

Work Session Notes
October 9, 1985
Page 3

- At the next meeting there will be a recommendation from staff.
- Shoot to reschedule the field trip early in the evening on October 23rd.

SWEENEY PROPERTIES MPD

Dave said to help facilitate and structure tonight's work session, staff prepared an outline. Dave said it was important to concentrate on the "hard" issues at this point in the review. He further commented that Master Plan approval is just that and to focus on those areas which can reasonably be resolved through this process, as opposed to those which are better deferred until conditional use review.

On September 11, 1985, the Commission discussed the Coalition development sites adjacent to the Town Lift base facilities. At this meeting there seemed to be a consensus that the conceptual plans for these sites were acceptable.

On September 25, 1985 the discussion focused on the hillside development sites where several major issues have been identified. The applicants presented detailed slides of the Creole Gulch and Mid-station sites, depicting four different development scenarios.

On October 9, 1985 the discussion focused on staff's outline as follows:

I. Norfolk Avenue Extended.

A. Should Norfolk Ave. be extended?

At this juncture, staff and the consensus of the Commissioners do not favor this option. They are primarily concerned about the impact it would have upon the city budget and services. In addition, there is a larger land area disturbance resulting from the new road and single family home concept. This concept would also create visual impacts to existing homes in the area. Commissioners favoring this concept felt that fiscal impacts shouldn't rule over the impacts to the community. They would rather see a single family home transition from Old Town to the mountain.

B. Is Upper Norfolk appropriate for any additional development?

The extension of Norfolk would help alleviate some of the current access problems but it would still be difficult to access Norfolk from the King Rd. area.

C. Are there alternate locations for development that should be evaluated in light of the above discussion?

The consensus of the Commission favors clustering the density at the Mid-Station and Creole Gulch sites.

II. CREOLE SITE

- A. Is there a preferred approach to the development of this site?

Referring to photographs A-D, the Commissioners prefer A, or the scenario proposed by the Sweeney family.

- B. How detailed should the Master Plan get?

The Commissioners need more time within which to decide the correct approach to the master plan details since this is such a long range issue. Still to be worked out are the:

- a) building pad(s), areas of disturbance
- b) building envelope(s), height definition

Will there be a possible 100' height envelope - should Council's input be required at this time?

- c) development parameters or concepts

The high rise approach is difficult to envision at this time.

-) specific density assignment vs. ranges

Should something similar to the Deer Valley SEP approach be applied here? The problem is how the agreements are formed with the Master Plan approval and how to actually label density assignments for each parcel.

- e) what zoning approach makes the most sense

- B. Is the density appropriate or reasonable?

The majority of the Commissioners are comfortable with the density issue, however, some Commissioners are very concerned about the number of unit equivalents assigned to this site.

- C. What additional information or analysis would be helpful in rendering a decision?

A meeting with Council.

III. MID-STATION SITE

- A. Identify the critical or key issues

- 1. Is this site appropriate for development?

The consensus of the Commission favor clustering on this site rather than the extension of Norfolk Avenue.

(Mid-Station Site Continued)

2. Should we rank the concerns raised?

There seems to be concerns regarding the transition from Old Town and the density, massing and height at this site.

3. Explore other options to those proposed.

The 650' Norfolk extended cul-de-sac, and the high rise and stepped high rise approach has been discussed.

4. Determine level of detail necessary at this point.

Still under discussion.

B. Consider various options available and trade-offs.

The high rise approach would produce the greatest amount of trade offs available. A short extension of Norfolk was suggested.

C. What additional information or analysis would be helpful?

Input from Council on height envelope.

Phasing

Pat Sweeney said that the Coalition site will be under construction within the next five years. On the hillside properties the Sweeney family is looking for realistic scenarios that are marketable to potential developers over the next fifteen years.

Summary

Clustering concept is o.k.

Density is o.k.

Norfolk Avenue extended will not be pursued any further.

Need a proposal for gross parcel density.

Height - will there be a stepped facade and 100 foot envelope?

- do we need to meet with Council regarding the height issue?

Phasing - block in 5 year increments? (Code now 2 years)

More work sessions are needed.

Dave Boesch said that staff feels the applicant would probably prefer Option 2 and to take his chances in the future when the adjacent vacant lots were built on. However, the Commissioners were concerned about the enforcement of this option.

Motion

Ruth Gezelius: "I move that we approve Option 1 as shown with Exhibit "A" for the condition use approval to allow the property owner at 2075 Equestrian Way to keep two horses on Lots 9 and 10", subject to the following conditions:

1. That Option 1 as shown with Exhibit "A" be used to define the area used for the paddock to ensure that the paddock is a minimum of 75 feet from the nearest dwelling.
2. That the paddock be located no closer than 75 feet to the Equestrian Way right-of-way.
3. That the paddock area be kept sufficiently clean so that a nuisance is not created by offensive odors.
4. That no horses will be allowed to be kept on the subject property until a certificate of occupancy has been issued.
5. Standard Departmental Review Requirements.

Vote and Second

Paul Bickmore seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m. and the work session on the following items was continued.

WORK SESSION

1. Bald Eagle Community MPD - Continued discussion and follow-up on tonight's field trip.
2. Sweeney Properties MPD/Hillside Properties - Continued discussion regarding the development concept proposed for the property situated above Woodside Avenue, adjacent to the Town Lift mid-station, and in Creole Gulch southwest of the Empire Avenue/Lowell Avenue switchback.
3. Planning Department Activities - Overview and update on current projects underway.