Statement of Vision
Lafayette’s panoramic view of the Rocky Mountains inspires our view into the future. We value our heritage, our unique neighborhoods, a vibrant economy and active lifestyles. We envision a future that mixes small-town livability with balanced growth and superior city services.

Statement of Values
We foresee a strong economy that is diverse and sustainable, attracts innovators, encourages a balance of big and small businesses, and meets the community’s needs.

We intend to shape the future through strengthening our voice on environmental stewardship and social issues, taking an active role in sustainability and strategically planned development, and facilitating leadership development and fresh thinking.

We strive to be a connected community that encourages cooperative relationships and inclusivity, expects accessibility and communication, nurtures resiliency, appreciates multiculturalism, and humanizes physical and social interactions within the City.

We support placemaking endeavors that stimulate historic preservation and the arts, encourage open space stewardship and networking of neighborhoods, and promote comprehensive planning and livability.

Tuesday, September 24, 2019
AGENDA
7:00 PM – Planning Commission Meeting
Council Chambers
1290 S. Public Road
Lafayette, Colorado 80026

I. 7:00 PM - PLANNING COMMISSION
   Call to Order
   Pledge of Allegiance
   Roll Call

II. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

III. MINUTES FOR JULY 23, 2019

IV. SCHEDULED ITEMS
   A. Willoughby Corner Sketch Plan Review – Public Hearing
      (SE 1/4, Section 2, TIS, R69W, 6th P.M.)
      1. Sketch Plan Review
         - Questions
         - Motion

V. OTHER BUSINESS
   A. Commission Comments/Committee Reports
   B. Department Comments

VI. ADJOURN
Site Development Locations
Planning Commission Meeting
September 24, 2019

Lafayette Planning and Building Department

Willoughby Corner Sketch Plan
Chair Godfrey called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Those in attendance included: Chair Godfrey, Vice Chair Viers, and Commissioners Bent, Smith, Stephens, and Thomas.

Absent: Commissioner Fischer

Staff present included Planner Director Paul Rayl, Planning Manager Jana Easley, Planner II Jon Hoffman and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko.

II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda
None.

III. Election of Officers
Commissioner Godfrey asked for nominations for Chair. He noted that he is interested in continuing to serve as Chair for the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Viers nominated Commissioner Godfrey for Chair. Commissioner Smith seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. The Planning Commission voted unanimously for Commissioner Godfrey to be Chair.

Commissioner Bent nominated Commissioner Viers for Vice Chair. There were no other nominations. The Planning Commission voted unanimously for Commissioner Viers to be Vice Chair.

IV. Meeting Minutes for May 28, May 29, May 30, and June 25, 2019 and June 25, 2019 Workshop Minutes
Chair Godfrey moved to approve the May 28, May 29, May 30, and June 25, 2019 and June 25, 2019 Meeting Minutes and the Workshop Minutes for June 25, 2019. Commissioner Bent seconded the motion. Chair Godfrey, Vice Chair Viers, and Commissioners Bent and Thomas and voted in favor of the motion and Commissioners Smith and Stephens abstained since they did not attend the meetings. The motion passed.

V. Scheduled Items
A. Development Code Amendment – Floodplain
Planning & Building Director Paul Rayl entered the staff report into the record. Mr. Rayl explained that as part of the City’s continued participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), the City is required to adopt the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) current Flood Insurance Study (FIS) and Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). The new FIS and FIRM for Lafayette will become effective on August 15, 2019. Prior to this date, Lafayette must amend its floodplain regulations to reference this new FIS. In order to maintain eligibility in the NFIP, the City must adopt the new FIS and FIRMs by August 15, 2019.

Mr. Rayl reviewed the proposed changes to Section 26-23-5, basis for establishing the areas of special flood hazard. He explained that the balance of the current floodplain regulations of Section 26-23 have been reviewed by FEMA and have been found in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 60.3(d) of the National Flood Insurance Program regulations. He added that Lafayette staff was involved in the FEMA study by providing
information such as areas known to have been impacted by the 2013 flood and reviewing Letters of Map Revision (LOMR) completed for property in the City since the last study in 2012. This included ensuring all LOMRs were included in the revised maps.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council of the proposed language to Section 26-23-5 adopting the new Flood Insurance Study and Maps dated August 15, 2019.

Chair Godfrey opened the public hearing at 7:20 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission, therefore, Chair Godfrey closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission asked staff whether Avalon Meadows had a lot that required a LOMAR. Mr. Rayl indicated that was correct.

Motion
Commissioner Stephens moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of an amendment to Chapter 26, Section 26-23-5 of the Code of Ordinances of Lafayette, Colorado, finding the proposed amendment is in the best interest of the City and its residents. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

B. Indian Peaks Marketplace Sketch Plan Review
Vice Chair Viers stated he lives in Indian Peaks but is outside of the notice range. He stated he believes he can be impartial during the review of this item.

Planning Manager Jana Easley made corrections to the staff report. She noted that additional comments were received and given to the Planning Commission before the meeting started. She entered the staff report into the record.

Ms. Easley stated this application is a sketch plan review for two parcels located in Indian Peaks Filing No. 17. This sketch plan is being reviewed using the City’s new review process. She presented a spreadsheet showing the steps and timeline for the review of this project. She presented a vicinity map to help illustrate the location of the subject parcels.

Ms. Easley explained the request is for approval of a sketch plan for the north and south commercial parcels of Indian Peaks Filing No. 17, consisting of 17.01 acres total. The plan would change the parcels from 100% commercial to a mix of residential and commercial. The north parcel is divided into 3.21 acres of proposed residential space and 2.7 acres of commercial space and would contain 32 single-family homes and 16,546 sq. ft. of commercial space. The residential density would be 9.97 dwelling units per acre. The south parcel is divided into 7.37 acres of residential area and 3.73 acres of commercial space and would contain 32 duplex homes and 27,166 sq. ft. of commercial space. The residential density would be 4.34 dwelling units per acre.

Ms. Easley reviewed the zoning for the north parcel and explained that it is zoned B1, which allows commercial as well as single-family and duplex residential if it is a part of a “mixed-use building complex”. This proposal is not for a mixed-use building complex, therefore the residential portion would require a Special Use Review at preliminary plan. Ms. Easley noted that restaurant space also requires a Special Use Review in the B-1 zoning district.

Ms. Easley explained that the south parcel would need to be rezoned and a Rezoning application would be reviewed at the time of preliminary plan submittal. She added that a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendment would be required for both parcels to reflect the lower percent of commercial space being proposed.
Ms. Easley reviewed the previous reviews and approvals for Indian Peaks Filing No. 17 as well as the comprehensive plan land use designation for the property. She reviewed the site layout, the site constraints, lot coverage, the proposed PUD modifications, drainage, and access to the site, public transportation, parking, and schools. She reviewed the PUD criteria and discussed how the application meets the criteria. She discussed permit allocations and explained that there are not enough permits to allocate for the project, therefore the residential will not be able to proceed to preliminary plan. However, the commercial portion of the project could move forward.

Staff recommended approval of the Indian Peaks Filing No. 17 (Indian Peaks Marketplace) Sketch Plan, subject to the staff recommended conditions of approval. Staff finds 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.

Jeff Wingert, W.W. Reynolds Companies, 1375 Walnut Street, Boulder, gave a brief background on his company and how they got to this proposal.

Mike Cooper, Boulder Creek Neighborhoods, 711 Main Street, Louisville, gave a brief background of their company. He presented their proposal and discussed the various products and streetscapes they are proposing

Paul Shoukas, PCS, 200 Kalamath Street, Denver, discussed their design concept for the North parcel and South parcels. He discussed the plan layout, the products proposed, parks, trail connections, and open areas. He showed renderings of the project to help illustrate the streetscape, scale of the buildings, parking, and pedestrian connectivity.

Jeff reviewed the process they have gone through, the neighborhood meetings and feedback they received to get to this design. They agreed with staff’s conditions of approval except for condition number 3 regarding the redesign of the five lots in the north parcel.

Chairman Godfrey opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 8:15 p.m.

Jim Fletemeyer, 2837 Crater Lake Lane, Lafayette, expressed concern about the proposed density of this project.

Deb Renbhaw, 492 Murphy Creek Drive, Lafayette, expressed concern about the proposed density of the project, access, and opposed any drive-thru restaurants.

Patty Quinones, 488 Murphy Creek Drive, Lafayette, expressed concern about density, lot size, increased traffic, school bus stop safety, potential negative commercial uses, access points, and traffic congestion.

Sandra Elkind, 523 Straight Creek Way, Lafayette, expressed concern about the project’s density, pedestrian crossings, existing empty commercial spaces in the area, and believes the site could be developed in more creative ways.

Will Fry, 1178 Paschal Drive, Louisville, expressed concern about drainage, wildlife, speeding traffic, and potential for smells from restaurant, and business uses interfering with existing residential uses.

Jeffrey Greene, 2831 Clear Creek Lane, Lafayette, expressed concern about increased traffic, cut-thru traffic, and the amount of existing vacant commercial space in the area.
Denise Snell, 2827 Clear Creek Lane, Lafayette, expressed concern about traffic issues and density of the project.

Chair Godfrey closed the public hearing at 8:30 p.m.

The Planning Commission questions to the applicant focused on setback reduction, how the project would change if the reduced setbacks were not approved, and whether they expect to have drive-thru restaurants. Other questions focused on whether the developer preferred a big box concept, what the rationale is behind the two separate parcels with commercial uses, and why they did not propose a traditional mixed-use concept of residential units placed above commercial/retail uses. The Planning Commission had questions on how the applicant looked at addressing safety issues at the intersection of Baseline Road and 95th Street such as an installing an underpass or additional road improvements that could be made to make that area safer for pedestrians. Other questions included whether the high-pressure gas line could be moved, whether there were additional opportunities for small business owners to have a live workspace in the commercial area, and whether the site could be redesigned to accommodate more live work space.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant what happens to the plan if the south parcel does not access 95th Street at Roberts. How would the applicant prevent left turns from the right-in, right-out turn lane? Other questions to the applicant focused on the type of commercial uses they anticipate, whether they have anybody interested in the commercial space now, and whether they believe they can fill their commercial spaces when there are vacancies in nearby areas.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant how they would address condition no. 3 regarding the redesign of the five lots in the north parcel. The Planning Commission had concerns whether the proposed residential lots allowed for patio or outdoor spaces, whether they plan to add a sound mitigation wall along 95th Streets, and how their detention area is sized.

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

The Planning Commission asked staff how the project might look if it were a traditional mixed used project or if the project was an affordable housing project.

The Planning Commission asked staff about building permit allocations and availability and when the residential portion could be built.

The applicant addressed the Planning Commission and explained to the Commission that they brought in the whole submittal package for both parcels so the Commission could see how the whole site would work.

The Planning Commission asked staff why they would review a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendment for this project when the City is in the process of reviewing the whole Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Easley reviewed with the Planning Commission the changes the Indian Peaks 17 area has since over the years and reviewed the recent Baseline Road improvements, the RTD bus stop improvements, the Special Use Review process, B1 zoning district uses and drainage.
The Planning Commission asked staff to investigate whether drainage and flooding issues that were discussed at the time of the previous Indian Peaks approval were addressed.

The Planning Commission asked staff to clarify condition no. 3 regarding the redesign of five lots in the north parcel. Staff believes the five lots could be worked into the plan layout so they are less isolated and more connected.

The Planning Commission asked staff about exploring the viability or addition of an underpass at 95th Street and Baseline Road. The Commission also asked for more information underpasses in Louisville. The Planning Commission asked for additional information on drainage, elevations, and grading be provided at preliminary plan.

The Planning Commission discussed ways to make the intersection at 95th Street and Baseline Road safer and more pedestrian friendly such as installing an underpass at that location. The Planning Commission discussed RTD bus connections and the need for a regional plan identifying access and connection points for vehicles and pedestrians.

The Planning Commission discussed the merits of the plan. Some felt the plan was not walkable or connected in a meaningful way and the overall layout of the building needed to be reviewed more. The Planning Commission discussed how the plan was not a typical mixed-use project, whether it was well designed for the site, whether it connected to the larger community, and whether the project connected with the regional trail plan.

The Planning Commission stated they wanted to see more information on the access at Roberts and 95th Street.

The Planning Commission discussed concerns about the commercial buildings on the north parcel along Baseline Road and noted they would like to see four-sided architecture at this location as well as landscaping if it is approved and when they review it at Site Plan/Architectural Review.

The Planning Commission discussed concerns that the proposed commercial area may not be enticing to local small businesses such as a small startup owner that might want a live work location.

The Planning Commission discussed conditions of approval and amended Condition No. 4.

**Motion**
Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Sketch Plan/PUD, subject to the thirteen (13) recommended conditions as amended, finding that the proposal complies with the requirements for sketch plan submittal; complies with the PUD criteria; and, complies with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies, and, subject to amendment, the comprehensive plan land use map. The plan is in the best interest of the City; and the proposed code modifications are in the best interest of the City and the neighborhood. Vice Chair Viers seconded the motion. Chair Godfrey, Vice Chair Viers, and Commissioners Bent, Smith and Thomas voted in favor of the motion and Commissioner Stephens voted against the motion. The motion passed.

**Conditions of Approval:**
1. Approval of a comprehensive plan land use amendment to reduce the amount of commercial and change residential portions to medium density residential. The comprehensive plan land use amendment application shall accompany the first preliminary plan submittal, and approval of the comprehensive plan land use
amendment shall be made a condition of first preliminary plan approval.
2. Rezoning of north parcel to B1, which application shall accompany the first preliminary plan submittal for the north site, and approval of the rezoning shall be made a condition of first preliminary plan approval for the north site.
3. The north residential area shall be redesigned to better incorporate the lots on the east with those on the west and the park.
4. The applicant shall work with RTD on improvements to the eastbound bus stop at Baseline Road and Roser Drive.
5. All homes shall have at least 5-foot side yard setbacks and minimum 10 feet of separation between non-attached units.
6. Duplex homes are allowed to have a zero-foot setback where attached.
7. The median in Crater Lake Lane shall be shortened to allow left in, left out movement into the residential area.
8. Crater Lake Lane shall remain a public road at least to the easternmost driveway for the alley to the south.
9. The applicant shall work with the City’s Fire Marshal to ensure commercial buildings 3 and 4 on the south site have access within 150 feet of a fire truck to all exterior first floors.
10. The word “potential” shall be removed from the sidewalk along the HOA park area.
11. The applicant will need to work closely with the city and CDOT as a part of the preliminary plan design phase to ensure proper access is maintained at Roberts Ave where it intersects at 95th St (State Highway 42) in accordance with CDOT and city standards.
12. The applicant shall address all comments in the City Engineer’s memo dated July 10, 2019.
13. The applicant shall address all redline comments from staff that are of a technical nature.

C. Lenart Minor Subdivision, Lot 1 Concrete Works, Minor Subdivision, Planned Unit Development (PUD) Review, Special Use Review and Site Plan/Architectural Review

Planner II Jon Hoffman entered the staff report into the record. He stated this application include a Minor Subdivision, a Planned Unit Development, a Special Use Review and a Site Plan/Architectural Review for Concrete Works. The project is located at 1105 N. 120th Street which just west of and adjacent to 120th Street between East South Boulder Road and East Emma Street. Mr. Hoffman provided a vicinity map to help illustrate the location of the project. He stated the property is zoned M1 (Industrial) and the concrete works use is a use by right, but the fuel facility and proposed caretakers unit require special use review approval.

Mr. Hoffman presented the proposal and explained that this proposed project would include four buildings and existing storage area on the 10.49-acre lot. The buildings include a 13,588 square foot six bay vehicle maintenance building, 4,189 square foot office building, and 4,320 square foot barn with caretakers unit building, and private fuel center facility.

The development of the property will relocate Concrete Works administration offices and maintenance facility buildings, currently located approximately one-half mile south on 120th Street in Lafayette to this site. Development of Lot 2 will not alter the current outdoor storage
area of Lot 1. The intent of the layout and design is to convey the image of a rural, ranch complex with natural, native grass vegetation in attempting to keep with the historic rural area.

Mr. Hoffman presented the Minor Subdivision and explained the applicant proposes to subdivide the existing 10.49 acre lot into two lots and an outlot to be dedicated to the City for open space trail purposes. He explained that Lot 1 is the existing outdoor storage lot that is currently located at the property, Lot 2 will entail the proposed Concrete Works campus, and Outlot A will be dedicated to the City for Open Space trail connection. He reviewed easements being provided, access to the site, public land dedication and trail connections.

Staff recommended approval of the Minor Subdivision application, finding that the Minor Subdivision, with the recommended condition of approval, meets the applicable requirements of Section 26-17-7.

Mr. Hoffman presented the Planned Unit Development for the project. He explained the proposed plan includes two Code modifications for the project which are allowing multiple buildings on a single lot and increasing the fence height to 8 ft. He reviewed the reasons behind the request and staff’s support for the request. He reviewed the application against the PUD criteria and discussed how it meets the criteria and some of the city’s PUD Aspirational Standards.

Staff recommended approval of the Lenart Minor Subdivision Planned Unit Development subject to the recommended conditions, believing the plan complies with the criteria of Section 26-18-5, the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-5. Furthermore, staff finds 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.

Mr. Hoffman presented the Special Use Review for Concrete Works. He explained that there are two requests one for a caretaker unit and one for the fuel facility in the Industrial (M1) zoning district. He reviewed the two applications against the city’s special use review criteria and discussed how the applications complied with the criteria.

Staff believes that the caretakers unit and fuel facility meet the Special Use Review criteria of Section 26-15-4(a), and the proposal is compatible with the surrounding uses which include a mixture of residential and industrial, 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/architectural review and the recommended conditions.

Mr. Hoffman presented the site plan/architectural review for the project. He explained that the site plan and architecture, including site plan, grading, drainage, utilities, multiple building elevations, site details, landscaping, irrigation and lighting, have been reviewed by city staff from Planning, Engineering, Fire, Police, Building; the City Attorney; and relevant outside agencies, such as Xcel. The plans have been found to meet all applicable City codes and regulations subject to the recommended conditions herein are met.

Mr. Hoffman reviewed the code criteria for the Site Plan/Architectural Reviews and discussed how the criteria has been analyzed and how the application complies with the criteria.
Staff recommended approval of this Site Plan/Architectural Review finding that, subject to the recommended conditions, the proposed site and architectural plans comply with the review criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 and the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9.

Mr. Hoffman presented the growth management portion of the application. He explained the applicant is requesting one residential permit. There are currently no available permits until 2024 to allocate for the project. Mr. Hoffman explained that the applicant will need to obtain a hardship permit allocation from City Council in order to construct the proposed caretaker unit. Staff is supportive of the request for a dwelling unit permit allocation for a caretaker unit.

Jeanne Fielding, ZP Architects, 2727 Bryant Street, Denver, presented their proposal, reviewed the architecture and layout of the site.

Chair Godfrey opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 11:00 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission. Chair Godfrey closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to explain what kind of regulations are in place for the fuel facility, what was the type and frequency of truck using the site, and to review the traffic patterns for the site. Other questions included why they wanted a caretaker’s unit, whether the railroad was still active, what are their lighting levels and to review the fencing height and location.

The Planning Commission asked staff to review access to the site and to the nearby residences. The Planning Commission asked whether they make a recommendation for the permit allocation. The Planning Commission asked staff to review the trail connections and easements on the property.

The Planning Commission discussed the caretaker unit and the fencing. The Planning Commission added PUD condition no. 3 regarding fencing.

Minor Subdivision Motion
Commissioner Thomas moved the Planning Commission recommend City Council approve the minor subdivision, subject to the recommended condition of approval, finding that the plat complies with the requirements of Section 26-17-7 of the Code. Commissioner Bent seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Planned Unit Development (PUD) Motion
Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission approves the PUD, subject to the recommended conditions as amended, finding that the proposal complies with the requirements for the PUD criteria; and, complies with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies, and land use map. 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. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Special Use Review Motion for Fueling
Chair Viers moved the Planning Commission approve this request for Special Use Review for the fueling facility, finding that the use meets the criteria of Section 26-15-4; 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 Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.
Special Use Review Motion for Caretakers Unit
Chair Godfrey moved the Planning Commission approves this request for Special Use Review for the caretakers unit, subject to City Council authorizing one Growth Management Permit from the hardship allocation, finding that the use meets the criteria of Section 26-15-4; 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. Vice Chair Viers seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Site Plan/Architectural Review Motion
Commissioner Bent moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Site Plan/Architectural Review subject to the recommended conditions, finding that the plan complies with the criteria of Section 26-16-7.1; the submittal requirements of Section 26-17-9 have been met; and the residential architectural promotes transition in scale and character in the neighborhood and will complement the existing development. Vice Chair Viers seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Minor Subdivision Conditions of Approval:
1. Staff recommends that all easement corrections, clerical errors, and grammatical errors shall be corrected by the applicant prior to recording of the plat.

Planned Unit Development Conditions of Approval:
1. The Planned Unit Development approval subject to Site Plan and Architectural Review approval;
2. The eight-foot privacy fence shall be cedar or wood (approved by staff) and not chain link or barb wire fence material; and
3. The eight-foot privacy fence shall extend along the entire west property line.

Special Use Review Conditions of Approval:
1. Special Use Review approval subject to site plan/architectural review approval;
2. Obtain State of Colorado Building Department, Division of Oil and Public Safety;
3. The caretaker’s unit special use is conditioned upon Council allocating one residential permit for the use.

Site Plan/Architectural Review Conditions of Approval:
1. Public improvements along 120th Street shall be escrowed rather than installed;
2. At the minimum one onsite building shall be pre-wired for solar panels to help promote sustainable development within the City;
3. All wall mounted equipment will be painted to match field/background color and that ground mounted mechanical be screened via plantings where possible;
4. Parking lot poles be 25-foot in height;
5. All lighting temperature be 3000K temperature to be within the “warm” temperature level;
6. The applicant either eliminate or reduce lighting levels for the three most southern lights on the office building to meet zero foot-candles at the south property line.
V. Other Business
   A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports
      None.
   B. Department Comments
      Planning Manager Jana Easley reminded the Planning Commission about the upcoming thank you event on Friday, August 30, 2019 and noted the RSVP date was August 16, 2019.

      Ms. Easley asked the Planning Commission for some feedback on the Indian Peaks Filing No. 17 Sketch Plan project. The Planning Commission discussed some of their confusion with the staff report, their frustration with the overall connections with Indian Peaks Filing 17 with the rest of the area and feel there were missed connections and believes there needs to be a larger overall transportation plan and safety needs to be addressed.

      Ms. Easley reminded the Planning Commission of the joint workshop with City Council on July 29, 2019.

VI. Adjournment
   Chair Godfrey moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Thomas. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 12:05 a.m.

   City of Lafayette

   ______________________________
   Doug Godfrey, Chair

   Attest:

   Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary
Subject: Public Hearing and Action on a proposed 400-unit housing development at the southwest corner of Emma Street and 120th Street

Applicant/Owner: Boulder County Housing Authority

Prepared By: Jana Easley, AICP, Planning Manager

Recommended Action: Approve with conditions the Sketch Plan for Willoughby Corner. This recommendation is based on staff's analysis that the Sketch Plan is generally supported by the criteria set forth in Section 26-18-5 of the Lafayette Code of Ordinances (Code).

Summary Statement: The applicant requests approval of a Sketch Plan for 400 homes, including 30 duplex, 130 townhouse, 120 multifamily and 120 senior multifamily units, on a 24-acre site. Approximately 90% or 360 of the homes will be permanently affordable at 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) for Boulder County. The remaining 10% would be deed restricted at >80% to 120% of AMI. Approximately 20% will be for-sale and 80% will be for-rent.

An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use designation from Industrial to High Density Residential will be needed at Final Plan. Rezoning from M1 (Industrial) to R4 (High Density Residential) will also be needed at Final Plan. The Planning Commission will consider the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning at Preliminary Plan.

History: The site was annexed in 1973 as the Willoughby Annexation. The Final Plat for the 30.589-acre Coal Park Subdivision was approved in 2004, which included the subject site and the Peak-to-Peak school site. In 2009, the zoning on Tract A-1 (the subject site) was changed from DR (Developing Resource) to M1/PUD (Industrial/Planned Unit Development) for the purpose of developing a church. However, in 2017, Boulder County and the City of Lafayette purchased the property and entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for the property to be developed as permanently deed restricted based on AMI to include both rental and ownership options.

Policy Issues: Is permanently affordable housing needed in this location in Lafayette? Are services and infrastructure in the area adequate to accommodate 400 new homes?

Alternative Action: Deny the proposed Sketch Plan for the subject property. Such a denial would leave the City and Boulder County with an undeveloped property that was slated for affordable housing through the IGA.

Expenditure Required: The City and Boulder County entered into an IGA and purchased the property in 2017 for $3.5M. The City’s initial portion was $145,150, leaving a balance of $3,350,000 owed to Boulder County which has been earmarked to be re-paid from the affordable housing fund over several years.

Source of Funds: The City’s Affordable Housing Fund, which is generated by a fee of $1.00 per gross square foot for new residential, commercial and industrial buildings, collected at the time of building permit.
Background Information:

Overview of Development Review and Entitlement Process
Sketch Plan approval is the first step in obtaining development approval for more than three (3) residential lots, not within the Lafayette Urban Renewal boundary. Sketch Plan submittal shows a conceptual layout of the site, ingress/egress, conceptual engineering such as location of drainage and detention, general landscaping, proposed street sections and fire access. The conceptual plans and proposed use(s) are reviewed against the Code and Comprehensive Plan for general conformance. Broad policy issues are also discussed. Sketch Plan approval is valid for two (2) years.

The next application in the process would be Preliminary Plan which is when preliminary engineering and plans with much greater detail are provided. After Preliminary Plan approval, the applicant would have 90 days to apply for Final Plan approval. Final Plan approval is required before applying for building permits. This project will require a development agreement.

Affordable Housing in Lafayette
City Council, pursuant to the “Boulder County Regional Housing Partnership’s Priorities and Strategies for Expanding Access to Diverse Housing for the Community,” approved Resolution 2017-16 which sets a goal of having at least 12% of its housing units be permanently affordable, as defined as not more than 80% of the Boulder County AMI. Affordable homes can be individually integrated into a market-rate neighborhood, or they can be built together as an entire neighborhood. The City collects a fee on each building permit to generate funds for affordable housing projects.

In about 2004, the City had a community housing program based on inclusionary zoning whereby a certain number of homes in each new subdivision had to be permanently affordable. That program ended in the late 2000s. In 2012, Council approved an affordable housing fee on all new construction. By doing this, the City can leverage those funds and have a much greater impact than only requiring developers to build a certain amount of their homes as permanently affordable. The subject project is an example of how the City and BCHA have partnered to leverage those funds which will provide many more affordable homes than through inclusionary zoning.

The City also encourages developers to build at least 40% of their units as affordable as a way to be exempt from the growth management program. The affordable housing fee applies to all homes built, whether affordable or not.

The City works with partners to develop affordable housing. For example, BCHA provided 95 affordable homes in 32 different structures through a scattered site affordable housing approach in Lafayette. BCHA also worked with the City to provide a mix of affordable rental and market-rate for-sale homes on Dounce St and Brooks Ave in Lafayette. BCHA worked with a private developer, the Inland Group, to disperse affordable housing units within the primarily market-rate Copperstone apartment development. Like these other examples, Willoughby Corner will also include a mix of affordable rental and for-sale homes to serve Lafayette residents.

Public Land Dedication (PLD)
The Lafayette Open Space Advisory Committee (LOSAC) has reviewed the project and has requested cash-in-lieu for the PLD.

- Attachment 1 is comments from LOSAC

Nature of Request
This application is a request for Sketch Plan approval for 400 residential units on 24 acres. The project is located at the southwest corner of 120th St and Emma Street.

The proposed density of 400 units is being requested to insure affordability for the project and the
intended end users. In addition to on site construction costs, the applicant will be required to pay cash-in-lieu for PLD, construct and/or escrow funds for roadway and sidewalk improvements, and install a traffic signal at 120th St and Emma Street. Another cost to applicants are impact fees that assist the City in covering ongoing operating costs, which will be negotiated through the development agreement at Final Plan.

The plan uses transition zones along the Emma St frontage and the 120th St and Emma St corner with density similar to Old Town density at 4.0 units per acre, or 30 units on 7.5 acres. A combination of townhomes, multifamily, and senior units are proposed for the balance at a density of 22.3 units per acre, or 370 units on 16.6 acres. The 24-acre site has an overall gross density of 16.7 units per acre, which is below the allowed 18 units per acre in the R4 zone district. This density allows the project to be financially viable by spreading the cost of infrastructure development and construction across all of the proposed units.

- **Attachment 2** is the Vicinity Map and also shows locations of other affordable housing in Lafayette
- **Attachment 3** is the applicant’s narrative
- **Attachment 4** is the Sketch Plan/PUD document
- **Attachment 5** is the perspective drawings

Rezoning and a Comprehensive Plan Land Use amendment would have to be approved as part of the Final Plan process, as summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Identification:</th>
<th>Acreage:</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Zoning:</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>Proposed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract A-1, Coal Park Subdivision (Currently Undeveloped)</td>
<td>24.01 Acres</td>
<td>Vacant; M1 (R4)</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Attachment 6** is a map that illustrates the proposed zoning changes
- **Attachment 7** is a map that illustrates the proposed comprehensive plan land use changes

**Surrounding Land Use and Comprehensive Land Use Plan Designation**
As shown in the table below, the subject property is surrounded by a variety of land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Development Name</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comp Plan Designation</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Unincorporated Vacant Land</td>
<td>AG (County)</td>
<td>Opportunity Parcel D</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Unincorporated Capital Hill Townsite Subdivision (aka Flagg Drive Neighborhood) (Erie)</td>
<td>AG (County)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Large Lot Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Cozy Corner Towing/U-Haul; Container Reclaimer; Colorado Timberframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Peak to Peak Subdivision Vacant Land</td>
<td>P, M1, DR</td>
<td>Public Facility Industrial</td>
<td>Peak to Peak Charter School Vacant land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AG=Agricultural; DR=Developing Resource; M1=Industrial; P=Public
Illustrative Plan
Pursuant to City Code §26-16-4, the applicant provided the City an Illustrative Plan that was posted on the City website in January 2019 for a period of ten days for online comment. The applicant also posted sign(s) and mailed the “notice of intent to develop” to properties within at least 750 feet of the site. The City received 30 responses on the Illustrative Plan.

- Attachment 8 contains all public comments received by staff

Neighborhood Meeting
Pursuant to City Code §26-16-4, the applicant held a neighborhood meeting, with City staff present, on March 6, 2019.

- Attachment 9 is the sign in sheet, photos and applicant’s presentation from the neighborhood meeting

Public Notification
Pursuant to City Code §26-16-9, notice was published in the Boulder Daily Camera on September 13, 2019; two signs were posted on the property and letters mailed to owners within at least 750 feet on September 13, 2019.

Analysis:
Comprehensive Plan Evaluation
The request complies with 70 Comprehensive Plan policies; does not comply with three policies; and the remainder are either not applicable or will be addressed at preliminary or final plan.

- Attachment 10 outlines all of the Comprehensive Plan policies
- Attachment 11 is the Community Framework Plan, which is referenced in the Comp Plan policies and shows designated city gateways, etc.

Lafayette Development and Zoning Code Analysis
Sec. 26-18-5. – Planned Unit Development (PUD) Review criteria
(b) The following criteria shall apply to all residential P.U.D.s, with analysis to follow each:

1. Water and water reclamation. The city shall have a projected capacity to serve fully all subdivided lots with water and water reclamation.

   The City has the ability to serve this project with public water and sewer.
   - Attachment 12 is the City utilities map

2. Other utilities. The city shall receive adequate assurance from all nonmunicipal service providers of adequate, imminent service for all subdivided lots.

   The application was referred out to Xcel and Xcel can provide service to the project. Telephone and cable services are available in the area.

3. Public safety. The city shall have the capacity to provide an appropriate level of fire and police protection to all subdivided lots.

   The application was referred out to the Fire and Police departments whom have indicated they can serve the project.

4. Recreation. The city shall ensure sufficient recreational opportunities for all of its current residents and the future residents of the proposed subdivision.
Outdoor amenities will include a looped walking trail on the east, dog park, orchard and community gardens, courtyards (mews), sidewalk connection to the Burlington Trail, and sidewalk and multi-modal path connections to the west and south. Indoor amenities will include community space for use by residents, as well as a second community space for use by the public—an important amenity for the City.

(5) **Economy of service.** City services shall be provided in the most efficient manner practicable.

This project is on the eastern boundary and contiguous with existing built developments within Lafayette. Water service is available in Canterbury Dr, Emma St and 120th Street. Sanitary sewer service is available in Canterbury Dr and Emma Street. The nearest Fire station is approximately 1.3 miles to the south. Approximately 120 units will be age restricted (senior multifamily), which tends to put a heavier burden on emergency services. City staff will consider those impacts in their review of the anticipated incentive request that will be reviewed by City Council at Final Plan as part of the development agreement.

(6) **Schools.** The city shall support and encourage the best quality education for Lafayette children.

Boulder Valley School District reviewed this proposal and found it has the ability to serve with existing and planned capacity. Furthermore, the school district has indicated that the plan appears to have adequate pedestrian access throughout and multiple opportunities to site bus stops. The proposed sidewalk improvements would allow students within 1.5 miles of Sanchez good pedestrian access, so they would not be bussed. Bus transportation would be provided for Angevine and Centaurus due to this development’s distance to those schools. No additional improvements are needed at nearby school bus stop locations.

- **Attachment 13** is the referral letter from BVSD.

(7) **Prior agreements.** To the extent any prior development and/or annexation agreements do not conflict with the provisions of this ordinance, the city shall consider any prior commitments made in such agreements in reviewing a P.U.D.

Through the development review process, all agreements have been reviewed and staff and the city attorney find no conflicts.

(8) **Community housing needs.** The city shall promote a variety of housing types, prices, and ownership forms to satisfy the needs of all segments of the community.

This project will provide needed permanently affordable and deed-restricted homes for a variety of ages, abilities and incomes ranging from 30% to 120% of AMI. Home types will be varied to include apartments, senior apartments, townhouses, and duplex units with yards.

(9) **Developer's ability to complete construction of the P.U.D.** The city will commit city resources only to developments that are likely to be completed as proposed.

The applicant has proven its ability to develop large, affordable housing projects throughout Boulder County and Lafayette.

(10) **Build-out rate.** In order to manage residential growth in accordance with the city's ability to provide services and to allow a variety of housing developments to be completed, the city shall encourage building to occur subject to an agreed upon time schedule and build-out rate.

As a project that provides more than 40% permanently affordable homes, this development would be exempt from the City's growth management program.
(11) **Community amenities.** The city shall encourage residential developments that contribute significant amenities to the development itself, and to the community at large.

This project will provide approximately 5,000-6,000 sf of community space for use by the public. An additional 4,000-5,000 sf of space will be provided for community residents. Other amenities include a looped walking trail on the east, dog park, orchard and community gardens, courtyards (mews), connection to the Burlington Trail, and sidewalk and multi-modal path connections to the west and south. A bus/shuttle staging area is set aside near the community buildings that could be used by RTD and private busses and vans.

(12) **Goal fulfillment.** The city shall encourage residential developments that fulfill specific Comprehensive Plan or city council goals.

The proposed plan meets 70 policies, does not comply with three policies, and the remainder are either not applicable or will be addressed at preliminary or final plan.

(13) **City’s financial ability to serve.** The city shall demonstrate that it is financially able to provide general municipal services to all new residential development.

The City is financially able to provide general municipal services for this project.

(14) **Transportation.** The city shall encourage an efficient and environmentally sound transportation system.

The addition of the round-about along Emma St will help to slow traffic and also better serve Peak to Peak traffic. A traffic signal will be installed by the applicant and their cost at 120th St and Emma Street. Left and right turn lanes will be added to eastbound Emma St and northbound and southbound 120th Street. The 120th Street Master Plan provides the following:

**120th Street and Emma Street intersection**

*The following intersection configuration is recommended at the 120th Street and Emma Street intersection:*

- Northbound approach: One left turn lane and one through lane
- Southbound approach: One through lane and one right turn lane
- Eastbound approach: One left turn lane and one right turn lane
- Each intersection departure is recommended as a single lane with no acceleration lanes
Proposed 120th Street roadway sections as outlined in the 120th Street Master Plan:

The applicant has been encouraged to work with RTD and VIA to explore transit options for getting residents to existing RTD bus stops, the closest which is approximately half a mile by foot to the west.

Traffic Impact numbers and models can be found within the Draft Traffic Impact Study submitted in February 2019. Although a Traffic Impact Study is not required for a Sketch Plan application, BCHA hired Kimley-Horn engineers to conduct a Draft Traffic Impact Study for the proposed project. Should this project be recommended for approval, additional Traffic Impact Studies will be conducted as part of future applications. The conclusions and recommendations of the Draft Impact Study suggest that the proposed development can be successfully incorporated into the future roadway network. Specifically, this project supports, and will help fund, adjacent anticipated roadway improvements that are within the 120th Street Master Plan. The proposed improvements will add a signalized intersection, roundabout intersections, two-way public streets, in addition to a multi-use trail and sidewalk system to improve vehicular and non-vehicular traffic patterns in the area.

- Attachment 14 is the Traffic Study

(15) Environment. The natural environment assets of a property shall be preserved to the extent practicable.

As part of the preliminary plan submittal, the applicant will be required to submit an environmental/ecological study.

(16) Cultural. The city values its existing historical and/or cultural facilities, including its library, theatre, etc.

As part of the preliminary plan submittal, the applicant will be required to submit a cultural resources study.

(17) Strong homeowners associations. The city shall encourage the development of strong
homeowners associations to promote a sense of community and to ensure the continued existence of a viable entity responsible for maintenance of open space, open areas and other similar duties.

Not applicable. BCHA will maintain all common area.

(18) *Diversity and quality of development.* The city shall encourage residential developments that present a diversity of design, a feeling of spaciousness, and an enhanced quality of life.

This project proposes several different types of homes that will appeal to various ages and abilities. The building types will include 2-story duplexes with yards, 2-story townhomes that front on green space, and 3-story multifamily and senior multifamily buildings. There will be ample green space and trails throughout the site, some programmed, some not. Homes and trees on the east have been grouped to help provide visual corridors through the project and similar visual compatibility with the Flagg Drive neighborhood to the east. Landscape buffering along the south side will help to separate this development from the industrial area. New sidewalks and multi-model paths will connect this site on the east and south. The detention pond serves as a wide buffer from 120th Street.

At Sketch Plan, the architecture has not been fully developed; however, BCHA has indicated it will be visually compatible with the surrounding area. The homes fronting on Emma St will create a continuation of the streetscape from the west. Taller buildings will be located on the south, closer to the industrial area.

(d) The following criteria shall apply to all P.U.D.s:

1. **The city finds the project is unique and/or necessary for the economic development of the city.**

New homes generate additional property tax for the City. Although this is not a sales tax generating use, 400 homes will indirectly generate sales tax when those new residents purchase goods in Lafayette.

2. **The development is in the best interests of the city.**

There is a demand for affordable and attainable housing in the City, and the City has a goal to have 12% of its housing stock be permanently affordable. This project will provide for-rent and for-sale opportunities for household incomes ranging from 30% to 120% of AMI for Boulder County and provide a significant number of new affordable units to help meet our goal (2.3% of our goal would be met with this project of which about 5.5% has been or will be met with existing and planned projects).

- Attachment 15 shows the current Boulder County AMI

As part of this project, the applicant will either build or escrow funds to build the west side of 120th St improvements as outlined in the 120th St Master Plan. They will construct all of Emma St adjacent to the project, including sidewalks and multi-use paths to better connect pedestrians along Emma St and 120th St, to the Burlington Trail, and throughout the site. Sidewalk connections to the west, adjacent to Peak to Peak Charter School (P2P) will also be installed for better connectivity to Old Town. A new traffic signal will be installed, at the applicant’s cost, at 120th St and Emma Street. Road and sidewalk improvements will benefit Peak to Peak and all modes of travelers in the general area.

- Attachment 16 is the 120th Street Master Plan

The project will also include 5,000-6,000 sf of community space for use by the public.

(3) **The modifications to the code by the PUD are in the best interests of the city and the neighborhood in which the development is occurring.**
Because land and construction costs directly affect the costs of homes, it is necessary to have smaller lot sizes and greater density, especially when planning for affordable housing. Staff believes the requested Code modifications are the minimum needed and required to ensure this project remains affordable while providing an interesting layout, desirable amenities, and a variety of home styles and prices. The applicant has worked to provide ample green space and view sheds through the site from the east so as not to appear as a solid barrier from the Flagg Drive neighborhood or 120th Street. They have shown a similar scale and pattern along Emma St, so as to create a continuation of the streetscape from the west. They have worked with P2P to ensure the development will benefit the school and not create any negative impacts.

Requested parking reductions will allow more of the land to be either buildings or green space, rather than empty parking lots.

**Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Code Modifications**

A Planned Unit Development (PUD) permits greater flexibility in design by having the effect of overlaying the existing zoning, thereby adding to and modifying the existing zoning regulations.

The applicant is proposing the following Code modifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE MODIFICATIONS REQUESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT YARD SETBACK AT COLLECTOR (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT YARD SETBACK AT LOCAL (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE YARD SETBACK (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD SETBACK (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD SETBACK (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM LOT SIZE (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM LOT SIZE (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE (NET/ON LOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY PARKING (SPACES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR MULTIFAMILY PARKING (SPACES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL STREET CROSS SECTION (FLOWLINE TO FLOWLINE) (FT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setbacks, lot size, lot coverage:** In order to keep the project permanently affordable and lower maintenance, it is the applicant’s desire for smaller lot sizes, setbacks and lot coverage. The zero-foot side setback is for shared party walls between duplex and townhouse units. Smaller lots and clustered homes also allow for larger areas of green space. Compact development is preferred to better utilize scarce land resources.

- Staff recommends the table be updated to include the request for smaller townhouse lots, from 2500 sf minimum to 900 sf minimum.

**Parking:** The applicant has built and operated many permanently affordable age-restricted and non-age-restricted units. Based on their experience, owners and tenants of affordable units typically require less parking than market-rate homes. Based on built affordable projects in the City and elsewhere, staff concurs with this conclusion.

- **Attachment 17** is the Applicant’s Parking Analysis

The applicant is requesting 49 fewer spaces (24%) for the multifamily and 47 fewer spaces (24%) for the senior multifamily. The duplex lots meet the required parking. The townhouse lots exceed the required parking by 42 spaces (16%). Community space parking exceeds the required amount by 7 spaces (28%).
Overall, the parking is short 47 spaces (7%) without on-street parking. The applicant contends that guest parking (accounted for in the City’s parking requirement) can be met by 62 on-street parking spaces. While the Code does not allow on-street parking to be counted—since it could be used by anyone—these spaces likely will be used by guests and/or multifamily tenants.

The Planning Commission has the authority to grant up to a 20% reduction in parking for non-age-restricted units and up to a 70% reduction for senior (age-restricted) units. The townhome parking includes some off-street parking that could be used by multifamily units.

- Staff recommends the parking table shown on the plans be amended to reflect 9 spaces of townhome parking be allocated to multifamily parking to keep the shortage to under 20% for multifamily, to read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE MODIFICATIONS REQUESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT YARD SETBACK AT COLLECTOR (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT YARD SETBACK AT LOCAL (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE YARD SETBACK (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD SETBACK (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD SETBACK (FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM LOT SIZE (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM LOT SIZE (SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE (NET/ON LOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIFAMILY PARKING (SPACES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR MULTIFAMILY PARKING (SPACES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL STREET CROSS SECTION (FLOWLINE TO FLOWLINE) (FT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local street width: The applicants are requesting a one-foot reduction in the built street, flowline to flowline. The Code requires 39 feet, as shown below, with 7-foot parking and 12.5-foot drive lanes. The City standard is shown below:

The applicant is requesting 7-foot parking and 12-foot drive lanes in order to help keep traffic speeds down. The City Engineer has reviewed the proposed reduction and has no concerns with this modification in this location.
Neighborhood Concerns:

Peak to Peak Charter School (P2P) is located to the west and the applicant will need to obtain fee title for some portions of land that P2P owns in order to construct Canterbury Drive and the round-abouts. P2P has signed the application and provided a letter of support for the project. Early on, staff had asked BCHA to consider at least one four-story building in order to build vertical and preserve some additional green space. P2P was not in favor of this request and BCHA responded with no buildings taller than three stories. Given P2P’s concerns, staff is supportive of three stories.

- Attachment 18 is the City Engineer’s memo

The Flagg Drive neighborhood, an unincorporated Boulder County subdivision to the east, has expressed concern about cut-through traffic on Flagg Dr. from 120th St to Baseline Rd. (State Highway 7) and have provided a petition signed by all Flagg Drive residents in support of closing Flagg Dr. at Hwy 7. They have also requested a mid-block crosswalk to get from Flagg Dr. to the Willoughby sidewalk system. The applicant had originally shown a stub sidewalk that would put pedestrians into 120th St where there is no existing crosswalk or signal. Also, once someone crossed 120th, they would end up on the north or south side of Flagg Dr. which has no sidewalks. Because of safety concerns, especially for visually impaired persons who would normally be expecting a crosswalk to lead to an ADA-accessible sidewalk, staff recommended the stub sidewalk be removed until a good alternative can be provided.

Staff and the applicant have had numerous discussions with Flagg Drive residents and Boulder County Transportation during the course of this project. Flagg Dr. is a county road and, therefore, Boulder County has jurisdiction. Hwy 7 is within the City at the Flagg Dr. intersection. Hwy 7 is under CDOT’s purview and Lafayette is the issuing authority for any access changes. At the intersection of Hwy 7, as this is an annexed area, Boulder County does not have jurisdiction, so any modifications would go through a City of Lafayette/CDOT process. Boulder County does, however, have to be the initiator of any closure to Flagg Dr. south of Hwy 7, as it is a county road.

- Attachment 19 is the letter of support from Peak to Peak

- Attachment 20 is correspondence from the Flagg Drive neighborhood
The applicant also carried out extensive public outreach beyond what was required for the Sketch Plan process. Please see the following attachments for more information:

- Attachment 21 is the applicant’s community outreach summary
- Attachment 22 is the applicant’s documentation for their ELAC (East Lafayette Advisory Committee) meetings
- Attachment 23 is the applicant’s postcards in support of the project

**Recommended Conditions:**

Staff recommends the following conditions of approval for the Willoughby Sketch Plan:

1. The code modification table shown on the plans shall be amended to reflect nine spaces of townhome parking be allocated to multifamily parking to keep the shortage to under 20% for multifamily.
2. The code modification table shall be updated to include the request for smaller townhouse lots, from 2500 sf minimum to 900 sf minimum.
3. Subject to the successful Comprehensive Plan Land Use designation change to High Density Residential.
4. Subject to the successful Rezoning to High Density Residential (R4).
5. The applicant shall address all comments in the City Engineer’s memo dated September 10, 2019.

**Motions:**

**Proposed Motion for Approval:** The Planning Commission approves the Sketch Plan/PUD, subject to the five (5) recommended conditions, finding that the proposal complies with the requirements for sketch plan submittal; complies with the PUD criteria; and complies with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies, and, subject to amendment, the comprehensive plan land use map. The plan is in the best interest of the City; and the proposed code modifications are in the best interest of the City and the neighborhood.

**Proposed Motion for Denial:** The Planning Commission denies this request for Sketch Plan/PUD approval finding that the proposal does not comply with preliminary plan requirements; does not meet the PUD criteria; does not comply with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies or land use map.

**Attachments:**

1. LOSAC review comments
2. Vicinity map
3. Applicant’s narrative
4. Sketch Plan set
5. Perspective drawings
6. Zoning map
7. Comprehensive Plan Land Use map
8. Public comments received by staff
9. Neighborhood meeting information
10. Comprehensive Plan Policies
11. Community Framework Plan
12. City utilities map
13. Letter from BVSD
14. Traffic Study
15. Boulder County Area Median Income
16. 120th Street Master Plan
17. Applicant’s Parking Analysis
18. City Engineer’s Memo
19. Letter from Peak to Peak Charter School
20. Flagg Drive correspondence
21. Applicant’s community outreach summary
22. Applicant’s ELAC meetings documentation
23. Applicant’s “support” postcards
Link to Willoughby Corner Presentation for 9-24-19 Meeting