

**Record of Proceedings
City of Lafayette
Planning Commission
Lafayette Library – 775 W Baseline Road
Tuesday, October 23, 2018**

Chair Godfrey called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Those in attendance included: Chair Godfrey, Vice Chair Viers, and Commissioners Bent, Fischer, Kusjanovic, Thomas, and Varley
Staff present included Planning Manager Jana Easley, Senior Planner Greg Thompson, and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko

II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda

None.

III. Meeting Minutes for September 25, 2018

Chair Godfrey moved to approve the September 25, 2018 Meeting Minutes and Commissioner Bent seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

IV. Scheduled Items

A. Caliber Collision PUD Amendment, Special Use Review, Site Plan/Architectural Review and Minor Subdivision

Senior Planner Greg Thompson noted that he provided the Planning Commission with additional surrounding property owner letters received after the staff report was written and then entered the staff report into the record. He stated this request is for an automotive repair shop with an outdoor enclosed storage area. The applications include an amendment to the PUD to change the uses permitted, a special use review for an auto body repair and paint shop, a site plan/architectural review for the review of a 16,765 square feet building, and a minor subdivision to combine two lots – one in Black Diamond, the other in Steele's Minor.

Mr. Thompson presented an aerial map to help illustrate the location of the project site which is located in the northwest corner of Baseline Road and Aspen Ridge Drive. He explained that the Black Diamond portion of the lot was created in 1984, while the Steele's subdivision was created in 2000.

Mr. Thompson presented the PUD Amendment application. He explained the PUD on both the Black Diamond portion and the Steele's portion of the site was rezoned from M-1/PUD to C-1/PUD in 1999 and 2000 respectfully. The ordinances changing this zoning indicated the City Council directed all future uses of the parcel would exclude some uses including Automotive service and sales less than and greater than two tons, Automotive paint and body shop, and Enclosed storage yard.

Mr. Thompson explained that the applicants have proposed to remove the use restrictions to allow their use of an auto body repair facility which has a paint shop and an enclosed storage yard.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the PUD criteria and discussed how this application does not meet the City's code criteria. Staff believes the Caliber Collision facility does not meet the PUD criteria of Section 26-18-5(d) and the project is not unique nor necessary for the economic development of the city, the development in this location is not in the best interests of the

city or the neighborhood and recommends denial of the request to amend the PUD to allow uses which were specifically excluded from this property.

Mr. Thompson presented the request from Caliber Collision for Special Use Review approval for an Auto Body and Repair Facility in the C-1 (Regional Business) zone district. He reviewed the application against the special use review criteria and discussed how this application does not comply with the criterion.

Staff believes the Caliber Collision auto body repair facility with accessory outdoor storage for automobiles use does not meet the Special Use Review criteria of Section 26-15-4(a), and the proposal is not compatible with the existing and proposed surrounding uses which include other businesses, possible adverse environmental influences have not been mitigated, and the use is not compatible with several Comprehensive Plan policies and recommends denial of the request.

Mr. Thompson presented the site plan for the development of a proposed 16,765 square feet auto body repair facility with a 66 car accessory outdoor storage yard. The plan also includes 34 parking spaces and 26,384 square feet of landscaped area. Two (2) vehicular access points are proposed. He reviewed the dimensional standards, streets and access to the site, and parking. He discussed staff's concern that the parking provided for customers and employees is not adequate.

Mr. Thompson presented the architecture for the building and reviewed the application against the city's Commercial Design Guidelines. He reviewed the proposed exterior materials and colors, as well as the building design and elevations. He discussed staff's concerns with the architecture. He reviewed the landscape plan, the lighting plan and signage.

Staff recommended denial of the request for Site Plan/Architectural Review finding the plan does not comply with the criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 and 26-16-7.2, the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9 have not been met, and the design is incompatible with the location and surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Thompson presented the Minor Subdivision application. He stated the minor subdivision would combine Lot 6, Block 2 Black Diamond 2nd Filing, and Lot 3, Steele's Minor Subdivision into a new lot. Part of the reason the zoning was changed on the Steele portion of the site was to allow the two portions of the site to develop together as a larger, 2+ acre site. The proposal would combine those two lots into one 2.18 acre lot. A number of existing easements would be preserved on the new minor subdivision. Staff has identified a number of corrections and additions needed on the plat which need to be corrected prior to recordation. Staff has reviewed the minor subdivision and has determined, with the minor changes noted, complies with the applicable requirements of Section 26-17-6.

Staff believes the Minor subdivision complies with Code requirements and could be approved subject to approval of the other applications.

John Hausen, Caliber Collision, Denver, presented their proposal. He discussed how the auto collision industry has changed from an industrial use to more of a commercial use. He explained how their business operates, how they have reduced noise and visual impacts, and regulations they adhere to. He explained why they have chosen this location as well as details about their business. He stated they will work to comply with the conditions of approval. Chair Godfrey opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 7:55 p.m.

Laurie Thayer, 440 London Avenue, Lafayette, agreed with the staff report and asked the Planning Commission to deny the application. She expressed concern about the prairie dogs and whether they could be relocated anywhere.

Jeff Burns, 1200 W. Devonshire Street, Lafayette, expressed concern about traffic and this type of use being located here.

Brad Steele, 1646 Spring Wagon Drive, Loveland, spoke in support of the project and believes the project would be an asset to everyone.

Anna Lynn Janden Houten, 1018 S. Moline Street, Aurora, expressed concern about the prairie dogs and finding a relocation spot for them.

Kevin Reardon, 310 Zenith Avenue, Lafayette, expressed concern about the appropriateness of this business at this location and opposed the application.

Chair Godfrey closed the public hearing at 8:05 p.m.

The Planning Commission questions to the applicant focused on parking and how they calculated their parking needs and whether the parking for customers and employees being provided would be adequate. Other questions to the applicant included whether they could add a turn area to the site, what right-of-way are they dedicating and whether they would make any improvements to the intersection. The Planning Commission had questions about the business process and how quickly cars are repaired and how they address noise and other environmental issues.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant if other cities had similar concerns and questions and how they addressed those concerns. The Planning Commission asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions of approval.

Mr. Hausen discussed their disagreement with Site Plan Conditions number 1 and number 2 regarding parking and outdoor storage.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant additional questions about mechanical equipment screening, whether they would have rental cars stored on site and what their hours of operations are.

The Planning Commission asked staff what types of business might be better suited for this location and whether an auto repair business generates sales tax. Other questions focused on the site access and whether additional right-of-way would be dedicated, whether there would be intersection improvements and where a traffic signal would be located. The Planning Commission asked staff for additional information on the history of the zoning changes and whether staff heard from the property owner to the north of the site. Planning Commission asked staff about the pre-application meetings they had with the applicant and what was discussed with them and what direction staff gave the applicant during those meetings. Other Planning Commission questions with staff focused on parking and the outside storage.

The Planning Commission took a ten minute break at 9:05 p.m. and reconvened at 9:15 p.m.

The Planning Commission discussion focused on the site location. They see the site as a highly visible site, a gateway type site for the city and questioned whether this project is the highest and best use of the property. They expressed concern that the project is more of a

car lot with a 6 ft. screening wall and is not a good fit for this site and that it might work better at a different location in the city. They discussed what other uses might be more appropriate at this location.

PUD Amendment Motion

Commissioner Kusjanovic moved the Planning Commission recommend City Council deny this request for Planned Unit Development approval finding the proposal does not comply with the Planned Unit Development criteria, the land use map, and the requested use changes are not in the best interest of the City. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Special Use Review Motion

Commissioner Thomas moved the Planning Commission recommend City Council deny this Special Use Review request finding the use does not meet the criteria of Section 26-15-4 (a) and (b), is not compatible with the surrounding area, there is no need or desire for this use within the this specific area of community, potential adverse environmental impacts have not been mitigated, and it is not compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. Vice Chair Viers seconded the motion. The Planning Commission discussed the location of the use. Vote: All voted in favor of the motion.

Site Plan/Architectural Review Motion

Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission recommend City Council deny this request for Site Plan/Architectural Plan Review finding that the plan does not comply with the criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 and 26-16-7.2, the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9 have not been met, and the design is incompatible with the location and surrounding neighborhood. Commissioner Kusjanovic seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Minor Subdivision

Commissioner Varley moved the Planning Commission recommend City Council deny the minor subdivision plat finding the plat does not comply with the requirements of Section 26-17-6 of the Code. Commissioner Kusjanovic seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

V. Other Business

A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports

The Planning Commission discussed having staff include in future staff reports a listing of some of the Comprehensive Plan Policies that an application complies with as well as a list of the Comprehensive Plan policies that do not comply with the application. The Planning Commission asked staff for an update on the RTD meeting regarding the Lafayette bus routes, particularly for the Regional L route. Commissioner Fischer gave up an update on the prairie dog management plan that City Council reviewed at their October 2 meeting. She noted that she would not be able to attend the November 27, 2018 meeting. Chair Godfrey thanked the City for new Silver Creek Park. Commissioner Varley stated he would like to remind everyone to vote in the upcoming election.

B. Department Comments

Planning Manager Jana Easley asked the Planning Commissioners to let her know if they would not be able to attend the November Planning Commission meeting. She gave them an update on the ADU's throughout the community review process. She noted that their

January meeting would include a joint workshop with the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the City Attorney to review ethics and the review process. She stated she would update the City Council on what the Planning Commission has reviewed/worked on throughout 2018 and will share that with the Planning Commission. She added that they are interviewing Comprehensive Plan candidates at the November 20, 2018 City Council meeting.

VI. Adjourn

Vice Chair Viers moved to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Bent. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

City of Lafayette

Doug Godfrey, Chair

Attest:

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary