



**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**AMENDED Meeting Minutes**  
**February 5, 2019**

**PRESENT**

Jason Cowles, Chair  
Stephen Richards  
Jesse Gregg  
Charlie Perkins  
Matthew Hood  
Brent McFall  
Bill Nutkins

**STAFF**

Morgan Landers- Town Planner  
Colton Berck- Planner I  
Jessica Lake – Planning Technician

**ABSENT**

Kyle Hoiland

This meeting was recorded. The following is a condensed version of the proceedings written by Jessica Lake.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission held in the Eagle Town Hall on was called to order by Jason Cowles at 6:30p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Bill Nutkins made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2019 meeting. Matt Hood seconded. Brent McFall abstained as he was not present at the meeting. All others present voted in favor. The motion passed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**LAND USE FILES**

***PUD18-02 Reserve at Hockett Gulch***

1. Commissioner Cowles opened file PUD18-02, a request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning Map Application – max of 500 dwelling units of various types and/or 30,000sf of commercial on 30 acres. And a Site Specific Development Plan (vesting of property rights).

## **STAFF REPORT AND PERSENTATIONS**

Landers entered files into the public record that staff received after publication of the packet. The first file was the RHG Parking Variations Memo dated August 10, 2018, which did not make it into the packet. The remaining files entered into the public record are letters of public comment received after the publication of the packet, including: Jeff Kennedy of Moe's BBQ, Bruce Noring a local resident and Stan Kensinger of the Business Advocacy Council with the Chamber. Landers introduced the contract planning firm representative Stephanie Stevens of McCool Development; Fred Tobias, the Town Engineer; Brandy Reitter, the Town Manager; and Bill Shrum, Assistant to the Town Manager. Landers introduced Dominic Mauriello of Mauriello Planning Group, the applicant.

Mauriello gave an overview of the site and the proposal. Introduced Dan Metzger with Brau Baukal the owner of the property. Lauren Brockman of Convergence Multifamily Real Estate Group is the developer who is under contract to purchase a portion of the property. Mauriello presented the project focusing on the community support for the project; the vision for the property; an overview of the PUD; the benefits of the property's location and the opportunity for work force housing; traffic and parking; and park land dedication requirements versus applicant proposal. Mauriello noted that the PUD supports the overall community goals. Believes that the PUD would bring density to the right place with limited impacts, provide development of non-environmentally sensitive land; the property would be connected to the fabric of the community; the PUD would foster economic growth; and it would implement workforce housing goals. The proposed PUD would allow for up to 500 dwelling units; 400 would be one and two-bedroom rental apartments; 100 units would be a variety of townhomes, apartments and single-family homes; 30% of the proposed rental units and 15% of the for sale units will be deed restricted. The proposed PUD also allows for a limited amount of commercial space, including: 30,000sq.ft. in total to be developed along Highway 6 and/or Sylvan Lake Road, the current vision is for this to be small local retail or commercial space that would serve the neighborhood.

Kari McDowell Schroeder with McDowell Engineering presented the Traffic Report. Analysis is based on worst case scenario, or highest traffic volume. The site is likely to generate over 5,000 vehicle trips per day. Delays are likely to occur at the North access on Hwy 6 as Hockett Gulch, Haymeadow and Eagle Ranch are built out. It will become more and more difficult to make left turns onto Hwy 6. Hwy 6 Corridor Study will be performed this year. Residents will most likely travel East to Sylvan Lake Roundabout to go West towards Gypsum. Eventually it will also be difficult to turn left on to Sylvan Lake Road as well.

Mauriello followed up McDowell with the onsite parking. Project meets the Town's requirements with the exception for guest parking. Mauriello and McDowell analyzed the typical parking for this type of a complex, proposal is for 1.75 parking spaces for a multiple family unit. This matches Town Code if you don't count the guest parking spaces. Under current code 179 parking spaces would be required. Irrigation and water usage is proposed with raw water to reduce demand on the water treatment facilities. Cowles asked where the diversion point would be. Mauriello responded that it is on Sylvan Lake Road, very close to where the Green Acres Mobile Home Park's diversion point is. Believes that the project will be very efficient and use much less water than what Town Staff believes will be used for a project of this size.

Park land dedication is also likely to be an area of discussion, the requirement dates back to 1986. Roughly 50% of the property would need to be dedicated as park land. Need to consider the impact to Town when dedicating park land. Mauriello believes the project meets the intent of the park land dedication with the 9 acres of open space (4.7 acres of which are useable), easements, trail space, soft path, perimeter path, trailhead parking, crosswalk, recreational uses on the site and a land dedication fee up to \$50,000. Mauriello concludes that the proposal supports the Town goals with limited impacts, limited environmental impact, property is connected to the Town, PUD supports economic growth within the Town. Staff conditions one and three meet with applicant's approval, staff conditions two and four they feel will be negotiated with the Town Board from a policy standpoint.

Landers and Stevens present the project from staff's perspective. Landers commented that staff's presentation would respond to the applicant's presentation with staff's viewpoint. Current use is a vacant lot. Two requests are in front of you this evening for a PUD Zoning Map with a max of 500 dwelling units of various types and/or 30,000sf of commercial on 29.65 acres and for a Site Specific Development Plan, which is a vesting of property rights for a period of 7 years. 8 public comment letters were received prior and included in the packet and 3 letters were received after the publication of the packet and entered into the record at the start of the Hearing. Commissioners have done individual site visits. Site visits were conducted by Commissioners Hood, Nutkins, McFall and Gregg. The Town Board did review the Annexation and have allowed it to move forward to this point.

Landers reviewed the aerial photos and site visit photos and presented the project summary. The Standards for Approval for a Planned Unit Development were presented as well as the overall intent, which is "to encourage innovative and unique, mixed-use developments that promote efficiency and support a balance of preservation, open space, and cohesive development that provides a public benefit to the community." The guiding documents that staff reviewed are the Eagle Area Community Plan and the Town of Eagle Strategic Plan.

The Town's goals policies and plans include the Community Plan and the Strategic Plan as the guiding documents for Staff to review. Identify areas of guidance and areas of compliance. The project is within the Town's urban growth boundary. It is adjacent to existing development, incorporates open space and communal gathering spaces. It provides housing opportunity to residents that is area not currently occupied by other developments. Areas of conflict include the impact to existing wildlife movement, impact of high density on viewsheds, does not provide a density transition to rural lands on the external boundaries of town, potential impact to water quality, and the potential reduction in fee-based revenue with impacts to servicing and infrastructure improvements.

Landers presented the areas of the Strategic Plan looked at; mainly economic vitality and development and housing affordability and availability. There are multiple access points to this property, this project would allow to establish a western gateway to the Town. Housing affordability and availability for a project that has not been proposed in Eagle before, rental housing is not currently readily available.

Stevens presented Town Code, development standards and review. Stevens brought up the areas that are disputed between town staff and the applicant. Municipal Park Land Dedication variation in size to be able to reduce the amount of acreage up to 10%, staff is ok with this as long as they are maintaining the minimum amount. They would be required to donate 15 acres, 7.5 could be dedicated publicly and 7.5 could be dedicated privately. PUD does allow to waiver that by 50% in consideration of active recreation provided. Of that 15 acres 80% of that needs to be usable land. Staff is recommending for them to allowed to vary from the requirement although we do recommend going with a set per fee amount, minus those areas providing a public benefit.

Stevens presented the general architectural standards they are asking for a variance on the 35 ft height requirement. Commission could allow for this variation according to code. Staff supports the recommendation to vary to a maximum of 3 stories and 45 ft in height.

Stevens presented on parking and access, staff is supportive of the request to limit guest parking. Preference would be to not assign tenant and guest parking. McFall clarified that this does not pertain to the rental garages; Landers and Stevens confirmed.

Stevens presented the Local Employee Residential Requirements; this project goes above and beyond current requirements. Looking at the what we have required in the past, to be consistent we would require 10% of the fee priced at 90%-100% AMI.

Stevens presented the Environmental Impacts. Town received comments back from all referral groups, which were included in the packet. The property is a wildlife corridor although it is not a wildlife habitat. Preliminary analysis has been done; more information will be needed at time of development permit.

Staff recommends approval of PUD18-02 The Reserve at Hockett Gulch PUD Zoning Plan and Site-Specific Development Plan (vesting of property rights), with the following conditions:

1. OS-1 and OS-2 shall only be allowed to be reduced in acreage (at a maximum of 10%) if compliance with open space and municipal park land dedication requirements is maintained;
2. The payment-in-lieu for municipal and park land dedication shall be revised to match Town standards;
3. Guest parking for multi-family uses may only be eliminated if general parking spaces are not assigned specifically for residents, thereby offering guest parking options; and
4. Household income limits shall be lowered to 90-100% of AMI as it applies to for-sale units.

#### Q & A

Nutkins asked about Condition #1, if it applied to our Code the way it is. Stevens verified that yes, they would have to meet the minimum PUD open space requirement in the Code.

Gregg asked about the conservation-oriented development piece. Stevens replied that it is most relevant to the Eagle Area Community Plan which calls for smart planning to protect the high movement corridors, but it conflicts with the intent of conservation-oriented development. It's a balance between the conservation-oriented development and high density. Landers replied that this property is a bit of an anomaly because it is much smaller than some of the other projects that have been considered. Staff's perspective is that it is a smart growth, low impact development and compact development which can play well in conservation. Not all the properties share all the same types of characteristics. Gregg responded that clustered development should consider wildlife movement through the area. Nutkins commented that he witnessed an Elk herd moving through the property.

Nutkins asked about the variance in fees between the one-time fee of 8million versus if they paid the full Town fee it would be 12million. Landers responded that the reduction is in the water and sewer plant investment fees and mentioned that the Board will have to make that decision. Cowles asked for the rationale for the reduction. Landers noted that we only have one EQR table so if you do a reduction in one that automatically applies to the other.

Hood asked about the dichotomy between the park land dedication standards. Landers replied that it is very confusing. Municipal and Park Land Dedication is 15 acres which can be half private and half public. Effort to acknowledge that PUDs are difficult, and it might be appropriate to apply a reduction. Hood responded that he doesn't understand the two different numbers within the code. Hood asked if the intent of the PUD is to give more flexibility in that regard. Landers replied yes. In the instance of Haymeadow part went to fire and school areas. It can be used for municipal benefits as well. Hood asked about what changes we might see in the Code Update. Landers replied that code requirements dictate that money would go into an open space fund or you can split 50/50, it can't all go into capital improvements. Hood asked about where this portion of the code might be headed. Landers replied that this section will be revised, and we will look at best practices and take under consideration total units as a whole, not number of persons per unit.

McFall noted that we will have to look at the Open Space that currently exist within the Town and take that into account. This is a much different Town then when those code requirements were written into the code. Cowles asked if the Open Space requirements should stand in the way of the overarching goals of the community.

Cowles noted that much of the public support focuses on the work force housing component of the project, asked how staff came up with the minimum density requirement, which is different from some other projects that have come through the Town. Many projects have been skewed towards single family housing. If this is approved as written and we get what is required on the lower end of the density requirement we may have failed the Town. Stevens replied that staff has asked the applicant completely remove the single family component, what eventually resulted was the minimum density requirement of 6.86 dwelling units per acre. Staff agrees that this is something that the Commission should take under consideration. Hood asked if it was allowed in all three phases. Stevens replied yes. Perkins asked if phase two was for sale or rental. Mauriello replied that it could be any of them, multi-family, townhomes, duplexes and single family.

Perkins asked about the trash and refuse strategy. Mauriello replied that there will be refuse areas throughout the property, they will be concealed and interspersed between garage areas and be wildlife proof.

Perkins asked about electric charging stations. Mauriello replied it would depend on demand.

Cowles noted that we should focus on zoning.

Stevens noted that the concept plan is not being approved tonight or by the Commission. The Zoning Plan is what is up for approval.

Hood asked about the commercial and asked if there is concern about further segregating commercial centers. Landers replied that we don't want uses that pull away from our downtown, but we want to allow for neighborhood commercial amenities. It is a balance when it comes to Hwy 6 corridor. McFall questions whether or not the commercial is viable but is good for leaving it in the plan because it's not required.

Hood asked McDowell about the traffic study. McDowell did not include it they used a national standard. Roughly 1 car every 2 minutes would be the increase. Total trips per day is calculated to be 5,190.

Cowles asked issues that staff had raised about the AMI limits and how they apply to for sale units. suggesting they would go up to 15%. Was it discussed to have a portion go to the 90-100% AMI to have opportunity for lower income. Landers responded that administratively that is difficult. Achieving ranges might be achievable, the discussion could be had if that is something the Commission would like for staff to do.

Gregg asked about the irrigation. PUD says that irrigation is not a requirement, should it be one? Landers replied that feasibility is a concern at this point in the process. If we asked them to have it at this point it would be difficult to then change it at a later date. Gregg asked if the reduction in tap fees plays into irrigation? Landers said we really won't know until we dive into the details. Gregg asked if they paid up front and then used potable what would happen? Landers replied that there would be an analysis at time of development permit which is also when the fees would be assessed.

Gregg noted that there is a pretty clear difference between phase 1 and 2 and is that considered to be open space? Landers replied that staff prioritized the trail system as a higher amenity then the area along Hockett Gulch because it's a fairly informal depression at this point. Stevens noted that once you add in the soft path perimeter trail it's all a balance of getting impervious cover. Gregg asked about the impervious cover and conservation-oriented development. If we're not going to conserve enough open space, then maybe

impervious coverage should be increased. Richards commented that the break on the parking would allow more green space. Gregg replied it doesn't necessarily have to be green space.

Perkins asked about the access onto Hwy 6 if the access point is clear or if it will be difficult for people to be able to see oncoming traffic. Landers said that would definitely be considered at time of development permit. McDowell noted that they did look at it, per CDOT's access codes the project is in compliance with site distance.

Hood asked about the trailhead parking / Cowles asked how Corky's property is currently accessed. Landers said that property has informal access. To Matt's question does it make sense to allow community trailhead access here. Landers replied that John State (Open Space Manager) noted that in the summer we are short on trail access, this could act as overflow parking for the Eagle Ranch trail system. Interim measures could be put in place to deter people from poaching on the property. Staff originally thought that access to this could come from Sylvan Lake Road, but then it was found that there would be too many curb cuts to have access directly from Sylvan Lake Road. Discussed the public and private improvements. Hood asked if the thought is that it would primarily access that Eagle Ranch bike path? Landers replied yes and that it would provide for overflow and connection to existing trail system. Eventually it could provide access at the point in time that there was access across the adjacent property. Hood asked if other lots were full? Landers replied that yes some weekends the other lots are full. Hood replied that he's concerned that people might just choose to park there instead of using other lots. Landers replied that if the Commission feels that some of the public improvements are an acceptable offset to the Municipal and Parkland Dedication as a whole, then we would go through the more specific design and implementation at the development phase. Hood asked if there is a route to access the BLM directly from the property. Landers responded not at this time.

Cowles asked if there were any more questions and proposed a short break before public comment.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Cowles opened the meeting back up at 8:33pm. Asked the public to limit it to three minutes and try to keep things non-repetitive. The applicant will be able to respond to comments at the end.

Corky Fitzsimmons owns Hockett Gulch, does not want the project to proceed without them buying Hockett Gulch and if they won't, then the Town Open Space should buy Hockett Gulch. He has been trying to sell the property for some time now. Fitzsimmons is frustrated that people are already trespassing on this land. He doesn't want to be paying taxes and fees so that town people can recreate. Asking to have Town help regulate from people trespassing on the land. Town should initiate the sale of the land for \$1.5 million. Doesn't want the project to go forward if his land doesn't sell.

Jake Hesseltine with Green Acres Mobile Home Park raised concerns about the pollution of the water as well as the traffic issues and the wildlife migrations would certainly be affected. The guest parking and the parking in general seems naïve based on the parking issues around town. Most households have at least one car per person.

Stan Kensinger of 2753 E. Haystacker Drive and President of the Business Advocacy Council. Trying to encourage economic vitality in the Town especially in downtown and in Eagle Ranch. Most single family lots are spoken for in the Town. This project would help create economic vitality, through providing important employee housing. Also provides 500+ people who are going to spend their money in Eagle. These residents will support restaurants and retail in the Town. Quality development by a quality developer done for the benefit of the Town we need to figure out a way to get it done.

Matt Jones of 70 Greenhorn Ave and the Vail Valley Partnership. Most important aspect to him is workforce housing, this doesn't mean that they automatically support every development that comes up. Looks at this as a great opportunity in terms of the project, the property, the infill aspect. Wants to address the Staff recommendation to lower the AMI. They consistently see people who get to the medium income and then leave because there is nothing available for this group. Would encourage reconsideration of the AMI to 120%. There are opportunities for public private partnerships and to be able to meet in the middle between municipalities and developers. Believes there is enough public benefit here and doesn't believe they are asking for things that are unreasonable and have seen success in other Towns.

Al Musser of 2315 Eagle Ranch Road and the Business Advisory Council. The developer has presented a great comprehensive plan, this is a rare opportunity for the community to participate in a solution that has plagued the whole valley. We should look long term and look for solutions rather than challenges and difficulties. If we don't solve this problem today, then where do we go next? We need to make it possible for people to live here in this valley. Encourage us to look for the answers, we might not get the opportunity again. His hope is that we find a way there.

Steve Lindstrom of 1140 Capitol Street mixed use building. He has been talking to businesses around Town and they say we need more housing for employees and more customers. He has been a landlord since 2002. Very few people who work at the resorts are looking for housing in Eagle. People who are working down valley are looking to live down valley, they will stay for a long time and a project like this will meet the needs of that middle segment to keep the community moving ahead. Serves on the Vail Housing Authority and he notes that getting caught up in the AMI world is pretty tough; maybe government shouldn't be making guesses on how people live. Believes that lighter regulated deed restrictions work better. Best thing he heard during this meeting was the prohibition on nightly rentals as that will keep rentals prices more in line with local wages. Recommends encouraging resident occupants and less focus on AMI restrictions. We want to encourage people who will be a part of our community and keep them here. Mentioned NOAH, which stands for Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing. We should allow the market to determine where people live and what they can afford. He urges the Commission to keep it as simple as possible.

Closed public comment at 8:56pm

Mauriello's response to public comment: As an applicant coming into this process we have tried to accommodate as many people as possible as a way to get this to go through. There are aspects of the plan that they are not married to and very willing to retool or negotiate on. There needs to be some recognition of what the Town really needs. Do you really need a lot of Open Space? Open Space is competing with development because it is then tagged as Open Space forever. This project will meet a vital need. The minimum density is still a fairly significant amount of density. Parking concerns are probably unfounded because there will be a group who is managing the parking onsite. Parking proposed is over one spot per bedroom. Believes that adequate parking is in place. Conservation Oriented Planning is more about being mindful of the wildlife that currently moves through the project and protecting resources where they exist. They are adhering to what the experts have told them. There are wildlife corridors incorporated on the property. Wants to note that they are not trying to short change the Town on water, but they plan to very conscientious about water usage and are willing to pay penalties on the back end. This project is trying to tackle some larger issue.

## **DELIBERATION**

Cowles noted that there are a lot of materials and several conditions suggested by staff. Are Commissioners ready to make a decision about this tonight, or do they need more information?

Hood commented that he likes the location and the project. This is a good spot for high density, it's at the entrance of Town and it's in line with our developed areas. The variations seem reasonable in general and he agrees with the applicant on Park Land Dedication. Would like to know what the cost difference is between staff and applicant on the payment in lieu. Is ok with doing away with extra guest parking spaces. Sees the need for allowing the units to be more market driven and agrees with the applicant on the AMI criteria.

Perkins quoted, "If not now, when? If not here, where?". This property is very well situated for multi-family along established transit lines. Traffic concerns are valid, but those can be addressed later on. Fully supports this project.

McFall cannot think of a better location for a project like this, realizing that what we're potentially doing tonight is approving the PUD and Zoning Plan and not a Development Plan. Believes this is a well-conceived project, this is something that the Town needs and the region needs. The Town of Eagle would be better for it. Shares concerns about traffic, but these issues could be addressed at the development plan stage. Agrees with what the applicant said about the Park Land and the AMI. Would be supportive and would plan to vote to support. Would like to ask the Commission to support the 120% AMI and to also remove Condition #2 regarding the Park Land Dedication.

Roberts agrees with McFall. Believes it is a good project and is supportive of the 120% AMI and the removal of Condition #2.

Gregg agrees that it is a needed project for the town in terms of work force housing. Issue is with the future zoning map and how it's a Conservation-Oriented development. Doesn't see how that plays out in this current plan. He could see approving this with some further conditions on green infrastructure and impervious green spaces to employ in lieu if they did not meet the intent of the conservation requirements. Diminishing density as you move east and west of Town, doesn't see how the plan reflects this. Would like the irrigation system to be a requirement. Would like to see some recreation area consolidation in the final plan. The Open Space parcel where Hockett Gulch drains out might make sense as an easement. Doesn't see how the project aligns with some goals, but maybe the positives outweigh the negatives.

Nutkins supports the project overall. Has some issues with the language in the PUD. Does not think that single family belongs in this PUD and would like to see it taken out. We are looking for higher density development, there would be a very awkward transition between high density and single family. Understands that flexibility is important, but it just doesn't seem to be a necessary clause. Parking seems like it works out over all, however the management will certainly have a task on their hands. Would like to see the irrigation hammered out at the development permit phase. Agrees that the 10% reduction should be taken out, our guidelines are pretty intensive, with as low as we're going we don't need to go any lower. Asked Landers if she would like his verbiage comments separately? Landers responded that if he has big picture issues he should bring them up here, but verbiage comments can be sent separately.

Cowles agrees that this is a good site for this type of development and a good opportunity given proximity to infrastructure and transit. Would like for the single family to be removed as well. Comments have shown the importance of the middle of the road housing solutions. If we are going to concede on park land dedications, we should get something in return and it should be the single-family component. Would move to strike the single-family housing component from HD/PUD 1 and 2. This is short amount of review time. If we don't get something that is going to meet the need then we've failed the community and that is not the direction that he would like to see this go. Park Land Dedication is a bit in contrast to our goals in that we should focus more on the need the project meets over park land, particularly on a smaller parcel. Not sure if Condition #2 is appropriate or not and would be ok with striking it. Supports the variation of eliminating the guest parking requirement, 1.75 per unit in a multi-family seems appropriate, a single family

would change this calculation. Nutkins asked for verification on how the parking is written in the PUD Guide. Stevens responded that yes, it is. Cowles is supportive of the proposed parking spaces; the bottom line is there should be enough parking spaces based on our standards. The AMI they are proposing gives us more units with an AMI cap in exchange for increasing that cap, this is probably a fair trade off. The market will dictate how that goes. Takes no issue with the height variation, doesn't believe there will be visual impacts to the surrounding properties.

Landers asked a clarifying question: are you all considering the 50% reduction in the full requirement as requested by the applicant? If you remove that condition in your approval then you would also want to clarify that a 50% reduction in the Municipal Parkland Dedication is acceptable. Cowles asked if we say we recommend the 50% reduction then what? Landers replied then your cash-in-lieu is likely not a tool that you would use. Nutkins asked if we approved their proposal it would be more than just the 50% correct? Landers replied yes that once you set the total required amount the rest adjusts accordingly. Cowles asked about Condition #1 and if that open space condition relates to the Municipal Parkland requirements? Landers responded that Condition #1 is less related to the Municipal Parkland requirements and more that things shift over time so as we get to development plan time and maybe OS-2 gets bigger; there is shifting that happens between the current concept stage and the Development Plan Stage when things become more concrete. Staff is requesting this is to make sure that as long open space and municipal parkland dedication requirements are met, you can still do a reduction to the 50% and that first condition will still apply. Nutkins thanked Landers for clarifying that. Landers also said it still has to be approved, it can be reduced to this point but not beyond without approval. Mauriello said our proposal is that we'll give you these eight things plus the \$50,000 and that's all we want to do, I hope that what I'm hearing is that you're all ok with that. Hood mentioned that Condition #2 would then be a payment in lieu to match whatever staff is working on. Landers clarified that the payment in lieu is a requirement in case you didn't accept their proposal, but this is not something that staff has adopted yet and it would need to be adopted by the Board, staff does not have an estimate at this time. Hood asked that if we struck #2 then we would be accepting the applicant's proposal. Landers replied that yes, that is correct and the PUD Guide would reflect that any further subdivisions wouldn't be required to dedicate any additional at that point. Stevens mentioned that this is all based on the highest yield scenario and that it really would be waiving half the requirement, if they come in with less units then it's a lesser number.

Hood would like to strike Condition #2 and eliminate single family homes from the first 2 districts make sense.

Cowles asked the applicant how they feel about striking single family homes. Mauriello replied that they are fine with it being taken out of HD/PUD 1 and 2, with the caveat that they would probably bring it up again with the Board.

McFall would like to single-family homes removed from HD/PUD 1 and 2; but would like to see it left as an option in HD/PUD 3.

Nutkins noted that the lot sizes would be very small, smaller than we've seen in the Town before.

Gregg thinks we should leave it in there because it provides a greater variety of housing types.

Cowles believes that there are already more than enough single-family homes in the Town of Eagle.

Landers noted this would still be a departure than what most of the single-family properties are in Eagle.

McFall clarifies that if someone makes a motion that eliminated Conditions #2 and #4 it would simply revert to the applicant's proposal. If they wanted to remove single family homes from HD/PUD 1 and 2

that would be an additional condition. Cowles asked for verification that Condition #3 did not include the garages. Nutkins clarified that with Condition #1 OS-1 and OS-2 the gross stays the same.

Hood made a motion to approve PUD18-02 the Reserve at Hockett Gulch PUD Zoning Plan and Site Specific Development Plan (vesting of property rights), based on the following Conditions:

1. OS1 and OS2 shall only be allowed to be reduced in acreage each (at a maximum of 10% each), provided that the gross acreage is not reduced, if compliance with open space and municipal parkland dedication requirements is maintained.
2. Guest parking for multi-family uses may only be eliminated if general parking spaces are not assigned specifically for residents, thereby offering guest parking options, excluding the individual garages that would be separately rented.
3. HD/PUD 1 and 2 shall not have any single-family residential zoning.

McFall seconded. All voted in favor.

**TOWN BOARD OF TRUSTEE UPDATE**

None.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT UPDATE**

None.

**ADJOURN**

Cowles made a motion to adjourn and McFall seconded. All voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM.

3/19/19  
Date

  
Jason Cowles – Planning and Zoning Commission Chair

3/18/19  
Date

  
Jessica Lake – Planning Technician