

MEETING MINUTES

**Meeting of the Technical Review Committee for Stanley Historic District Lot 4
November 30, 2006, 2:00 p.m.
Board Room, Estes Park Town Hall**

- Committee Members:** Michael Chalona, Bob Goehring, Bob Joseph, Randy Repola, John Spooner
- Attending:** Chair Repola, Technical Review Committee Members Chalona, Goehring, Joseph, and Spooner
- Also Attending:** Architectural Review Committee Member H. David Nelson, Town Attorney Greg White, and Recording Secretary Julie Roederer
- Absent:** None

Chair Repola called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

He stated the Committee's role is to review the technical compliance of the development plan submittal with the requirements of the Stanley Historic District Master Plan (henceforth Master Plan). The Estes Valley Development Code (EVDC) is not applicable to this application. The sale of Lot 4 is a Town Board decision. The Committee's goal for this meeting is to reach a decision whether to approve the submittal, disapprove, or approve with conditions. A written summary of the Committee's conclusions will be completed following the meeting.

APPLICANT COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

Kerry Prochaska of Cornerstone Engineering and Surveying addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, Estes Winds, LLC. Comments are summarized as follows:

Parking & Access

- Mr. Prochaska stated that per the Master Plan guidelines, 186 parking spaces would be required for this development. The applicant proposes 163. Thirty-six of the spaces are for residential use, which meets the requirements of two spaces for each of the eighteen proposed units. Shared parking is proposed due to the mixed-use nature of the development. Two other local developments that have similar mixed uses—Stanley Village Shopping Center and National Park Village South—provide 75% and 65% of the required parking spaces, respectively. The applicant's proposal of 163 parking spaces will provide 86% of the required parking spaces. The assumed occupancy load per vehicle for the banquet hall was three to four people per vehicle.
- Mr. Prochaska presented a site drawing showing several proposed revisions to address concerns expressed by the Committee at the November 16, 2006 meeting. Revisions include:
 - Redesign of a portion of the parking area to the northeast of Building D to provide access to that parking area from the south, as well as add four parking spaces (included in total above). A sidewalk connection would also be provided in that location.
 - A crosswalk and stairs at the exit from the Stanley Hotel property have been added.
 - Sidewalk, crosswalk, and handicapped ramps have been added in an L-shaped configuration to provide a pedestrian connection between Building C and the restaurant/banquet facility, the Wild Elk Lodge.
 - Member Joseph suggested the addition of a sidewalk connection from the residential units (Buildings B1 and B2) to the commercial core. Mr. Prochaska expressed the applicant's willingness to add this connection.
- The Public Works Department suggested in a memo dated November 13, 2006 that the applicant provide sidewalk along the eastern property line, which would be in the general location of an existing horse trail along Steamer Drive. Mr. Prochaska stated no connection could be made to the suggested sidewalk because an existing open-

space outlot owned by Stanley Hills Homeowners Association lays between the horse trail and public right-of-way. Town Attorney White provided a brief history of a lawsuit regarding the outlot and stated his belief that cuts across the outlot for either drainage or pedestrian use would not be possible unless the homeowners' association was willing to grant an easement.

- In lieu of the sidewalk along Steamer Drive, Member Joseph suggested that a sidewalk be constructed on the south side of Steamer Parkway from Steamer Drive to the eastern entrance of the development. This sidewalk would provide pedestrian access into the development from the residential neighborhoods to the north. Mr. Prochaska stated the applicant would be willing to provide that sidewalk.
- The Public Works Department also requested an Ashto-type guard rail along the southern boundary of the property for vehicular/pedestrian safety. After discussion, it was agreed the applicant will provide a berm or similar feature that would enhance safety and still be aesthetically pleasing, subject to approval by Town staff.

Traffic Impact Analysis

- Mr. Prochaska stated a revised traffic impact analysis (TIA) had been submitted, as requested by the Committee. Although he estimates that 25% to 30% of traffic to the site will enter or exit via Stanley Village Shopping Center, Mr. Prochaska assumed no traffic would use the Stanley Village access for the purposes of the revised TIA. His findings were that 1,300 to 1,340 trips per day would be generated on Steamer Drive/Steamer Parkway. He argued that a left turn lane on Steamer Drive and/or a right turn lane on Steamer Parkway are not warranted.

Storm Drainage

- Mr. Prochaska met with staff of the Public Works Department and Mr. Spooner to review the proposed storm drainage. Mr. Prochaska stated the applicant will comply with requirements to store drainage and not impact downstream users. There may be an opportunity to discharge water onto an outlot in the Stanley Hills PUD rather than onto Steamer Drive; the applicant is willing to make the necessary design changes if it is determined that it is possible to do so. Committee Member Spooner stated that if one assumes that the developer is allowed to discharge at the historic rate at the historic discharge point, either option (discharging drainage onto the outlot or discharging drainage on Steamer Drive) will work. He stated the better solution would be to direct the discharge under Steamer Drive to the outlot if it is possible to do so.

Lighting

- Written comments regarding the proposed lighting were received from the Public Works Department and Member Chalona. The applicant does not propose additional lighting along Steamer Parkway, given the number of lights currently in place there. Lighting internal to the development has not yet been worked out in detail. Steve Lane of Basis Architecture, representing the applicant, stated exterior lighting will be provided on the buildings, as well as in the plaza and courtyard. Lighting will comply with "dark sky" requirements and will be incorporated into landscape features where possible; the applicant will submit lighting cut sheets with the building permit applications for staff review and approval. Members Repola and Goehring expressed the opinion that lighting should maintain consistency with current light fixtures along Steamer Parkway that were installed by the Estes Park Urban Renewal Authority (EPURA). Member Joseph stated that the newly proposed crosswalk from the end of the Stanley Hotel access road across Steamer Parkway would warrant a streetlight (to match those installed by EPURA). The proposed staircase leading into the development from that location will also require lighting. Mr. Prochaska agreed that the applicant will install a street light at the south end of the crosswalk that coordinates with the existing lighting.

Other

- Mr. Prochaska stated the applicant is willing to comply with all other suggestions made by the Public Works Department and Member Chalona.

MEETING MINUTES

**Technical Review Committee for Stanley Historic District Lot 4
November 30, 2006**

3

Chair Repola acknowledged receipt of correspondence from Al Renner on behalf of the Stanley Views Homeowners Association and also again acknowledged receipt of the packet of information from Attorney Amy Hansen of Otten, Johnson, Robinson, Neff & Ragonetti, PC. He opened the meeting to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Amy Hansen of Otten, Johnson, Robinson, Neff & Ragonetti, PC, addressed the committee on behalf of New Stanley Associates, LLLP. She requested that information from all prior proceedings, including the Technical Review Committee meeting on the applicant's previous proposal; the Estes Valley Development Code; and the confidential financial information submitted by New Stanley Associates be incorporated into the official record for this proposal. She objected to the applicant's request that the Committee not include below-grade square footage in the project totals; she objected to the proposed banquet hall use, stating it is not an allowed accessory use; and she objected to the number of proposed parking spaces. She stated the EVDC should apply to this application and encouraged the Committee to adopt EVDC standards for review. She urged the Committee to consider the economic viability of the Stanley Hotel and the possible financial impacts of the proposed banquet hall to the Stanley Hotel. Town Attorney White stated the prior development proposal submitted by the applicant had been withdrawn and is irrelevant to the current application. He agreed that the financial information submitted by New Stanley Associates could become a part of the official record. He stated it doesn't make any difference whether the EVDC is included in the official record or not and did not object to its inclusion. Chair Repola stated the economic viability of the hotel is a consideration solely in the Master Plan's site specific standards and design guidelines for Parcel 1. Attorney Hansen agreed that competition with the hotel is not prohibited.

Bob Shelley, General Manager of the Stanley Hotel, stated he does not object to the development proposal except for the banquet facility, which would compete directly with the hotel. He expressed his concern that the number of proposed parking spaces is inadequate to meet the parking demand that will be generated.

Al Renner, 601 Findley Court, expressed his concern that the design of Steamer Parkway is not adequate to accommodate the estimated use of 1,300 cars per day. He also stated the proposed parking is inadequate and there is not adjacent parking available for overflow.

George Peck, 280 Peck Lane, urged the Committee to consider the Stanley hotel and its importance to Estes Park. He stated Lot 4 should be left as open space and objected in general terms to the amount of development in Estes Park.

Steve Lane of Basis Architecture, representing the applicant, stated the proposed number of parking spaces is based on technical design standards used across the country. He emphasized that none of the below-grade square footage is rentable; it will be used exclusively for building services or parking. Unsightly services such as trash storage will be placed out of public view; there is no monetary gain to the developer in doing this. He stated the developer should not be penalized for using good design principles on the site.

Jim Edwards addressed the Committee, stating he is the potential owner of the restaurant/banquet facility. He currently owns Twin Owls, which has two banquet facilities (one that seats 50, one that seats 60) and a restaurant that seats 100 people. There are forty parking spaces at Twin Owls. He stated that although parking can get tight on weekends, it is ample otherwise.

CONCLUSIONS:

Town Attorney White reiterated his belief that the Estes Valley Development Code does not govern the use of Lot 4—the Master Plan does. It is within the purview of the Technical Review Committee to find that the uses proposed by the applicant are allowed.

Chair Repola polled the Committee Members regarding whether there was reason to deny the application. No Member expressed belief of reason for denial.

VARIANCES

- 1. Variance from commercial main floor with residential units above to allow commercial and residential development to be on either the first or second floor, and to allow buildings to contain either or both residential and commercial uses (Buildings C and D).**

DISCUSSION: Chair Repola noted that the Committee had received feedback at the November 16, 2006 meeting that this variance made sense. Member Spooner noted the Committee had received public comment in support of the variance.

It was moved and seconded (Chalona/Spooner) to approve variance request #1, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

- 2. Variance to the commercial setback mandatory build-to line from zero feet to approximately fifteen feet (Building C) and twenty-four feet (Building D).**

DISCUSSION: This variance references the plaza design versus a streetscape design.

It was moved and seconded (Spooner/Joseph) to approve variance request #2, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

- 3. Variance to the residential landscape buffer setback to allow decks thirty inches or more above grade to extend into the setback by as much as ten feet (Building B1).**

DISCUSSION: None.

It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Goehring) to approve variance request #3, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

- 4. Variance from parking requirements to allow 163 total parking spaces, due to shared parking on the site, in lieu of the 186 required.**

DISCUSSION: Member Joseph and Chair Repola noted that other local developments provide fewer than the required number of parking spaces but still have workable parking arrangements due to mixed uses.

It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Spooner) to approve variance request #4, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

- 5. Variance to the requirement for all commercial off-street parking to be located behind buildings.**

DISCUSSION: Member Chalona stated he would support the proposed variance if additional landscaping and/or other buffering such as berming or fencing is provided, as discussed during the Committee meeting on November 16, 2006. Changes the applicant may propose to meet this requirement would be subject to review and approval by Town staff.

It was moved and seconded (Chalona/Goehring) to approve variance request #5, with the condition noted below, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

CONDITION: Additional buffering shall be provided in the form of landscaping, berming, or fencing, or a combination thereof, and shall be subject to review and approval by Town staff.

- 6. Variance from the requirement in Special Conditions Note 3 that the second primary access point be between the eastern access and the access drive to the Stanley Hotel because the description of the Stanley Hotel access is no longer accurate.**

DISCUSSION: At the time the Master Plan was adopted, it was assumed the main entrance to the Stanley Hotel would be in a location other than where it is today.

It was moved and seconded (Spooner/Joseph) to approve variance request #6, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

MEETING MINUTES

Technical Review Committee for Stanley Historic District Lot 4
November 30, 2006

5

- 7. Variance from the roof slope specified in the Master Plan to allow accent roofs to be at a pitch less than 4:12, specifically as shown on the submitted architectural elevations.**

DISCUSSION: Architectural Review Committee Member H. David Nelson stated the Architectural Review Committee's support of this design element.

It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Goehring) to approve variance request #7, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

- 8. Variance to allow encroachment not to exceed ten feet into the building setback in order to accommodate rotation of Building B1 in order to save existing trees. Utilization of this alternative shall be the developer's option. If the developer exercises this option, Town staff shall ensure compliance.**

DISCUSSION: Member Chalona expressed his concern that the location of Building B1 will damage the root zones of many trees and may result in the loss of those trees. He suggested "flipping" the building in an effort to save the trees. Mr. Lane noted that a variance would have to be approved because changing the orientation of the building will result in a corner of the building encroaching into the setback rather than the deck. The Committee chose to vote on an optional variance to allow this encroachment.

It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Chalona) to approve variance request #8, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- The site plan exhibit presented by Mr. Prochaska at today's meeting, with the changes shown on the exhibit, shall be adopted as the part of the official submittal. Changes are summarized as follows:
 - The entrance to the residential parking area behind Building D shall be located at the southeast end of the lot rather than on the northeast side.
 - Four parking spaces shall be added to the residential parking area behind Building D.
 - A crosswalk on Steamer Parkway shall be located at the end of the driveway to the Stanley Hotel to provide pedestrian access to the development on Lot 4. A stairway from the crosswalk into the development shall be constructed.
 - Lighting shall be provided at the crosswalk and shall match the existing lighting fixtures along Steamer Parkway.
 - Sidewalk, crosswalk, and handicapped ramps shall be added in an L-shaped configuration to provide a pedestrian connection between Building C and the Wild Elk Lodge.
 - A pedestrian connection shall be added from the residential portion of the site to the commercial portion of the site.
 - Sidewalk shall be constructed along the south side of Steamer Parkway from Steamer Drive to the easternmost entrance of the development. This sidewalk shall not encroach on the open-space outlot.
 - Berming and landscaping along the southern property line shall be installed for public safety in place of a guard rail to address concerns noted in the Public Works memo of November 29, 2006.
- Compliance with review comments submitted by Committee Member Chalona.
- Compliance with comments made in the Public Works memo dated November 29, 2006, with the exception of item "h" as noted above, subject to review and approval by Town staff.
- The proposed stormwater management plan shall be reviewed and approved by Town staff.

MEETING MINUTES

**Technical Review Committee for Stanley Historic District Lot 4
November 30, 2006**

6

5. In order to address concerns regarding traffic congestion at the intersection of Steamer Parkway and Steamer Drive, signage shall be installed, if warranted, providing right of way to vehicles turning south from Steamer Parkway onto Steamer Drive. Proposed signage shall be reviewed and approved by Town staff.

FINDINGS:

1. It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Spooner) to find that the banquet facility use is consistent with the site-specific development standards for Lot 4 as described in the Stanley Historic District Master Plan, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.
2. It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Goehring) to find that the below-grade square footage of the service area and parking area below the Wild Elk Lodge building (Building A) not be counted as part of the 30,000 square feet of commercial space as it is not being used for commercial activity. Use of this below-grade area shall be permanently restricted to service and/or parking use; the below-grade area may not be converted to commercial use in the future. The motion passed unanimously via voice vote.
3. It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Chalona) to find that the below-grade square footage of the parking and service areas in the residential buildings B1 and B2 not be counted as part of the residential square footage as it is not being used for residential activity, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.
4. It was moved and seconded (Joseph/Chalona) to accept the Architectural Review Committee's finding, at the November 16, 2006 meeting, of the development proposal's compliance with the Stanley Historic District Master Plan site specific development standards for Parcel 4, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

FINAL APPROVAL:

It was moved and seconded (Spooner/Goehring) to approve the applicant's proposal for development of Stanley Historic District Parcel 4, with the findings, conditions, and variances approved by the Technical Review Committee, and with authorization for Town staff to provide a written summary of said findings, conditions, and variances, and the motion passed unanimously via voice vote.

All conditions of approval shall be subject to review and approval by Town staff prior to issuance of a building permit. The applicant shall provide a final set of plans reflecting the changes proposed by the applicant and those requested by the Technical Review Committee; these revised plans shall become the official development plans for the site.

Chair Repola adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

Randy Repola, Meeting Chair

Julie Roederer, Recording Secretary