

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

DRAFT

**TOWN OF DILLON
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, September 3, 2014
5:30 p.m.
Town Hall**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Dillon, Colorado, was held on Wednesday, September 3, 2014, at Dillon Town Hall. Vice Chairman Nosari called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm. Commissioners present were: Amy Gaddis, Nathan Nosari, Jerry Peterson and Jeff Shibley; Commissioner Brad Bailey was absent. Staff members present were Ned West, Town Planner / Engineering Inspector, Dan Burroughs, Town Engineer / Community Development Coordinator.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF August 6, 2014

Commissioner Peterson moved to approve the meeting minutes from August 6, 2014. Commissioner Shibley seconded the motion, which then passed with roll call vote, Commissioner Nosari abstaining because he was not present at the August 6th meeting.

Public Comments

No Public Comments – No Members of the public Present.

Dillon Municipal Code Interpretation per Sec. 16-3-10(b):

‘Parking Requirements’ (Sec. 16-6-40) as it relates to dormitory style rooms for boarding. The Commission shall make a determination such that the Code may be clarified if warranted.

Ned West, Town Planner, presented the topic and began the discussion with stating that this interpretation is a continuation of the discussion from the previous Planning and Zoning Commission meeting where the commissioners discussed a parking ratio of 50-75% parking spaces to beds for dormitory style / hostel lodging. Mr. West presented data obtained from surrounding communities as well as some throughout the State and Nation. Many communities use their parking requirements for dormitories for assessing the parking requirements for a hostel. Included in the table presented to the commissioners was data from the Dillon Municipal Code for various parking requirements for comparison purposes.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Jurisdictional Comparison for Hostel Parking Requirements							
Hostel Location	Have Hostel	Parking Spaces	Occupants / Beds	Unit	Square Feet	Specifically Address Hostels	Comments
Anchorage, AK	Yes	1	2		600	Yes	Hostel Group Living: 1 parking space per 2 beds, + 1 per 100 SF of assembly area
Boulder	Yes	2	3			Yes	
Estes Park	Yes	1	3			Yes	+ 1 space per 3 employees
Gunnison	Yes	1	1			Yes	+1 space per 3 employees
Aspen	Yes	0.7		1		No	Hotel / Lodge
Breckenridge	Yes*				1,000	No	*Property annexed as is Dormitory inside service area - fractional component paid, not rounded up Dormitory outside service area - fractional portion rounded up Based on their website & aerial photography. 0.74 spaces per bed
The Bivvi, Breck		14	19				
Durango	Yes	1	2			No	Dormitories / Fraternities / Sororities
Fraser	Yes*					No	*Former hostel purchased and privatized as a ranch bunk house
		1		1			Hotels, Hotels, Rooming Houses
		1		1			For each owner's / manager's quarters
Glenwood Springs	Yes	1		1		No	Hotel, Rooming House
Grand Junction	Yes	1	4			No	Group Living. + 1 space per each 3 employees
		1	2				Dormitories
		1		1			Hotels. + 1 space per 250 SF or restaurant, bars, meeting space
Grand Lake	Yes	2		1		No	Bed & Breakfast Group Home. + 1 space per 4 beds
		1		1			Hotels. 1.5 spaces per 2 bedroom unit; 2 spaces per 3 bedroom unit; 2.5 spaces per 4 bedroom unit
		1		1			Hotel, motel, lodge
Ketchum, ID	No*	0.75		1		No	Accommodation. *Proposal for Hostel brought forth, but does not appear to have gone forward
		1			1,500		Residential. + 1 space for every 4 residential units
Leadville	Yes	1		1		No	Hotels, hotels, bed & breakfast
		1		10			+ 1 space per employee for each 10 units; min. 1 space per employee
Salida	Yes	1		1		No	Lodging. + 1 space per 150 SF of group assembly, + 1 space for accessory commercial space + 1 space per manager / front desk person
Dillon	No					No	
		1		1			Lodging
		0.25	1				College. + 1 space per faculty member
		1	4				Auditorium / Theater
		1	1				Adult Entertainment. 1 space per seat + 1 space per employee based upon maximum

Mr. West stated that there is a potential for a hostel to come to Dillon, and since the Code does not specifically address the parking requirements for such dormitory style lodging, Town staff is requesting that the Planning and Zoning Commission make an interpretation of the Code and decide what the appropriate parking requirements should be for such a type of lodging. This information is needed so that the potential developer can develop a site plan and business model. The issue with the current Code regulations on parking as it relates to lodging is that there would be a requirement for one parking space per lodging unit; however, a hostel might have as many as eight beds in a single lodging unit or dormitory room.

Dan Burroughs, Community Development Coordinator, stated that this is a unique potential project, but he cautioned the commissioners not to judge the specific project and its potential location, but consider the basic question of what parking requirement seems the most appropriate for the style of lodging.

Commissioner Nosari asked if there is data presented to date by the potential applicant as to the modes of travel for their potential clients. How many come by Greyhound versus personal car?

Commissioner Gaddis commented that typically people staying in hostels come by mass transit.

Mr. West agreed that that is the model we see elsewhere in the world, especially in Europe; however, the lack of mass transportation in the United States makes it difficult to make that assumption. This is especially true for Summit County where there is some, but limited, mass transit opportunities.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Commissioner Nosari stated that the County does have a Greyhound station.

Mr. West acknowledged the Greyhound station as well as the Colorado Mountain Express, and another transit company bringing people up from the Denver airport. Also noted is that six people might pile into a vehicle and travel to Summit County for winter activities and then seek affordable lodging such as a hostel, but there also might be that one person in their own car wanting to stay there.

Commissioner Gaddis asked if the developer had done a hostel project elsewhere.

Mr. Burroughs stated that he did not think that the particular person that Town staff has been dealing with does not appear to have yet done a development project. We will be asking the developer to submit a study for their project that would include travel modes of clientele and parking demands; however, the Town is also interested in protecting itself from parking problems or law suits. It was noted that there is no Town provided overnight parking in the area of the potential project, as there is in the Town Center. So no overflow is readily available. The Town does not want to be burdened in the future with a parking problem associated with this style of lodging.

Mr. West stated that the potential applicant had stated that they would reach out to the surrounding businesses to try to obtain some overnight, overflow parking through joint parking agreements. This does not eliminate the need to provide the required parking on site.

Commissioner Gaddis summarized the presented jurisdictional comparison data by stating that the parking requirements range from 50% to 100%. She then asked if we have any idea what the developer is thinking about for occupants.

Mr. West stated that the last number talked about was a one hundred bed hostel with some private rooms and some in dormitory style rooms.

Commissioner Peterson then commented with that size of a facility there will be a need for bus parking. There will be church groups wanting to come by bus.

Mr. Burroughs again asked the commissioners to consider the parking requirements in more general terms rather than only considering this particular potential project.

Commissioner Peterson referenced the hostel in Breckenridge that has 0.74 spaces per bed. He felt that is a good number to use. Then he thought adding one space per employee would be appropriate. Commissioners Shibley, Gaddis, and Nosari agreed with a 75% ratio. The employee parking was further discussed, and the commissioners agreed on a parking requirement for employees of one space per three employees present on site at any given time. If there are employees living onsite, the parking requirements associated with their dwelling units would count, but they would not be double counted in the employee count for the general parking lot.

Discussion Item:

Electronic Message Center (Digital Displays): Staff was supposed to meet with CDOT today to discuss the topic with them; however, they were forced to postpone the meeting. Staff has nothing new to present tonight and refers the commissioners to the numerous previous discussions on the topic in the past. The signs being discussed would be Town entry signs both on Lake Dillon Drive as well as the western entry signs on Anemone Trail. Both staff and the Town Council are interested in changing the existing marquee signs to a digital format primarily to improve the ability to change the copy on the signs, as well as the idea to get the word out for traffic problems as quickly as possible to

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

avoid the clogging of Highway 6 that has been observed in the past. Things to consider will be how often the sign displays will cycle from image to image.

Other Business:

It was discussed that there is a possibility that we will not need to have a meeting in December due to a lack of foreseeable applications. Staff does anticipate tenant finish and even some single family development applications, but those are currently staff level approvals because the Code was changed by the previous planner to make things that way.

Again discussed trying to schedule legal training. Proposed looking into a Monday, perhaps 10-12 p.m. because of the town attorney's inability to come up on Wednesdays.

Adjournment: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Wilkerson

Debbie Wilkerson,
Secretary to the Commission