Table shall include unit count (existing, proposed) and number of bicycle spaces provided.
18. The legal description shall not include the first phrase “Know all men . . . being owners of the.”
19. The Certificate of Ownership shall include printed names and titles.
20. “Notes” sections on the Cover Sheet shall be consolidated with redundant notes removed.
21. The number of rooms shall be included on the Grand Lodge elevation; floor area shall be included on all elevations; and floorplans shall be provided.
22. The landscaping plan shall include information regarding percentage of parking area devoted to landscape islands.

23. The percentage of parking area covered by landscaping islands shall be delineated on the landscaping plan.
24. The development plan shall include sidewalk and trail connections, as outlined in the staff report.
25. The phasing schedule shall include the new loop road and removal of Kallenberg/Mountainside.

6. ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2008

It was moved and seconded (Tucker/Grant) to elect **Commissioner Eisenlauer for Chair** and **Commissioner Klink for Vice-Chair** for 2008, and the motion passed unanimously.

It was moved and seconded (Tucker/Hull) to appoint the Community Development Department Secretary or designee as Recording Secretary for 2008, and the motion passed unanimously.

7. REPORTS

Planner Chilcott reported that staff anticipates receipt of an application for subdivision and redevelopment of the Elkhorn Lodge property on January 23, 2008, which is the next submittal deadline. The property consists of approximately 60 acres, 20 of which are currently accessed from Elkhorn Avenue and 40 acres that are accessed from Elm Road. The proposal will include a bypass road connection from Highway 34 to Highway 36 through Elm Road, as well as single-family residential development on the upper 40 acres and commercial development on the lower 20 acres (with design guidelines). This will be a large-scale development proposal. If the submitted application is complete, it will be scheduled for review by the Planning Commission on March 18, 2008.

There being no further business, Chair Hull adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

Betty Hull, Chair

Julie Roederer, Recording Secretary