City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

November 9, 2023
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – Chairperson **Brauneis** called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Roll Call was taken, and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Steve Brauneis, Chair Jeff Moline, Vice Chair Keaton Howe, Secretary Tamar Krantz Allison Osterman Cullen Choi Debra Baskett
Staff Members Present:	Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager Rob Zuccaro, Community Development Director Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve was moved by **Howe**, seconded by **Osterman**, and adopted by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Baskett moved to approve the minutes for the September 14, 2023, and October 12, 2023, meetings with a condition that the roll call vote is included and with future adjustments on formatting. **Moline** seconded, and the motion was adopted by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

CONTINUED BUSINESS – DISCUSSION ITEM:

A. Housing Plan Strategy Framework

Hirt summarized the staff presentation from the October meeting, and explained the strategies that were included in the proposed framework. He noted that Baskett and Krantz previously provided written comments on the plan.

Baskett said she wanted to recap the high points of the housing needs assessment. She noted its importance in setting the stage for the comprehensive plan. She also noted the findings of the assessment regarding the number of new housing units that would be needed to accommodate the City's projected population growth.

Krantz said she appreciated the detail of the report. She noted she had spoken to other residents who questioned whether the projected population growth was inevitable or necessary for the City. She asked Baskett whether she accepted the methodology and growth metrics in the report.

Baskett said that she did accept them, but questioned whether the City would need to change its planning policies to accommodate the full population growth projected in the report.

Krantz said that she felt the Commission should question the conclusions of the report as they evaluate the proposed strategies.

Zuccaro added that the pro-rata share of growth was a factual number from the State. He said that the proposed policies would all still be applicable and useful regardless of any housing unit target the City may set. He noted that State law had recently changed to prohibit population caps and growth limits. He asked the Commission to consider whether these were good policies regardless of the pro-rata share number.

Brauneis said that he agreed with Zuccaro.

Choi said he also agreed with Zuccaro. He noted that the projections are for the whole County, and that the data is presented to show Louisville working in conjunction with neighboring cities. He would like to be able to focus exclusively on the actions Louisville can take, and not compare it to the other cities. However, he noted that it was important to take this into consideration and said that this should be expanded to include Broomfield.

Brauneis said the Commission would have to consider whether the draft strategies would be good approaches for the City.

Moline said that he appreciated Choi's comments, and that the lack of affordability in Louisville stood out to him. He was concerned about how the City's character would change if people who worked in Louisville could no longer afford to live there. He said that the report's detailing of the percentage of current residents who could not afford to buy their current properties today was of particular concern. He added that affordability affected every part of the City and was an important issue to address.

Brauneis asked whether there were any specific strategies Commissioners wanted to discuss.

Choi said that he really liked strategies 1 and 5. He was curious about the inclusion of the word “allowances” in strategy 2, and wondered why it was not omitted from the strategy.
Zuccaro clarified that there were currently areas of the City where housing might be allowed by special review use or conditional use, but that they could allow for use by right in strategic areas to help spur housing development. He noted that this was not calling for broad rezoning to residential, but to instead look at where transitioning to residential would make the most sense.
Krantz asked which stakeholders were involved in producing the plan and asked what parts of the zoning code they felt needed updating.
Zuccaro clarified that the stakeholder interviews were conducted by the consultant. He said that the first round was open to the public, and subsequent rounds were more targeted. He also noted that the majority of the zoning code was written in the 1970s and 1980s and had only received targeted updates since then. It did not reflect modern land use policy and practices.
Brauneis invited members of the public to comment on the proposed strategies.
Sherry Sommer, a resident, said that she had spoken to many residents during her recent mayoral campaign, and found that many people liked that Louisville had the character of a small town. She felt that the Commission needed to look at what was in the best interests of the City. She noted that there continued to be migration to the City, and that demand for housing would be inexhaustible as a result. She agreed with Moline that people who worked in Louisville should be able to live there but noted that any federal grant money could not be used to exclusively fund housing for those people alone. She also noted the cost-of-living pressures many residents are facing, including the increased property tax burden over recent years.
Baskett said that the proposed strategies were an important first step. She noted from the report that 64% of Louisville workers live outside of the City. She wanted the Commission to consider how each of the strategies would help the City achieve its goals.
Choi asked the Commission to discuss the confluence of strategies 1, 2 and 5. He said that the development would likely happen in areas that were undeveloped or underdeveloped, and that the City needed to be proactive and plan out where the growth will happen.
Brauneis asked Choi how he thought about the questions presented by staff regarding strategies 1, 2 and 5.
Choi said that he felt the strategies were missing an opportunity for industry to be able to innovate with any proposed development. The strategies may not deviate far enough from the status quo.
Brauneis asked whether the strategies as written pointed towards allowing for innovation.
Choi said that he was not sure.

Moline asked how the housing strategies would integrate with the comprehensive plan.
Zuccaro said that the comprehensive plan would look at future land uses in addition to the existing zoning code. He added that the plan would include a market study and examination of fiscal balance. He discussed the importance of having a balance of commercial and residential zoning to maximize economic vitality.
Hirt said that one of the potential strategies would be to identify which areas could be appropriate for residential uses that currently aren't zoned for it. These strategies would give the City a head start in identifying some of these underutilized areas in consultation with the community in the upcoming comprehensive plan update.
Moline said that those strategies identifying areas appropriate for residential development most resonated with him.
Krantz said that she found strategies 3 and 6 resonated the most with her. She felt that they were missing a strategy to help those who were still displaced by the Marshall Fire. She wanted to know if the matrix could include information on the long-term costs of the strategies, their economic impacts, their environmental attributes, and how they would affect the tax base.
Osterman said that strategies 1, 2, 3 and 5 resonated the most with her. She wanted to know if the report would address the inclusionary housing ordinance, particularly about whether the requirement should be increased from 12%.
Zuccaro said that staff had been discussing this with the consultants, and that there would be a recommendation on the inclusionary housing ordinance in the final report. He said that one of the possible recommendations was to have the fee-in-lieu option at a higher rate than if the affordable units were included on the site.
Brauneis again invited public comment.
Sherry Sommer, a resident, brought up the possibility of converting underutilized office space to affordable housing units. She also suggested that the City could buy existing small houses to use as affordable housing, as they would already be integrated into the neighborhoods of the City. She was unsure about the effectiveness of the 12% affordable housing unit requirement.
Cindy Bodell, a resident, asked how much each new resident costs the City.
Zuccaro said that the complex fiscal model showed that there was still a cost to each new resident, and that new tax revenue did not make up for increased demand for services. He noted that there were cases, such as with underutilized and underperforming commercial corridors, that residential development can make more financial sense, but that this is not captured in the fiscal model.
Brauneis agreed with Zuccaro's assessment and asked whether the Colorado Department of Local Affairs had updated their estimates since the 1997 figure.
Zuccaro added that market rate housing would have less of a negative impact on the fiscal balance than affordable housing due to the higher amount of property tax and use

tax they would generate. High end, luxury housing could be fiscally positive for this reason.

Choi concurred with this assessment and added that appropriate residential development was good for commercial development too. This would help to expand the catchment area for local businesses.

Brauneis asked Hirt what additional feedback staff were looking for.

Hirt said staff were logging all the Commission's comments and would use them to inform the draft of the housing plan. He did not think there were any additional areas the Commissioners had yet to cover.

Choi commented that the suggested actions did not always seem to check the boxes of the specific strategies they were attached to. He suggested that each strategy could identify a particular area of the city where they could be implemented to help visualize how they could work.

Moline said that he was having difficulty prioritizing the strategies, though many of them did resonate with him. He noted that some of the strategies would be more appropriate in different areas of the city than others.

Brauneis again invited public comment.

Sherry Sommer, resident, said she appreciated the deliberative tone of the Commission's discussion, and thought that it would be valuable to have listening sessions with the various neighborhoods to gather their input on how these strategies would directly affect them.

Howe said that he felt many of the strategies could potentially compromise the nature and character of the city. He thought it would be important for the city to approach population growth with caution, so as not to put too much strain on City resources. None of the strategies singularly stood out to him as a solution.

Brauneis said that the strategies were solid enough to move forward with. He noted that they would involve additional outreach in the future, and that this sort of change was not something that could just happen overnight.

Moline said that change can be good. He added that the City had changed in many good ways since he moved there 30 years ago, particularly in downtown Louisville.

Brauneis concurred and noted that the many empty commercial spaces were distinct from the businesses that gave the City its small town character.

Hirt said that Brauneis' comments were valuable for the comprehensive plan, as values were very important to that process. The policies would need to be calibrated to meet the City's values.

Howe was interested to see how the comprehensive plan would differ from the last one in 2013. He noted the top priority from citizens in that plan was open space and parks and would like to see if that had changed.

Krantz felt there were still some things missing from the strategies. She agreed with **Osterman's** comments about the possibility of having an increased affordable housing percentage in exchange for rezoning. She also agreed with Sherry Sommer's comments about giving consideration to repurposing office buildings and having the City purchase some small homes to preserve as affordable housing. She was still concerned about how these strategies would impact those who were still by the Marshall Fire. She reiterated that she would appreciate a way to visualize the strategies, as this would make them easier to understand. She would also like to see how the Commissioners would rank their priorities for the housing plan.
Hirt said that the housing plan would have a better prioritization of these strategies, and that they would break them down into near-term, medium-term, and long-term priorities.
Krantz said that she would like to see multiple alternative growth scenarios for the City, such as high, medium, and low growth scenarios.
Baskett really liked Krantz's idea. She asked whether there had been any consideration given to the City forming a housing authority, particularly if the City was planning on owning some of the housing directly.
Zuccaro said that it was not included in any of the strategies. He noted that the City did formerly have a housing authority, but that Boulder County took over providing those services for the City, and that they would continue to do so. He added that they were looking at partnering with the City of Boulder to aid in providing affordable housing services.
Hirt said that staff plan to present the draft housing plan to the Commission in early 2024.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Baskett asked staff about the status of the comprehensive plan.
Hirt said that they had a consultant under contract, but that they were in the process of deciding how it would be completed. Staff intend to bring an update to the Commission in early 2024. The lead consultant is Design Workshop.

STAFF COMMENTS

Hirt said that the next Commission meeting in December would cover zoning code amendments for PUDs.

ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was moved **Howe** and seconded by **Choi**. The motion was approved by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 7:40pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

December 14, 2023
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – Chairperson **Brauneis** called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Roll Call was taken, and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:	Steve Brauneis, Chair Keaton Howe, Secretary Tamar Krantz Allison Osterman Cullen Choi Debra Baskett
Commission Members Absent:	Jeff Moline, Vice Chair
Staff Members Present:	Rob Zuccaro, Community Development Director Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager Amelia Brackett Hogstad, Senior Planner Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda was moved by **Howe** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the November 2023 meeting was moved by **Baskett** and seconded by **Krantz**. The motion was adopted by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

a. **Final PUD, SRU, Plat, Easement Vacation, and Annexation Agreement Amendment – 1303 Empire Road**. Adoption of Resolution 19, Series 2023 regarding approval of a final planned unit development (PUD), Special Review Use (SRU), plat, easement vacation, and annexation agreement amendment to allow a distillery, tasting room, and event space at 1303 Empire Road.

Howe said that he had a client relation with a member of the applicant team, but that this would not impact his decision making on this case.

Staff Presentation:
Brackett Hogstad introduced the presentation for the application. She said that the site was located on Empire Rd, was zoned for industrial use, and had been annexed into the City in 1986. The proposal was for a PUD and SRU, plat and easement vacation, and an amendment to annexation agreement. She discussed the proposed layout from the PUD, and noted the presences of the historic "Joe's Metal Shop" structure, and how the applicant intended to use it. She also explained the SRU and parking standards for the site, and why the annexation agreement needed to be modified.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 19, Series 2023, with 2 conditions.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Baskett spoke about the history of the no build zone from the annexation agreement.
Brackett Hogstad noted it was an unusual covenant.
Baskett noted that it was intended to preserve a gateway for Highway 42 and Empire Road.
Brackett Hogstad said that staff had looked at City Council records and noted that it provided a buffer. She added that the site was zoned for industrial use by Boulder County.
Baskett asked whether EV parking would include EV chargers.
Brackett Hogstad deferred to Zuccaro.
Zuccaro said he would have to look it up, noting that there were three different categories of readiness for electric vehicle charging. He assumed that there would be some, but that he would have to look up the exact number.
Baskett thought including them would be appropriate.
Baskett asked why the proposed trail along Empire Road was not going to be paved.
Brackett Hogstad said that Parks and Open Space would prefer an impervious surface.
Baskett asked about the offsite parking agreement, and whether there would be a trail linking the two.
Brackett Hogstad said that there would not be a defined trail, but there had been impromptu trail used in the past.

Choi asked about whether there was consideration of including parking on City owned land on the north side of the property.

Brackett Hogstad said that it may not be desirable as it was in use. She was not sure if this had been discussed.

Choi asked about whether there was consideration of adding further crossing improvements between the trail on the south side and Highway 42.

Brackett Hogstad said that there were not specific plans to include upgraded pedestrian crossings, and that this would not be required as part of the application.

Zuccaro said that he had found number of EV chargers.

Brauneis asked Zuccaro if there were improvements planned to the Highway 42 and Empire Rd intersection as part of the Highway 42 plan.

Choi added that he was concerned that there was not protected left turn from southbound Highway 42 onto Empire Rd, and that this could create traffic issues. He asked if the City had evaluated the intersection, and how they would go about doing that.

Zuccaro clarified Choi's question about the potential inclusion of a protected left turn lane. He said that he would have to look this up. He added that traffic studies were not typically done on single lot developments.

Brackett Hogstad added that there was no request from Public Works to do a traffic study.

Zuccaro said that Public Works felt it was minor enough that a traffic study would not be warranted.

Zuccaro said that there would be 9 spaces with EV chargers installed, 6 spaces classed as EV ready, and 13 spaces classed as EV capable.

Howe asked where the loading dock was located, and whether it could conflict with the neighboring lot.

Brackett Hogstad pointed it out. She noted that it would have limited impact on the neighboring facility as it was a decent distance away, with landscaping marking the border between the two.

Howe noted it was mainly northwest facing, and that this would help shield it from the adjacent property.

Howe asked whether there would be lighting on the new trail from the overflow lot.

Brackett Hogstad said that she would have to check.

Zuccaro said that staff wanted to be respectful of the buffer and said that it would help preserve a good transition downtown. He noted that changes to the annexation agreement would allow changes to use by right even if the current applicant abandoned their proposal. He added that the language proposed by staff would only change the buffer for this development and not permanently.

Krantz asked what expiration date would be for the plat and SRU.

Zuccaro said that the annexation agreement and plat would not expire, the SRU would expire after a year if not implemented, and the PUD would expire after 3 years.

Krantz clarified whether the changes to the buffer would expire.

Zuccaro said that it would not expire as it would be part of the annexation agreement.
Brackett Hogstad reiterated that the intention of the annexation agreement amendment was to preserve the buffer.
Krantz asked about the capacity of the tasting room and how this would impact the amount of required parking.
Brackett Hogstad said that the IDDSG are not being used for this application as it would not be applicable for the SRU. She said that they were instead using the citywide standards from section 17.20 of the LMC and setting the parking ratios from that.
Krantz asked what the maximum capacity for the venue would be.
Brackett Hogstad said that the tasting room and the event space had to be evaluated separately. She said that the tasting room was set with one space per three seats, while the distillery was done by number of employees per section.
Brauneis asked what plans the City had for the neighboring property that had the dump station on it.
Brackett Hogstad said that she was not sure of any plans.
Zuccaro said he wasn't sure either.
Brauneis asked whether the orchard would be part of a privately operated protected agricultural space, and whether people could potentially go pick them.
Brackett Hogstad said that it was not an agricultural lease, and the only request Parks had for the applicant was that they maintain the orchard properly.
Brauneis asked if the orchard agreement would be forced on any subsequent property owners.
Brackett Hogstad said that she believed there was a clause in the agreement that included what would happen to the orchard.
Brauneis asked to compare the sizes of the current and proposed no build areas.
Brackett Hogstad showed the comparison from the presentation.
Choi asked about the inclusion of the event stage on the site plan, and how it was contemplated that this would interact with the no build zone.
Brackett Hogstad said that activation of the event stage was a positive for the landmarked building, and would allow it to be showcased rather than just sitting there.
Choi asked about how the historic building was planned to be used.
Brackett Hogstad said that building was planned to be used flexibly.

Applicant Presentation
Andy Johnson, DAJ Design, resident, introduced the Ironton Distillery presentation. He noted that the design and development process had been ongoing for two years. He introduced co-owner Lance Peterson, nonresident, co-owner and marketing manager Kallyn Romero, and co-owner and head distiller Laura Walters.
Peterson discussed the history of the business, and what made them unique. He noted that they wanted to help beautify that part of the City. He said that they were one of only four distillery brew pubs in Colorado.

Romero explained why they chose Louisville and noted their community orientation.
Walters discussed the operations of the distillery, and their focus on sustainability. She said that they focused on local and self-grown ingredients.
Romero and **Peterson** discussed the event space and parking requirements.
Johnson discussed the details of the PUD. He noted that the site had been empty for a long time, and many had struggled to develop it. He discussed the connectivity of the site, with connections to trails. He addressed the history of the site and noted that there was no discussion in Council of the no build line. He discussed the proposed layout of the buildings, and the Joe's Metal Shop historic structure. He added that the stage was intended to be removable.

Further Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Zuccaro suggested changing the resolution around the no build line to include it as part of the PUD approval rather than as a change to the annexation agreement.
Howe asked for clarification around whether there was a difference between the buffer and the no build line.
Zuccaro clarified that he meant the no build line.
Brauneis asked whether staff was suggesting removing the no build line altogether.
Zuccaro said yes, as they believed the proposed application was in keeping with the spirit of the no build line.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
Johnson noted that the applicant would rather the no build line be removed entirely, but that the proposed alternative in the staff report would be acceptable.
Krantz asked why removing it would be a priority if they only wanted to put the historic structure in it.
Johnson said that future development would be the priority, and that removing it would more easily allow for future expansions.
Krantz asked whether they would have changed design of building if the line could not be removed.
Johnson said not necessarily, and that it was important to look at the context of the building and its surroundings. He noted that it was not surrounded by open space, and that it would likely remain a weed patch if it were not developed.
Brauneis asked why the City would want to vacate the no build line.
Zuccaro said he understood the concern, but that staff expected the building to be there for a long time, or to otherwise be reused. Removing the line would make it easier to expand the building in the future.
Brauneis asked whether changes to the line would still be open to a request in the future if it were kept in place.
Zuccaro said yes, it would be open to a request, but it would have to go through a PUD review. He noted that this was very different to a typical industrial use.

Choi asked whether the temporary stage would conflict with the no build line.
Zuccaro said that it could just be written into the annexation agreement, and that the no build area didn't disallow landscaping or flatwork. Staff's interpretation was that it was a no building zone, and as such it could allow temporary structures.
Choi asked whether there would be ADA requirements for an elevator in the building.
Johnson said not for the distillery, but that the tasting room and event space would be subject to the ADA.
Choi asked whether ADA requirements for distillery would change its design.
Johnson said it would not as the interior could be easily changed. The internal layout included in the PUD was a potential design they could use, but the exact layout had not been determined yet.
Krantz asked whether the exterior lights would be dark sky compliant.
Johnson said yes.
Krantz asked whether the distillery would require any environmental permits.
Walters said not to her knowledge in Denver. She noted that they did have a requirement for CO_2 monitoring and smell monitoring, and they did have to comply with wastewater permitting.
Krantz asked how many trucks each day they were expecting.
Walters said they were currently receiving 2 trucks per month, and that their distributor used small vans.
Krantz asked whether applicant was aware of City herbicide bans for the orchard.
Walters said they would likely have a landscaper manage the orchard for them.
Krantz asked whether the crusher fines in the open space area would provide the same level of drainage as grass.
Johnson said that they would.

<u>Public Comment:</u>
Cindy Bodell, resident, asked why the no build line was there, and what its purpose was. She thought that they should leave the no build line there, given that it could not be put back. She liked the dark sky compliant lighting and would like it to be required.
Sherry Sommer, resident, would like to maintain the no build zone. She noted that the applicant could request waivers in the future and would provide protection to the City. She thought that the unusual drainage was more of a reason to keep it. She was also curious about the maintenance agreement and wondered whether it had been decided yet. She appreciated Choi's comments on safety of intersection at Hwy 42.

<u>Additional Commissioner Questions:</u>
Brauneis asked why the application did not include any shady plants in the parking lot to help reduce the urban heat island effect.
Johnson said it was to reduce plantings around the building, and that there was no room to plant on north side with the emergency access easement. He said that access to the

site limited their ability to have plants. They still had many plants, they were just condensed in other locations.
Krantz asked whether there would be plants in the parking lot.
Johnson clarified that there would be some plants in the parking lot strip, but noted that they would have fewer than what was required in the code because of the topography of the lot.

Closing Statement by Applicant:
Johnson said that there was no record on why the no build line was created, and that it was arbitrary. He added that they had provided open space as they felt that this was important.

Discussion by Commissioners:
Baskett was in strong support of the project and said that it would be a strong addition to the City. She noted its connection to open space and downtown. She had no issue with moving the no build line, particularly to add the historic structure. She thought that the inclusion of the historic structure was really important and was in support of the resolution as written.
Howe said thought was compliant with PUD criteria and waivers and was supportive of resolution as written regarding the no build zone. He also felt that it met all of the SRU criteria, and agreed with the way the annexation agreement amendment was written. He thought it was win-win-win, and a big win for the City, particularly over current site use. He was strongly in favor.
Osterman said she was very excited about the proposal. Her one confusion was around the no build line, and whether a future owner could turn the site back to an industrial use. She wanted to make sure that the annexation agreement was not being amended improperly.
Krantz said that she agreed with Howe's analysis and was fully in support with the condition that the no build line be moved and not eliminated entirely.
Choi said that he was in favor and noted that the lack of justification for the creation of the no build line and the landscaping choices stood out to him. He said that the line seemed to be arbitrary, and it would be hard to convince him to keep an arbitrary line. He was appreciative of permeable surfaces for the parking spaces but would prefer concrete over asphalt for the loading area and drive aisles. He thought it was a very thoughtfully and tastefully done application and was a vast improvement over the current use of the site.
Brauneis said that he was in favor of the resolution as written. He viewed no build zone as a giant setback, though he was not comfortable with removing the line outright.
Howe moved to approve Resolution 19, Series 2023 with the conditions as presented in the staff report and was seconded **Choi**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

b. **Expedited PUD Review Process.** Adoption of Resolution 20, Series 2023 regarding revisions to the expedited planned unit development (PUD) process.

Staff Presentation:
Hirt introduced the presentation for the expedited PUD review process proposal. He outlined the background of how the PUD process worked, and the hearings required for them. He noted that there was very limited scope for expedited PUDs currently. The purpose of this proposal was to broaden the number of PUDs that could go straight to final PUD process. He outlined the proposed changes, and some example scenarios of how they would be applied.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 20, Series 2023.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Baskett asked about the 7 acres in the example scenarios.
Hirt said that it was what was in the LMC, but that they did not know where it came from.
Baskett asked whether this was part of the bigger picture code revisions.
Zuccaro said it may just be a band aid, but there had been suggestions of moving to a comprehensive code review after the comprehensive plan. It would simplify the PUD process in code and would codify the current processes.
Baskett asked whether staff had received feedback on this from the development community.
Hirt said that they had not on this specific change, but that they had heard from them about issues with the PUD process. The consensus was that many projects could be adequately evaluated with the final PUD process.
Zuccaro added that the intention of the PUD process was to protect the neighborhoods and neighboring property owners. He said that this proposal would capture projects that were small enough to where a single PUD hearing was adequate. He noted that there could be benefit to doing a preliminary PUD for more complicated projects.
Choi asked whether the planning director could have the discretion to only require a final PUD for a project under the proposed revision.
Hirt said that it was written as “shall” be eligible if the project met the criteria, but that the director would have a veto over it for reasons relating to material impacts.
Choi asked whether staff would have to decide whether an eligible application would follow a full or expedited PUD process.
Hirt said yes, and that the reasoning for their decision would be included in the staff report for the PUD.
Brauneis said that Commission could still continue an expedited case if they had more questions.
Hirt agreed, and noted that it would still have to be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Krantz asked about whether this would apply to Old Town given the lot sizes.
Hirt said that the old rules were limited to newer areas like the McCaslin corridor and noted that the details of where it would and would not apply were included in the staff report. He added that Old Town would be eligible for expedited PUDs under the proposal.
Howe asked whether there was any way an expedited PUD could go straight to City Council.
Hirt said no, it would still have to go to the Planning Commission first.

Public Comments:
Sherry Sommer, resident, said that the proposal made sense as it would remove some unreasonable hurdles. She appreciated that it would only apply to lots smaller than 7 acres.

Commissioner Discussion:
Choi said that he liked the requirements staff was keeping and appreciated the elimination of undue burden. He was in support.
Krantz said that she was in support.
Osterman said that she was in support.
Howe said that he was in support. He noted that PUDs had a lifespan of 3 years before they were required to be renewed. He thought that this should help act as an incentive to developers to complete their projects within a reasonable time frame.
Baskett said that she was in support.
Brauneis said that he was in support, and that he hoped it would make things less cumbersome with no loss of oversight by the City.

Motion to approve Resolution 20, Series 2023 was moved by **Krantz** and seconded **Osterman**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Howe gave thanks to staff, to his fellow Commissioners, and to the citizens of Louisville.
Krantz thanked staff and everyone for their help and wished the rest of the Commission the best of luck moving forward.
Osterman bid farewell to the Commission and said thanks for the opportunity to serve.
Brauneis thanked the Commissioners for their hard work and service.

STAFF COMMENTS

Zuccaro echoed Brauneis' words of thanks for the hard work of the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Krantz**, seconded by **Osterman**, and adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 9:24pm.