

**Record of Proceedings
City of Lafayette
Planning Commission
Tuesday October 23, 2012**

Chair Patzer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Those in attendance included: Chairperson Patzer, Commissioners Nickell, Knuth, Wilgus, and Benson.

Absent: Commissioners Steinbrecher and Wong

Staff present included Community Development Director/Assistant City Administrator Phillip Patterson, Planning Manager Karen Westover and Planner Roger Caruso.

II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda

None.

III. Minutes for September 25, 2012 Meeting

Commissioner Knuth moved the Planning Commission approve the meeting minutes for September 25, 2012, Commissioner Nickell seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

IV. Scheduled Items

A. Code Amendments – Floodplain Regulations

Director Patterson explained that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has been updating the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) and the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) for Boulder County. In addition, Colorado's Department of Natural Resources' Water Conservation Board, has also updated the floodplain standards that are required to be adopted and enforced by Colorado communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). In order for the City to continue eligibility in the NFIP, the FIS and FIRMS have to be adopted by the City prior to the effective date and the floodplain standards have to be adopted prior to the deadline.

Director Patterson reviewed the changes to the floodplain standards and he reviewed the specific changes to the City's Development Code subsection 26-8-1 regarding definitions and subsection 26-23, Floodplain Standards. He discussed subsection 26-23-16, Specific Standards and subsection 26-23-20, Properties removed from the Floodplain by fill. He reviewed changes to these two sections of the draft ordinance.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve adopting the new floodplain standards with the changes as discussed.

Chairperson Patzer opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 7:12 p.m. No one addressed the Commission; therefore Chairperson Patzer closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission asked staff about flood insurance if the community does not participate in the program and changes to the floodplain maps.

The Planning Commission discussed the code amendments.

Motion

Commissioner Knuth moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the proposed code amendments to Chapter 26-23 of the Lafayette Code of Ordinances, with staff's amendment to Section 26-23-20, finding that the proposed amendments are in the best interest of the City of Lafayette. Commissioner Wilgus seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

B. Coal Creek Village North Filing No. 1 Site Plan/Architectural Review

Roger Caruso entered the staff report into the record and described the subdivision location. Mr. Caruso reviewed the history of the subdivision and showed the area proposed for the paired villas and the single-family lots. One model is proposed for the paired villas with three different elevations. Mr. Caruso reviewed the single-family models and pointed out how some models have similar elevations and these should not be placed next to or directly across from each other.

Mr. Caruso discussed staff's concern with how some of the front porch designs look with a step in front of the stoop and when the stoop is smaller in width than the front porch. Staff recommended the applicant clearly show on each building permit if a stoop will be necessary. If a stoop is proposed, staff recommends the applicant design the stoop to be a minimum width equal to the front porch or other design acceptable to staff. Staff recommended the final design of each stoop receive staff approval with the building permit, or, the applicant could provide staff with a stoop design to be approved prior to any building permit submittal.

Mr. Caruso review the paired villa models, their locations, the proposed exterior materials and architectural elements.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend approval of the site plan/architectural review subject to the staff conditions.

Dan Nickless, Division President for Ryland Homes, 8200 E. Maplewood Avenue, Greenwood Village, described Ryland's products and stated they accept staff's recommended conditions except for condition no. 4. Mr. Nickless expressed concern about getting each stoop design approved by City staff stating it would be too cumbersome. He discussed a new stoop design that they would have engineered.

Pat Sorenson, Sorenson Engineering, 1169 Aspen, Broomfield, reviewed their suggested changes to the conditions of approval.

The Planning Commission asked staff to comment on the applicant's suggested changes to the conditions of approval. Other questions focused on the redesign of the stoop and whether staff is requiring the stoop be the full width of the porch.

Staff pointed out to the Commission that the condition as written allowed the design of the stoop to be reviewed for all models prior to the building permit stage and individually if a certain stoop does not fit into a pre-approved design.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant about the soils report for the subdivision, what the price points were for the homes, expand on the type of exteriors materials proposed, and whether they would provide a stoop design plan per model or one or two designs that worked for their models.

The Planning Commission discussed the conditions of approval.

Motion

Commissioner Knuth moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request for Site Plan/Architectural Review, subject to the amended conditions of approval, finding that the criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 has been satisfied because the site plan design is compatible with the location, monotony of design within a project has been avoided by providing variation of detail, form and siding that provides visual interest, and the plan is harmonious and compatible to the neighborhood. Commissioner Wilgus seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Elevations A and D for Model 4101 are considered the same model and shall not be built directly next to or directly across the street from each other.
2. Elevations A and D for Model 4203 are considered the same model and shall not be built directly next to or directly across the street from each other.
3. If a stoop is necessary, the applicant shall design the stoop to be a minimum width equal to the front porch or other design acceptable to staff. The applicant shall obtain staff approval for the design of the stoop prior to issuance of the building permit. The applicant may submit, for approval, a stoop design for each model or with each individual building permit.
4. Street trees shall be installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the lot the tree is located on, or nearest to.

C. Coal Creek Village Filing No. 6 Site Plan/Architectural Review

Roger Caruso entered the staff report into the record and oriented the filing in relationship to the other parts of Coal Creek Village PUD and Coal Creek Village North (CCVN). Mr. Caruso mentioned that these are the exact same models proposed for the single-family lots in CCVN and aside from the stoop issue previously discussed, the main issue that staff has with the proposal is compatibility with the proposed and the existing models along Riverton Way. Mr. Caruso showed slides of the existing duplexes along the south side of Riverton Way and recommended that either porches be added to the models or a new design be instituted for these lots to enhance the compatibility on both sides of the street. Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend approval of the application subject to staff's conditions.

Dan Nickless, Division President for Ryland Homes, 8200 E. Maplewood Avenue, Greenwood Village, stated they agreed with the conditions of approval except for condition no. 5 regarding the streetscape and porch design. He discussed the problems of adding a porch to the house design or to be required to come up with a new house design for seven lots. He offered instead to provide a front patio and landscaping as a "gift to the street". He believes that there is no reason to make both sides of the street look the same.

Pat Sorenson, Sorenson Engineering, 1169 Aspen, Broomfield, expressed concern that covered porches could place the house further out of the front yard setback and into the backyard making the backyards of those homes not useable. He discussed a proposed change to condition no. 5.

The Planning Commission asked staff to comment on the applicant's suggestion for adding front porches and landscaping alternatives.

Staff noted that the proposed "gift to the street" is a good idea but they also believe a balance along the streetscape is necessary.

Other Planning Commission questions to staff focused on the streetscape concerns and whether limiting the model elevations, particularly Elevations A and D would be a solution. The Commission asked about the height of the homes and what the setback would be for the covered porches.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant if they had other smaller models with front porches that might work on these seven lots and if they planned any ranch models.

Mr. Nickless stated they did not have any smaller models that would work at this location and they did not propose a ranch model. He agreed that limiting them to the A and D Elevations of Models 4201, 4202 and 4203 would be a good compromise.

The Planning Commission discussion focused on limiting the elevations that could be built on the seven lots along River Road. They discussed paint colors and suggested the applicant match the colors of their homes to the colors on the existing homes.

Staff reviewed the conditions of approval and suggested rewording condition no. 5 to limit the elevations to the A and D Elevations of Models 4201, 4202 and 4203 and adding the patios and landscaping or “gift to the street” for the seven lots along Riverton Road.

Mr. Nickless asked to address the Planning Commission and stated they disagreed with how condition no. 5 was being amended. He explained that their model designs for Elevations A and D do not lend themselves for the installation of the porches in front of the homes the same way the model designs for Elevations B and C would. He requested the Planning Commission limit them to the Elevations A and D for Models 4201, 4202 and 4203 and remove the “gift on the street” option for those seven lots.

The Planning Commission continued to discuss the streetscape concern and the conditions of approval. The Commission consensus was to amend condition no. 1 and no. 2 as they did for CCVN, delete condition no. 3, no change to condition no. 4, amend condition no. 5 to limit the seven lots to the A and D Elevations of Models 4201, 4202 and 4203 and strike the “gift to the street” option and no change to condition no. 6.

Motion

Commissioner Knuth moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request for Site Plan/ Architectural Review for Coal Creek Village Filing No. 6, subject to staff's recommended conditions as amended. The Planning Commission finds that the criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 has been satisfied because the site plan design is compatible with the location, monotony of design within a project has been avoided by providing variation of detail, form and siding that provides visual interest, and the plan is harmonious and compatible to the neighborhood. Commissioner Benson seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Elevations A and D for Model 4101 are considered the same model and shall not be built directly next to or directly across the street from each other.
2. Elevations A and D for Model 4203 are considered the same model and shall not be built directly next to or directly across the street from each other.
3. If a stoop is necessary, the applicant shall design the stoop to be a minimum width equal to the front porch or other design acceptable to staff. The applicant shall obtain staff approval for the design of the stoop prior to issuance of the building permit. The applicant may submit, for approval, a stoop design for each model or with each individual building permit.
4. Only Model 4201, Elevations A and D, Model 4202, Elevations A and D, and Model 4203, Elevations A and D can be located on the north side of Riverton Road.
5. Street trees shall be installed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the lot the tree is located on, or nearest to.

V. Other Business

A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports

None.

B. Department Comments

Planning Manager Westover announced that there may not be many applications to review in November so there will be a workshop with possibly a webinar training session.

VI. Adjournment

Commissioner Wilgus moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Benson. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

City of Lafayette

Chair Person

Attest:

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary