

**Record of Proceedings
City of Lafayette
Planning Commission
Tuesday, January 23, 2018**

Chair Wong called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Those in attendance included: Chair Wong, Vice Chair Godfrey and Commissioners Fischer, Kusjanovic, Thomas, Varley, and Viers
Staff present included Planning Manager Paul Rayl, Senior Planner Greg Thompson, City Engineer Aaron Asquith, and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko

II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda

None.

III. Meeting Minutes for November 28 and November 29, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Godfrey made a couple of corrections to the November 28, 2017 Meeting Minutes. Commissioner Fischer moved to approve the November 28 and November 29, 2017 Meeting Minutes as amended, seconded by Commissioner Thomas. All voted in favor of the motion.

IV. Scheduled Items

A. 40 North Sketch Plan Review

Commissioner Fischer disclosed that she lives within 750 ft. of the subject property and noted that she did not attend the neighborhood meetings and has no financial benefit with the subject property.

Senior Planner Greg Thompson entered the staff report into the record. He explained the two meeting review process for this particular application. He stated this application is a sketch plan review for a residential subdivision located on the north side of Baseline Road, northwest of Baseline Road and Anna Thomas Parkway or just west of Anna's Farm and east of Indian Peaks Subdivisions. He presented a vicinity map to help illustrate the location of the property and to show the surrounding areas. The subject property is zoned DR (Developing Resource). Mr. Thompson reviewed what transpired at the November 28 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Thompson presented the sketch plan for the proposed mixed residential development on 78.63 acres. The plan includes 465 residential units ranging from 12-plexes to cottages and a 10 acre site for a school. The applicant has also indicated the proposed future zoning of the property to be R1/PUD, R3/PUD, and R4/PUD which would allow the mix of residential uses desired by the applicant. The Comprehensive Plan Land Use map designation for the subject property is primarily Medium Density Residential with an area for the school designated as Public Facility and the area adjacent to Baseline is planned for Commercial.

Mr. Thompson reviewed how the city calculates density based on gross density and reviewed the density identified on the Comprehensive Land Use Map for the subject property and what is proposed. He reviewed the density of other nearby developments. He reviewed the requested PUD modifications and noted that additional PUD modifications are needed such as lot size, setbacks and lot coverage.

Mr. Thompson reviewed sketch plan issues and discussed questions and issues that came up from the November Planning Commission meeting. These included connectivity and why it is important, street standards, access to Baseline Road, additional vehicular access to Baseline Road, drainage, the multi-family site layout, and public land dedication. Mr. Thompson reviewed the conditions of approval.

Staff recommended approval of the 40 North Sketch plan, subject to the recommended conditions, finding the plan meets the review criteria of Section 26-18-5, the requirements of Section 26-16-4, and the application requirements of Section 26-17-4.

Michael Markel, Markel Home Construction Company, 5723 Arapahoe Ave, Boulder, stated that since the November meeting, he has met with some of the homeowners to discuss the issues they have raised. Mr. Markel discussed their vision for the project and reviewed the site plan and housing types they propose. He discussed some of the changes they are willing to make to address the neighbor's concerns. These include making the Navajo Trail connection a pedestrian trail and fire access, eliminate 4 lots near the detention area, have 15 ft. setbacks from home along the east property line including the townhomes, make Greenlee a pedestrian access, enhance side setbacks for a view corridor, all products would be two story including the townhomes, condos will be two story with underground parking, and a new condo layout plan to preserve sight lines to the Homestead Parcel from Baseline Road. Mr. Markel explained they would investigate the ground water and drainage issues and would provide information on the capped oil and gas wells. He discussed access, transportation and traffic, cross sections, setbacks, and the multi-family portion of the plan. He discussed their disagreements with the conditions regarding public land dedication and condition no. 15 regarding the multi-family housing.

Chair Wong opened the meeting for public testimony at 8:22 p.m.

John Bollinger, 143 Salina Street, Lafayette, expressed appreciation for the energy efficiency components proposed in the plan. He discussed the importance of trail connections and greenways.

Anna's Farm United Presentation and Speakers:

Bob Richards, 521 Mills Street, Lafayette, updated the Planning Commission on what their group has done since the November Planning Commission meeting. He expressed concern with the subdivision access to Baseline Road, traffic, safety issues, the density of the subdivision, and lack of open space and wildlife corridor. He expressed concern about the vehicle trips the proposed subdivision will generate.

Greg Holskaw, 704 Homestead Street, Lafayette discussed traffic concerns and presented the traffic analysis they have done. He expressed concern that the local streets in Anna's Farm may not be able to handle the traffic that will be generated from the 40 North Subdivision.

Mel Haik, 1533 Harvest Drive, Lafayette, discussed the existing Baseline Road access through Anna Thomas Parkway onto Homestead Street. She expressed concern about whether there is adequate space for a traffic circle and whether Homestead can handle the traffic that would be generated.

Ed Walent, 521 Homestead Street, Lafayette, discussed current traffic congestion issues, the traffic impacts of the proposed subdivision and the need for a direct access to Baseline Road for the proposed 40 North Subdivision other than Anna Thomas Parkway.

Susan LaHoda, 616 Mills Street, Lafayette, expressed concern that the affordable housing component of the project is congregated in the southeast portion of the property.

Maggie Garfield, 609 Mills Street, Lafayette, expressed concern about the level of density proposed for the subdivision and that the proposed multi-family units will be located mostly next to Anna's Farm and the density does not match what exists in Anna's Farm today.

Jonathan Bent, 1531 Greenlee Way, Lafayette, expressed concern about the loss of wildlife habitat and lack of open space proposed within the 40 North development. He wants to see as much open area be preserved as possible for wildlife species. He expressed concern that people's interactions with wildlife would be one of fear because the wildlife would use the roads and backyards instead of a wildlife corridor and open space to access water and prey.

Karl Spear, 613 Mills Street, Lafayette, gave a summary of concerns: include direct ingress/egress to Baseline Road from 40 North through an extension of the Homestead collector street directly to Baseline Road and include a stoplight at this intersection, no traffic signal at Anna's Farm, reduce overall density to 4.5 du/acre, eliminate 12-plexes and find a more suitable alternative for the space, develop a more reasonable match for the density on the eastern half of 40 North to the density of Anna's Farm, integrate all deed-restricted housing into the overall community, minimum of 20 ft. setback from property line to foundations on lots bordering Anna's Farm, increase the park and open space acreage and consider wildlife corridor, eliminate the four lots at the north entry detention area, close Greenlee Way and Navajo Trail to through traffic, and provide traffic calming measures throughout 40 North and Anna's Farm.

Cheri Watson, 1504 Greenlee Way, Lafayette, expressed concern about the lack of information from studies she feels are needed leaves insufficient data for the Planning Commission to make informed decisions.

Allison Hamm, 754 Furrow Way, Lafayette, expressed concern about making decisions without studies being done and reviewed. She expressed concern for wildlife and expressed the need for a wildlife corridor.

Neil D. Muccio, Lafayette, stated he supports the project and feels it could even have more density. He appreciated that the project is offering affordability and diversity.

Ernie Sica, 1403 Harvest Drive, Lafayette, expressed concern about increased traffic and existing traffic issues with traffic congestion and with the streets within Anna's Farm are currently designed.

Indian Peaks Group Presentation:

Dave Armstrong, 531 Sawtooth Point, Lafayette, discussed subsurface and surface runoff water issues they have had in Indian Peaks. He expressed concern that the 40 North development could add to their issues and discussed possible solutions including requiring the 40 North developer to install a pipe to carry Highline lateral ditch irrigation water across 40 North Subdivision as well as a hydrology study.

Joe Warren, 547 Sawtooth Point, Lafayette, expressed concern about the Navajo Trail connection and safety issues and existing issues with Indian Peaks Trail such as no sidewalks on one side of the street and its narrow width.

Brian MacDonald, 598 Brainard Circle, Lafayette, stated he measured collector streets throughout the City and expressed concern about the street width of Navajo Trail and Indian Peaks Trail, site distance at street entrances along Indian Peaks Trail, the number of streets that access Indian Peaks Trail, and sight vision clearance issues.

Melanie Phares, 2086 Navajo Trail, Lafayette asked Planning Commission to table their decision until all the issues are resolved.

Garry Connell, 777 Niwot Ridge Lane, Lafayette, expressed concern that Navajo Trail connection would be unsafe, and discussed how navigation apps could exacerbate congestion through 40 North and Navajo Trail and Indian Peaks Trail by creating cut thru traffic.

Planning Commission took a 10 minute recess at 9:20 p.m. and reconvened at 9:30 p.m.

Barbara Padden, 2389 Indian Peaks Trail, Lafayette, expressed concern about existing issues with Indian Peaks Trail, opposed the Navajo Trail street connection to 40 North Subdivision, cut thru traffic, and the downside of navigation apps creating hazards and congestions through secondary roads.

David Burnett, 760 Bridger Point, Lafayette, opposed the Navajo Trail connection and expressed concern about cut thru traffic.

Ted Montoya, 2041 Navajo Trail, Lafayette, discussed the traffic study they did, cut thru traffic, and opposes the Navajo Trail street connection.

Linda Panter, 2040 Apache Lane, Lafayette gave a summary of traffic concern they have and asked the Planning Commission to not allow the Navajo Trail street connection.

Ed Byrne, 250 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, supports a pedestrian and bike path/trail connection at Navajo Trail but opposes a vehicular connection. He discussed cut thru traffic problems that would be generated with 40 North Subdivision and believes Indian Peaks Trail was designed only for local traffic.

Wayne Grider, 565 Brainard Circle, Lafayette, opposes connectivity and expressed concern about cut thru traffic, navigation apps creating congestion, and feels that the school is not going to be a neighborhood school.

Phil Roth, 2034 Buchanan Point, Lafayette, expressed concern that the 12-plex portion of the plan is too dense.

Jillian Weems, 1670 Lost Angel Road, Boulder, asked the Planning Commission to hold the developer to the same net-zero standards as Silo proposed. She discussed benefits of a net zero product and wholly integrating sustainability into a home versus one that is solar ready and/or net zero ready and added that net zero building practices needs to be standard of home construction.

Sally Hurand, 1506 Haystack Way, Lafayette, expressed concern about traffic, whether there is subsidence on the school site, and that more research and studies need to be done.

Chair Wong closed the public hearing at 10:00 p.m.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to review the pocket parks including their design, their size, how they will be used and where they are located within the subdivision. The Planning Commission asked what the percentage of park and open space is and what the amount of public land dedication is without the school site.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant's traffic engineer for their professional opinion about connectivity and specifically about making the connection with Navajo Trail. The

Planning Commission also asked the traffic engineer about traffic circles and to show the location of all the access points in Anna's Farm Subdivision.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to describe the difference between net zero ready and net zero. Other questions focused on the affordable units and how many would be deed restricted, the location of the affordable units, and whether the affordable units could be disbursed throughout the project.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant whether staff has reviewed the changes they proposed and have shown to the Planning Commission and neighbors. Other questions included whether the various housing types could be spread out within the subdivision more, how the pocket parks were connected, whether the annexation agreement specified the locations of the school site, where did the school district prefer the school to be located, and whether they were aware of any mines or subsidence on the property.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant whether they had any issues with condition No. 8 regarding public land dedication, whether the parks include any playing fields, and whether the two-story units would be at grade.

The Planning Commission asked staff about lot coverage and lot size, whether the annexation agreement specified the location of the school, and what the public land dedication requirement would be without the previous dedication of the school site. The Planning Commission asked staff about the 12 plexes and where else they might be located and reconfigured in the plan.

The Planning Commission asked staff what studies would be done at the Preliminary Plan submittal and when would an amendment to the annexation agreement go to City Council?

The Planning Commission asked the City Engineer about water issues on Indian peak site, what could be done, and questioned whether underdrains around the homes help.

The Planning Commission asked staff whether the 12-plex component would have to come back to the Planning Commission for review if they were to approve the sketch plan without amending any of the conditions.

Chair Wong stated he would like to have more city staff analysis and opinion on the proposed changes to the plan made by the applicant.

Motion

Chair Wong moved to table the 40 North Sketch Plan Review to the February 27, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed additional items they would like to have: staff review of the recent proposed changes to plan made by applicant; review of entry points proposed, location of multi-family units, gross density calculations, alley widths, additional information on alleys, code modifications, and distribution of affordable units. Vote: All voted in favor of the motion.

V. Other Business

A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports

None.

B. Department Comments

Planning Manager Paul Rayl noted that staff gave them updated code books for them to take with them.

VI. Adjournment

Vice Chair Godfrey moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Varley. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

City of Lafayette

Brian Wong, Chair

Attest:

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary