

**Record of Proceedings  
City of Lafayette  
Planning Commission  
Wednesday, July 26, 2017**

Chair Wong called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Those in attendance included: Chair Wong, Vice Chair Kusjanovic and Commissioners Thomas and Viers

Absent: Commissioners Fischer, Godfrey and Varley

Staff present included Planning Manager Paul Rayl, Planner Jon Hoffman and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko

**II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda**

Julie Nelson, 902 Vetch Cir, Lafayette, discussed growth and restoration in Lafayette and what she would like to see happen in Lafayette.

**III. Scheduled Items**

**A. 504 East Oak Street PUD (Planned Unit Development) & Minor Subdivision**

Planner Jon Hoffman entered the staff report into the record. He stated this application is a request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Minor Subdivision for 504 East Oak Street. He presented a vicinity map to help illustrate the location of the property and showed the surrounding uses on the neighboring properties.

Mr. Hoffman gave a brief background of the property and noted that a duplex that was built in the early 1970's was demolished in early 2017. Subsequently in 2017, a 3,600 square foot duplex was built on the subject property. Mr. Hoffman explained that the applicant is now requesting a Minor Subdivision to subdivide the property to create separate lots for individual duplex units. The PUD includes Code modifications to allow the proposed lots to be smaller than 7,000 square feet, reduced setback to side lot lines to 0-foot (duplex shared wall), and reduction of rear yard accessory structure setback from 5-foot to 4-foot. The property is zoned OTR (Old Town Residential), duplexes are permitted. The duplex and accessory structure (garage) have been built onsite.

Mr. Hoffman presented the Minor Subdivision and explained the subdivision would create two lots with Lot 1 proposed to be 4,282 square feet and Lot 2 proposed to be 4,437 square feet in size. He explained that the zoning on the property allows for a duplex or a single-family home and accessory dwelling unit on a single lot. With the proposed subdivision of the lot, staff does not believe that an increase in the density allowed at the subject property is appropriate and recommends a condition be added that states a maximum of one dwelling unit per lot and that the condition be recorded as part of the PUD.

Mr. Hoffman reviewed the minor subdivision against the applicable requirements of Section 26-17-7 and found that it meets the requirements subject to the conditions of approval.

Mr. Hoffman presented the PUD and reviewed the intent of the PUD process. He reviewed the proposed code modifications against the PUD criteria in Section 26-18-5(b) and Section 26-18-5(d). He discussed how the application complies with the criteria.

Staff recommended approval of the 504 East Oak Street Minor Subdivision and PUD, subject to staff's recommended conditions, finding the plan complies with the criteria of Section 26-18-

5(b) and (d). The plan is in the best interest of the city; and the code modifications are in the best interest of the city and the neighborhood.

Jeff Wind, Stadia Associates, 504 E Oak St., Lafayette, explained they want to provide ownership opportunity and that is why they are requesting a minor subdivision. He showed pictures of the new duplex and also showed pictures of the old duplex that was demolished.

Chair Wong opened the meeting for public testimony at 7:20 p.m.

Jill Braszal, 502 E. Oak St., Lafayette, stated she lives next to the property and discussed some of the code violation issues with the previous duplex and property owner. She stated she is happy to see the improvements made to this property and supports both applications.

Chair Wong closed this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 7:23 p.m.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant whether there would be individual service lines and water taps for each unit.

The Planning Commission asked staff how many duplex lots have been built and subdivided like this in Old Town. Other questions included whether trash trucks would be able to access the alley, whether the garage could be rebuilt with the PUD setbacks or would it have to meet current setbacks, whether the setback discrepancy could have been caught at the time of inspection, and whether the garage has a shared wall.

The Planning Commission discussed how many lots could be split in the future, ownership opportunities, lot sizes and subdivision.

### **PUD Motion**

*Chair Wong moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve this request for a PUD, finding that the proposal complies with the Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies, and meets the PUD criteria. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

### **Minor Subdivision Motion**

*Commissioner Thomas moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the minor subdivision for 504 E. Oak Street, subject to staff's recommended conditions of approval, finding that the plat complies with the requirements of Section 26-17-7 of the Development and Zoning Code. Commissioner Viers seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed how moved they were by the neighbor's testimony. Chair Wong called for a vote. All voted in favor of the motion.*

### **Minor Subdivision Conditions of Approval:**

- 1) The applicant shall make all necessary grammatical and technical corrections to the minor subdivision and submit two sets of complete mylar copies to staff prior to scheduling the City Council hearing;
- 2) Two (2) street trees, one (1) on each lot, shall be planted onsite or financial securities shall be provided prior to recording of the plat;
- 3) The lots within the PUD shall be limited to a maximum of one dwelling unit per lot, and that condition be recorded as part of the Plat;
- 4) If the accessory structure is ever demolished it must be rebuilt to meet current regulations, and that condition be recorded as part of the Plat.

**B. West Ridge Subdivision Lot 3 (Les Schwab) Special Use Review and Site Plan/Architectural Review**

Planner Jon Hoffman noted that staff received additional public comment after the staff report was written and provided copies of them to the Planning Commission and applicant. Mr. Hoffman entered the additional comments and staff report into the record. He stated this application is a request for a Special Use Review and Site Plan/Architectural Review for Lot 3 of the West Ridge Subdivision for a Les Schwab Tire Center. He presented a vicinity map to help illustrate the location of the property and show the surrounding uses on the neighboring properties.

Mr. Hoffman gave a brief background of the previous approvals for the subdivision and the design guidelines for the subdivision. He noted that the property is zoned C-1/PUD (Regional Business/Planned Unit Development). The proposal is for Les Schwab Tire Center, an automotive and recreation vehicle service and sales less than two ton which requires a Special Use Review in the C-1 zone district. The proposal also includes the site plan/architectural review for an 11,976 Square foot retail tire center building.

Mr. Hoffman presented the Special Use Review for Les Schwab Tire Center for an automotive and recreational vehicle service and sales less than two ton in the C-1 Regional Business zone district. He reviewed the intent and purpose of the special use review. He reviewed the application against the special use review criteria and discussed how the application complies with the criteria. He reviewed some of the Comprehensive Plan policies the application complies with.

Staff recommended approval of the Special Use Review for Les Schwab Tire Service subject to approval of the site plan/architectural review. Staff found that the application meets the Special Use Review criteria of Section 26-15-4(a), and the proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses which include other vehicle related businesses, possible adverse environmental influences are mitigated with site design; and the use is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hoffman presented the Site Plan for Les Schwab Tire Center. He explained that the plan includes the development of a 11,976 square foot retail tire center for the sale, installation, and servicing of tires, wheels, shocks, brakes, batteries, and tire alignment. The plan also includes thirty-four (34) parking spaces, 12,766 square feet of landscaped area, a separate trash and tire storage building, and two (2) vehicular access points connecting the site to Lafayette Promenade commercial development. Mr. Hoffman reviewed the dimensional standards for the building, street access, pedestrian access, the RTD bus stop location, and bus shelter.

Mr. Hoffman presented the architecture. He showed the materials board to the Planning Commission and explained that it incorporate elements from the Lafayette Promenade Design Guidelines and the City's Commercial Design Guidelines. He showed the building elevations as well as renderings of the building and reviewed the materials and design elements proposed for all sides of the building. He discussed staff's concerns and recommendations for the building architecture and color choices.

Mr. Hoffman reviewed the trash enclosure, the landscaping plan, the lighting plan and the conditions of approval.

Staff recommended approval of the Site Plan/Architectural Review subject to the conditions of approval. Staff found that the proposed site plan/architectural review complies with the review criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 and the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9.

David Moreroney with Les Schwab Tire Center, Benson, Oregon introduced their team and gave some background on their organization. He presented their special use review application and discussed how they comply with each of the City's code criteria. He discussed the site plan and stated they can meet all of the landscaping and site lighting requirements.

Aaron McLean, Galloway, 6162 S. Willow Dr., Greenwood Village, Colorado presented their architecture for the building and discussed their design concept. He reviewed the elevations and renderings of the building. He discussed their disagreement with site plan/architectural review conditions of approval numbers 4, 6, 10, 13 and 17.

Chair Wong opened the meeting for public testimony at 8:35 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission, therefore, Chair Wong closed this portion of the meeting for public testimony.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant what the building height and ceiling height would be, where their signage would be placed, how much signage they anticipate to have, and whether they would have any solar panels on their building. The Planning Commission asked the applicant to walk them thru the site plan and explain how traffic and pedestrian would work, and where the loading area would be, and where the trash removal is located. The Planning Commission asked the applicant to discuss their market analysis and why they selected this location.

The Planning Commission asked staff how the proposed architectural materials would tie into businesses to the South of the subdivision and what material is the screening wall made of. Other questions focused on the landscaping whether other lots landscaping was determined as lots get developed and when would sidewalk improvements be made. The Planning Commission asked staff how tall the screening wall is and what the material proposed for is and whether it will match the existing Wal-Mart screening wall. Other questions included where the bike racks would be located.

*The Planning Commission took a 5 minute recess at 9:00 p.m. and reconvened at 9:05 p.m.*

The Planning Commission discussed the Special Use Review application and whether this was the right location for an automotive store and whether it complied with the city code requirements. The Planning Commission asked the applicant if they could provide a charging station for electric cars.

The Planning Commission discussed the Site Plan/Architectural Review application, the building color and style, and site plan/architectural review conditions of approval numbers 13, 4, 10, 6, and 17. The Planning Commission deleted Site Plan/Architectural Review conditions numbers 13, 4, and 10. The Planning Commission amended condition number 6 changing the *Mission* colored CMU with Lafayette Promenade approved *Dover Sky #104* or a closely related color. The Planning Commission amended condition number 17 to say "the trash enclosure / tire recycle enclosure shall be split face and part of the approved materials and colors outlined in guidelines. The Gate color shall match the building." The Planning Commission added a condition requiring the applicant to add at least one (1) electronic vehicle charging station shall be added to parking lot.

### **Special Use Review Motion**

*Commissioner Kusjanovic moved the Planning Commission approves this request for Special Use Review, finding that the use meets the criteria of Section 26-15-4 because the proposal complies with the Municipal Code, is compatible with the surrounding area, presents no potential for adverse environmental impacts, and it is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Viers seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

### **Site Plan/Architectural Review Motion**

*Commissioner Thomas moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request to City Council for Site Plan/Architectural Review, subject to the recommended conditions as amended, finding that the plan complies with the criteria of Section 26-16-7 and Section 26-16-7.1, the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9 have been met, and the design is compatible with the location and proposed use. Commissioner Kusjanovic seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed condition number 9 regarding the glazed CMU. Commissioner Thomas amended her motion to delete condition number 9. Commissioner Kusjanovic accepted the amendment. Vote: All voted in favor of the motion.*

### **Special Use Review Conditions of Approval:**

1. Approval of the Special Use Review is subject to approval of the Site Plan/Architectural Review.

### **Conditions of Approval:**

1. The applicant shall install “no overnight parking, violators may be towed” signs on the subject property, including at the electric vehicle charging station, and Les Schwab shall be responsible for this enforcement and should there be a violation of this condition;
2. The low-E window coating proposed to appear as light green shall be replaced with a clear coating;
3. The south and east elevation shall be a combination of *fireweed mahogany* color glazed CMU and CMU-3 #807 as recommended by Planning Commission;
4. Ground face CMU shall be replaced with approved split faced CMU;
5. *Mission* colored CMU shall be replaced with Lafayette Promenade approved *Dover Sky #104* or closely related color;
6. The exposed wood timbers shall be fabricated from architectural grade Douglas Fir Larch or some similar wood element;
7. *Sailcloth* paint color shall be replaced with the Lafayette Promenade approved *aged white* color;
8. The applicant shall work with staff on adding a wood awning over the man door and adding additional wood or metal awnings on both sides of the overhead door on the west elevation;
9. Overhead doors and man doors shall be a Lafayette Promenade approved color;
10. The cornice band that is part of the showroom portion of the building shall be added to the west, southwest and northwest portion of the building;
11. Staff recommend that all wall mounted equipment be painted to match or compliment the building wall;
12. All roof mounted mechanical equipment be screened from the public view;
13. The trash enclosure / tire recycle enclosure shall be split face and part of the approved materials and colors outlined in guidelines. Gate color shall match building;
14. A deciduous tree be added along the south property line;

15. The applicant shall work with staff to amend the lighting plan so that no foot candle readings exceed 8-foot candles;
16. The plans shall be amended prior to submittal of a building permit to address the concerns of the City Engineer outlined in the memo dated July 6, 2017;
17. The applicant shall work with the on the Fire Marshall prior to submittal of a building permit to address his concerns.
18. At least one (1) electronic vehicle charging station shall be added to parking lot.

**V. Other Business**

**A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports**

None.

**B. Department Comments**

None.

**VI. Adjournment**

*Commissioner Kusjanovic moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Viers. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.*

City of Lafayette

---

Brian Wong, Chair

Attest:

---

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary