

**Record of Proceedings
City of Lafayette
Planning Commission
Tuesday, February 27, 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, and Viers

Absent: Commissioner Varley

Staff present included Planning Manager Paul Rayl, Senior Planner Greg Thompson, City Engineer Aaron Asquith, Planner Jon Hoffman, and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko

II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda

Vicki Uhland, 303 W. Simpson Street, Lafayette, spoke in support of increasing the public speaking time limit to 5 minutes but feels staff recommendation of 4 minutes is a good compromise. She disagreed with staff's recommendation regarding pooling of speaker testimony to one person.

III. Meeting Minutes for January 23 and January 24, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Fischer moved to approve the January 23 and January 24, 2018 Meeting Minutes, seconded by Commissioner Viers. All voted in favor of the motion.

IV. Policy Regarding Public Hearing and Applicant Speaking Times

Commissioner Thomas moved the Planning Commission change the public speaking time limit for their meetings from three (3) minutes to four (4) minutes. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed pooling of time, whether four minutes was too long and the length of their meetings. Vote: Chair Wong and Commissioners Fischer and Thomas voted in favor of the motion. Vice Chair Godfrey and Commissioners Kusjanovic and Viers voted against the motion. The motion failed.

Vice Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission keep the public speaking time limit for their meetings to three (3) minutes. Commissioner Kusjanovic seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed reasons to keep the speaking time limit to three minutes as well as some reasons to increase the time frame. Vote: Chair Wong, Vice Chair Godfrey, and Commissioners Fischer, Kusjanovic and Viers voted in favor of the motion. Commissioner Thomas voted against the motion. The motion passed 5 to 1.

Planning Commission discussed allowing groups of speakers to pool their time and the consensus was the Planning Commission would communicate their comments to staff off-line.

V. Scheduled Items

A. 40 North Sketch Plan Review

Commissioner Fischer disclosed that she lives in Anna's Farms and is within 750 ft. of the subject property. She stated that after discussing this with the City Attorney, she has concluded that the proximity of her property to the subject property creates a "personal interest" in the application, as defined in Lafayette's Code of Ethics, which would preclude her from any further participation in the matter. Therefore she recused herself from further participation and left the Council Chambers.

Senior Planner Greg Thompson entered the staff report into the record. He used a vicinity to map to help orient everyone to the subject property. He gave a quick overview of the proposal

for the residential subdivision. He explained that the sketch plan area is 78.63 acres and includes 171 single-family homes, 20 cottages, 13 duplex homes, 57 townhomes, 45 triplexes, 32 4-plex units and 104 12-plex units for a revised total of 442 units. The plan also includes: a total of 4.24 acres of park space, 10.74 acres of other landscaped area, a 3 acre homestead site, and a 10 acre school site.

Mr. Thompson gave a brief background of the November 2017 and January 2018 Planning Commission meetings. He explained that at the January 23 meeting, Planning Commission requested staff to review and comment on 9 issues raised by the applicant as well as to provide some insight on the redesigned multifamily area presented by the applicants to the Anna's Farm neighbors and at the last Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Thompson discussed each of the 9 items. These included the following items: the proposed Navajo Trail Connection, eliminating four lots in the northeast corner of the property, enhanced side yard setbacks, larger rear yard setbacks along the east property line, change Greenlee to be a fire access/pedestrian path, enhanced side setback for view corridor, two story plans on east property line, R3 Zoning for Condo Loft community, and changed condo layout to preserve sight lines to the Homestead parcel from Baseline Road.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) modifications and discussed some of the additional PUD modification that staff has identified during the review of the plan. Mr. Thompson discussed connectivity, drainage, and subsidence.

Mr. Thompson noted that with the Preliminary Plan submittal, the applicant will be required to submit a Site Plan/Architectural Review to include plans that will help provide justification for the Code modifications.

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.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant for more information about the proposed enhanced side yard setback. Other questions focused on the cottage homes and how many they propose, and what the lot size and lot coverage would be for them.

The Planning Commission asked staff about the number of units proposed, the proposed density, and what the density is for the neighboring subdivisions.

The Planning Commission discussed the commercial designation for the property. The Planning Commission discussed the opportunity for the applicant to provide starter homes and affordable homes. Other discussion focused on the plan layout. Some of the Planning Commission felt the plan lacked open area, park area and a riparian corridor and that the park area did not connect very well to the overall plan. The Planning Commission also discussed the proposed density and felt the density was too high and would like to see the density reduced. The Planning Commission noted that the density needed to be balanced with more amenities and spread out within the development. The Planning Commission also wanted to see a mix of housing style and types within the subdivision.

The Planning Commission noted they want to see the traffic study and more information on connectivity and access to the site. The Planning Commission noted they want to see harmonious transitions between the neighboring subdivisions, more detail on the school site and

also want to see the Domenico Homestead parcel landmarked and kept as a homestead site and not developed in the future.

Motion

Vice Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission approves this request for sketch plan approval, subject to the recommended conditions, finding the proposal complies with the requirements for sketch plan submittal, the PUD criteria; and the Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies. Commissioner Kusjanovic seconded the motion. Chair Wong, Vice Chair Godfrey, Commissioner Kusjanovic, and Viers voted in favor of the motion. Commissioner Thomas voted against the motion. The motion passed.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The Preliminary Plan submittal shall include:
 - a. An application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the land use designation from "Commercial" to "High Density Residential" for those areas affected and relocating the Public area to show the proposed site for the school.
 - b. A Site Plan/Architectural Review application in order to give staff the opportunity to review how the proposed PUD modifications would affect the overall development and allow staff the opportunity to present the Planning Commission with a detailed analysis of each request.
 - c. Greater detail on the actual lots sizes being proposed for duplex, triplex, four-plex and townhome units.
 - d. Financial assurance for the proportional share of the traffic signal cost at Baseline Road with said proportional share to be determined prior to preliminary plan review.
 - e. All existing and proposed easements correctly depicted on the preliminary plan.
 - f. The applicant shall address the issues identified by the city engineer in the memo dated November 7, 2017.
 - g. A compliant Visitability Plan which will include the geographical dispersion of visitable units. Furthermore, the units will be dispersed in a variety of housing units as well. Said units shall be identified on the PUD.
 - h. A Phase I Environmental Study for the subject property.
 - i. Documentation for abandoning and capping the former gas wells on-site per the State of Colorado requirements shall be submitted. Evidence shall be provided that all flow lines on the site have been removed.
 - j. A Cultural Resources Survey for the subject property.
 - k. All homeowner's association documents.
 - l. A more detailed justification for the proposed PUD modifications.
2. Installation of an RTD approved bus stop shelter shall be coordinated with the remaining development in the Anna's Farm area and maintained by that development and the 40 North HOAs after all subdivision improvements are made to the roadway.
3. Trails:
 - a. The applicant shall work with staff to accommodate the trail along the Highline Lateral from Anna's Farm to the western edge of the property, and down to Baseline Road.
 - b. The preliminary plan shall include installation of the regional trail located at the northern boundary of the site connecting to the conservation easement property

north of the site. To accommodate this trail, the two lots in the northwest part of the site shall be removed or redesigned.

4. The applicant shall work with the City to provide appropriate access for fire and rescue equipment at those locations where alternative street designs are proposed.
5. The applicant shall meet with the Crime Prevention Officer prior to submittal of the site plan/architectural review application.
6. An ecological study shall be conducted by a qualified professional to determine if the project area supports important plant communities, wildlife habitat, or potential habitat for special status species.
7. The applicants shall work with staff to address PLD in relation to:
 - a. Cash-in-lieu for the remaining balance
 - b. Trails on the north and at the Highline Lateral with connection to Baseline
 - c. Detention Pond within the school site
 - d. Potential for Domenico Homestead
8. Existing healthy Cottonwood trees along the Highline Lateral need to have a water source provided if the ditch is piped.
9. Parking:
 - a. Adequate parking for residents and guests shall be provided for cottage lots.
 - b. Electric car charging stations shall be incorporated into the site as appropriate.
10. The applicants shall continue working on the redesign of the 12-plex area with city staff to create a plan that works better for this area. Issues which need to be addressed include the mass of buildings, the location of parking, appropriate and useable open space, entrance into the development, as well as orientation of this portion of the site to the homestead.
11. Provide required street trees adjacent to Anna Thomas Parkway.
12. Explore alternatives to street trees in locations relative to the Homestead in an effort to provide a sense of openness and to maintain character of the Homestead.
13. Geotechnical information shall be submitted as part of the Preliminary Plan which addresses any groundwater issues as well as previous on-site oil and gas development.
14. Work with Anna's Farm neighbors and staff to provide a wider view corridor rather than a smaller one.
15. Work with staff to explore further disruption opportunities in potential through traffic.
16. Connect the proposed cul-de-sac in the northwest corner of the property to the conservation easement property north of the Domenico site so future development can be connected.
17. Remove the 4 lots in the northeast corner of the site which front on Hearteye.
18. Changes proposed as part of the 9 issues outlined by the applicant at the January 23, 2018 Planning Commission meeting shall be incorporated, with the exception of the following:
 - a. Conversion of the planned street connection at Navajo Trail;
 - b. Adjusting of the view corridor as proposed.
19. 20 units on the site shall be identified as affordable and shall be geographically dispersed around the site.

The Planning Commission took a ten minute recess at 8:35 p.m. and reconvened at 8:45 p.m. Commissioner Fischer returned to the Council Chambers.

B. West Ridge Filing No. 1 Replat B, Lot 5 – 24 Hour Fitness Special Use Review and Site Plan/Architectural Review

Planner Jon Hoffman entered the staff report into the record. He stated this application is a Special Use Review and Site Plan/Architectural Review for a 24 Hour Fitness Center to be located on Lot 5 of Westridge Subdivision Filing No. 1, Replat A. He presented a vicinity map to help illustrate the location of the property and orient the Planning Commission to the site. He gave a brief history of the Lafayette Promenade Subdivision.

Mr. Hoffman noted that the property is zoned C-1/PUD (Regional Commercial/Planned Unit Development). He explained that the Code requires a Special Use Review for Recreational Club or Facility (indoor or outdoor) in the Regional Business zone district. He reviewed the proposed recreation club against the Special Use Review criteria and discussed how the application met criteria for Section 26-15-4(a). He reviewed some of the Comprehensive Plan policies the application fulfills.

Mr. Hoffman presented the site plan for the proposed 24 Hour Fitness Center. The plan includes the development of a 38,008 sq. ft. building on the south portion of the 8.5 acre lot. The plan also includes 246 parking spaces, 25,774 square feet of landscaped area, and multiple vehicular access points connecting the site to the Lafayette Promenade commercial development.

Mr. Hoffman explained the proposal is to develop the southern portion of Lot 5, while keeping the northern portion of the lot available for a future retail user(s). The future building may slightly impact the location of the 24 Hour Fitness building and staff recommended there be some flexibility on the precise location of the building to allow for future development of the building or buildings to the north. Mr. Hoffman noted that all dimensional, parking and landscape requirements would still be required to be met for the use.

Mr. Hoffman reviewed the dimensional standards for the building, the landscaping plan, streets and access to the site, sidewalk connections and drive aisles. He reviewed the parking plan.

Mr. Hoffman presented the architecture for the proposed building and discussed how the applicant has incorporated materials and design elements required in the Lafayette Promenade Design Guidelines and Lafayette Commercial Design Guidelines while maintaining the visual identity associated with 24 Hour Fitness. He presented the exterior materials board to the Planning Commission. He reviewed the proposed exterior materials and color, the scale and massing of the overall architectural style proposed, and the building elevations. He presented slides showing examples of the buildings that have been approved and/or under construction at Lafayette Promenade. He discussed some of the concerns staff has with the architecture and staff's recommendations to address the concerns.

Staff found that that the 24 Hour Fitness use meets the Special Use Review criteria of Section 26-15-4(a), and the proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses, possible adverse environmental influences are mitigated with site design; and the use is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and recommended approval of the request subject to approval of the site plan and architectural review.

Staff found that, subject to the recommended conditions, the proposed site plan and architectural review complies with the review criteria of Section 26-16-7.1, the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9, and the Lafayette Promenade Design Guidelines and recommended approval.

Ray Hix, Developer/Owner of Lafayette Promenade, 2183 Main St., Fairhope, Alabama, stated he was available for any questions.

Chair Wong opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 9:10 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission. Chair Wong closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions of approval. Mr. Hix stated they agreed with the conditions of approval.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant if the sign would be illuminated all night.

The Planning Commission asked staff to discuss how the area between the 24 Hour Fitness Center and the future retail building would be treated. Other questions focused on the access to the site, the awning colors, and whether the windows proposed were real windows.

The Planning Commission discussed the conditions of approval and added condition no. 12 to require the applicant work with staff to provide clear glass as appropriate. The Planning Commission discussed Site Plan/Architectural Review condition numbers 1, 3, 6, and 7 regarding the building location, wood trusses, increasing the stone height, and the roofline gable timber element.

Special Use Review Motion

Vice Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission approve 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 Kusjanovic seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Site Plan/Architectural Review Motion

Commissioner Viers moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request to City Council for Site Plan and 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. Vice Chair Godfrey seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed the need for the pedestrian walkway area to be wide enough to prevent security issues and be pedestrian friendly and inviting. Vote: All voted in favor of the motion.

Special Use Review Conditions of Approval:

1. Special Use Review approval shall be subject to the approval of the Site Plan/Architectural Review by City Council.

Site Plan/Architectural Review Conditions of Approval:

1. The applicant shall work with Staff on the precise location of the building to allow for the development of the building(s) to the north;
2. The stone columns, eve roof, and wood timbers at the building entrance on the east façade shall be extended out approximately three (3) feet from the proposed elevation to be just short of the edge of metal canopy;
3. Wood trusses, similar but not to match the Tractor Supply building, shall be incorporated in some form with the three (3) north and three (3) south awnings on the east façade;
4. The *electric blue* color stripes, roof, and accents shall be replaced with a darker blue color more in line with the *Georgian Bay* blue;

5. The *electric blue* awnings shall be replaced with the *satın finish galvalume* metal finish approved material in the Development Guidelines;
6. The height of the stone on the rear on the building shall be increased to 7-feet in height;
7. A roofline gable timber element shall be added to the west elevation of the building to emulate the east elevation timber element;
8. All wall mounted equipment shall be painted to match or compliment the building wall;
9. All roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from the public view;
10. The trash enclosure shall be clad with the Lafayette Promenade approved *Baselite split-faced CMU-3 #807* and include a solid metal gate painted to match or compliment the exterior building materials;
11. 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 February 8, 2018 and attached to this report.
12. Per the Lafayette Design Guidelines, the applicant shall work with staff to replace spandrel glass with clear insulated system glass.

The Planning Commission took a 5 minute recess at 9:45 p.m. The Planning Commission reconvened at 9:50 p.m. Chair Wong left the meeting and Vice Chair Godfrey took over the meeting.

C. 106 West Geneseo PUD – Lot 1 & E1/2 Lot 2, West Lafayette Addition, Blocks 21-23

Commissioner Kusjanovic disclosed that she lives within 750 ft. of the property and stated she has no conflict of interest with the application and can be impartial.

Senior Planner Greg Thompson stated this application is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) review for the property located at 106 W. Geneseo Street. Mr. Thompson showed a vicinity map to illustrate the location of the property.

Mr. Thompson explained that the applicants propose to develop the back portion of their property with an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). The property is zoned OTR (Old Town Residential). The site currently contains an 858 square foot single-family house adjacent to W. Geneseo. The accessory dwelling they propose is a 1923 house which is currently located in a Boulder floodplain. That house would be moved to this site. The main floor of this single-story house is 970 square feet and is proposed to have an 885 square foot basement. The PUD application would allow the applicants to exceed the size of an ADU. The Code permits a 750 square foot maximum for an ADU and the total square footage proposed is 1,855 square feet.

Mr. Thompson showed slides of the house that will be moved.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the intent of a PUD. He reviewed the application against the code criteria for PUD application and discussed how the application complies. He noted that the Historic Preservation Board suggested that a land marking application be submitted for the existing home on the property and the house being relocated.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed PUD modification with the condition as outlined in the staff report and found that the plan meets the review criteria of Section 26-18-5.

Kate Williams, 106 W. Geneseo St., Lafayette, presented their proposal and what steps they have taken so far to reach their July deadline.

Vice Chair Godfrey opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 10:02 p.m.

Vicki Uhland, 303 W. Simpson St., Lafayette, strongly supported the application.

Andrew Debakker, 3149 Stevenson, Erie, noted he owns property at 105-109 N. Public Rd. He expressed concern about access, alley maintenance, pedestrian access, and paving the alley.

Vice Chair Godfrey closed the Public Hearing at 10:06 p.m.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant if the existing fence would be removed, how would parking and access to the site work, whether they would rebuild the stone around the house, whether the City of Boulder required them to landmark the house, and whether they will subdivide the lot in the future.

The Planning Commission asked staff what the zoning on the property allowed, whether the applicant could subdivide the lot, and whether the Code allows basements with Accessory Dwelling Unit.

The Planning Commission discussed the merits of this proposal.

Motion

Commissioner Thomas moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve this request for a PUD, subject to the recommended condition, finding the proposal complies with PUD requirements; the PUD criteria; and the Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. The Planning Commission thanked the applicant for this project and suggested that she document the whole process. Vote: All voted in favor of the motion.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The property owner shall pursue land marking the existing and proposed buildings on the property.

D. Development Code Amendment – Section 26 Table 26A

Senior Planner Greg Thompson explained that this application is a request to amend Chapter 26, Table 26-A to conform with Ordinance No. 36, Series 2017, which amended in part, Chapter 26 and repealed, reenacted and retitled in its entirety Section 26-22.5. The ordinance changed where and how Wireless Communication Facilities would be done in Lafayette and reflect current legal issues relative to the telecommunications industry. However, Table 26A, the city's use chart, does not reflect some of the changes made in the new ordinance and needs to be changed. Mr. Thompson reviewed what needed to be changed to reflect the associated changes with Ordinance No. 36.

Staff recommended the proposed amendments to Table 26-A in Chapter 26 be approved.

Vice Chair Godfrey opened the public hearing at 10:20 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission therefore Vice Chair Godfrey closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission clarified with staff that only the Wireless Telecommunication Facility item and note no. 5 is changing.

Motion:

Vice Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to Chapter 26 of the Code of Ordinances (Table 26-A) finding the

proposal is in the best interest of the City and is desirable based on the language of Ordinance No. 36, Series 17 as outlined above. Commissioner Thomas voted in favor of the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

V. Other Business

A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports

Commissioner Fischer gave an update on the Lafayette Open Space Advisory Board meeting. Commissioner Kusjanovic discussed meeting process including public speaking time, staying on topic, point of order, and keeping the meeting on track. Vice Chair Godfrey discussed Lafayette Promenade design guidelines and thinks the architecture for the buildings needs to step up. He also noted that the Galt Plaza car wash lights were flashing both inside and outside of the building. Commissioner Viers asked if there had been any more discussion or information on high speed internet for the City. Commissioner Fischer asked for feedback on the recent two meeting process.

B. Department Comments

Planning Manager Paul Rayl reminded the Planning Commission that Wednesday's meeting would start at 6:30 p.m. with a workshop presentation by Lafayette Energy Sustainability Committee. He stated that staff is working on revising the development review process and plans to bring that item to the Planning Commission as a workshop in March and as Code Amendments in April. Since there is not a current Historic Preservation Board liaison, Mr. Rayl reminded the Planning Commission that the next Historic Preservation Board meeting is Monday, March 5, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. He asked the Planning Commission to email him about any absence that might arise in March due to Spring break. He noted that if there was not the ability to have a quorum, he would change the meeting dates to accommodate their schedules if so needed.

VI. Adjournment

Commissioner Viers moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Thomas. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

City of Lafayette

Brian Wong, Chair

City of Lafayette

Doug Godfrey, Vice Chair

Attest:

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary