

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 13, 2024

**City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM**

Call to Order – Chairperson **Brauneis** called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

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

Commission Members Present: Steve Brauneis, Chair
Jeff Moline, Vice Chair
Debra Baskett, Secretary
David Bangs
Cullen Choi
Jennifer Hunt
Jonathan Mihaly

Staff Members Present: Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager
Amelia Brackett, Senior Planner
Matt Post, Senior Planner
Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda was moved by **Baskett**, seconded by **Moline**, and adopted by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

- a) **Minor Subdivision – 1147 and 1149 W Enclave:** Consideration of Resolution 5, Series 2024 regarding a recommendation to City Council to adjust a lot line between 1147 and 1149 W Enclave.

Staff Presentation:

Brackett introduced the presentation for the minor subdivision change. The applicant was requesting to adjust the location of the lot boundary. The reasoning for the adjustment was to improve solar panel access on the northern lot, and to address drainage issues

on the southern lot. The applicant had requested one waiver, but was otherwise compliant with the subdivision requirements, and met the existing PUD lot size range. The application met the requirements for the lot depth waiver as the lot depth nonconformities already existed, and it did not alter the density or character of the neighborhood.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 5, Series 2024.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Mihaly asked to confirm that the setback requirements were still met with the proposed changes.

Brackett said yes.

Applicant Presentation:

Thomas Greany, resident, introduced presentation. Noted that the planned house was to be nearly identical to one destroyed in Marshall Fire. Also retained damage to original property during 2013 floods. Changes allow home to be rotated 25 degrees for best solar potential. Explained why the changes were necessary, and the benefits it would produce. Noted that broader impacts from changes would be very limited.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Mihaly asked whether the retaining wall had already been built, and whether it crossed the current lot boundary.

Greany said yes, and noted that it was allowed by the City since they owned both lots.

Mihaly asked to clarify that the only waiver was for the width to depth ratio.

Brackett confirmed this.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Hunt said that she saw no reason to reject the application, and noted that she personally had experienced similar drainage issues, so she could understand the applicant's predicament.

Moline said that he was in support, and acknowledged the difficulty the applicant would have meeting the required width to depth ratio given the size of the lots.

Bangs said that he was in support

Choi said that he was in support.

Baskett said that she was in support.

Mihaly said that he was in support, and added that the presentation alleviated his initial concerns about the application.

Brauneis said that he was in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 5, Series 2024 was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Mihaly**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

- b) **Planned Unit Development (PUD) – 745 S Pierce:** Consideration of Resolution 6, Series 2024, regarding a recommendation to City Council for a PUD to allow a small storage facility at 745 S Pierce.

Staff Presentation:

Post introduced the presentation for the PUD application. He said that the application was for a new self-storage facility in the Colorado Tech Centre (CTC). He noted that the site was vacant and had been zoned for industrial use. The proposal included a detention and water quality pond on the east side of site.

Post said that the applicant had proposed including 11 parking spaces, 3 vehicle loading spaces, and 4 bike parking spaces. He noted that this was well below the approximately 32 spaces that would be required under the City's parking requirements.

Post then covered the proposed design of the building, and the waivers that had been requested by the applicant. The first waiver was to allow the applicant to not have trees on the north side buffer due to the presence of the storm drain. Staff found that this was a reasonable request. The second waiver request was to allow the applicant to install additional wall signage. The applicant wanted to install an additional sign on the west side of the property as it would be highly visible. Staff found that the request was in line with the intent and limitations of the sign code. The third request was for a reduction in the required number of parking spaces. The applicant had asserted that the nature of the proposed land use meant that the proposed number of parking spaces would be adequate. Post also noted that on-street parking was prohibited in the CTC by covenant. Staff found that this request was reasonable.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of Resolution 6, Series 2024, with the condition that the applicant shall establish and record a shared access easement with the property to the south concurrent with the proposed shared access point prior to the building permit application.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Baskett asked how many staff were anticipated to work there.

Post deferred to the applicant.

Mihaly asked whether the proposed number of electric vehicle charging spaces would comply with the code.

Post said that code was applied to the number of spaces proposed by the applicant, rather than the number of spaces required by the parking minimums.

Choi asked about the dimensions and clearance for the western gate. He also asked to clarify whether customers would use the fire lane for loading and unloading.

Post said yes, and noted that the Louisville Fire Department had signed off on the proposal with no additional comments.

Brauneis asked whether Choi wanted to revisit this issue.

Choi said that he just wanted to check, and did not want to second-guess the judgement of the fire department.

Choi asked whether the mechanical equipment was intended to be roof or ground mounted.

Post deferred to the applicant. He also noted that there was to be a transformer on the east side of the building.

Bangs asked whether there were concerns about the hours that the proposed signage would be illuminated for.

Post said that he would have to check the code, but noted that the applicant would still need to apply for a sign permit, and that issues like this would be covered during that process.

Brauneis asked about the adjacent zoning. He also asked whether the reduced number of parking spaces would be used for additional leasable space in the building.

Post said that the applicant had argued that an increase in the number of parking spaces would necessitate a reduction in the amount of leasable space.

Brauneis asked about the proposed lot coverage.

Post said that the proposed landscaping kept the lot coverage in compliance with the code.

Hirt said that the railroad right of way was zoned industrial, and the area beyond that was planned community commercial.

Applicant Presentation:

Mark Delgado, non-resident, was the applicant's architect with DCB Construction. He spoke to the proposed color and design of the building, and noted that it was intended to meet the industrial design standards. He said that the proposed 35 foot wide fire lane would be wider than required 20 feet. He added that though they did not intend to have cars parked in the fire lane, the added width meant that parked cars would not impede Fire Department access.

Delgado said that the proposal for 14 parking spaces was be double the typical number of spaces for similarly sized storage uses. He noted that a nearby similarly sized property had an average of 33 customer visits per day, and that the expectation would be for there

to be no more than 8 customers visiting simultaneously. He added that some of the reduced parking area was repurposed as landscaping and additional leasable area. He also noted that the expectation was to have one on-site employee in the long term.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Mihaly asked what proportion of the applicant's other sites had been rented out.

Delgado said that they had rented out about 44% of the Glacier Park facility, and that Dylan Rd Storage had around a 96% occupancy.

Mihaly asked whether there was a national average for storage facility occupancy.

Delgado said that they had provided some regional averages from the "Self Storage Almanac".

Moline asked whether there was a backup plan for parking in case there were more customers than available spaces.

Delgado said that worst case scenario, they could use some of the additional landscaped area. He reiterated that the number of proposed spaces would be more than demanded and necessary, and therefore should be able to cope.

Moline asked if applicant would consider leasing off-site parking spaces if worst came to worst.

Delgado noted that applicant also operated another nearby storage location that could be used for additional parking.

Hunt asked how long people would typically spend at the unloading area.

Delgado said that most activity was at the recessed unloading area. He also noted that customers tended to arrive throughout the day, and that they tended to minimize the amount of time they spent at the facility.

Hunt asked whether the facility would be accessible 24/7.

Delgado said that it would only be open when it was fully staffed, which should be until about 9pm or so.

Brauneis asked whether there were any regulations on the lumen output of the proposed sign.

Post said that there were not.

Brauneis said that he had some concerns about how bright the sign would be, and how it would fit with the neighboring area.

Post said that there was a lighting ordinance that applied to the industrial district, and that there would be a chance for staff to review the proposed sign in conjunction with the photometric plan.

Post spoke to the City's sign code, and noted that internally illuminated sign were not permitted in the industrial zone district.

Public Comment:

Moline moved to enter the letter from DCB Construction into to the record. The motion was seconded by **Hunt** and adopted by voice vote.

No other comments were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Bangs said that he was inclined to support the application. He said that he still had some concerns about the proposed signage and its illumination, and added that he would like to learn more about it during the signage application process.

Choi said that he was in support.

Mihaly said that he was in support, but noted that he still had some concerns about the waivers for the proposed signage.

Baskett said that she was comfortable with supporting the application given the information provided. She particularly liked the reduced parking waiver.

Moline said that he was in support, and that he agreed with the previous comments on the waivers. He was excited that it would have less parking than required under the code.

Hunt concurred, and said that she was in support.

Brauneis said that he was in support, though noted that there would not be all that much additional landscaping.

Motion to approve Resolution 6, Series 2024 was moved by **Mihaly** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

DISCUSSION ITEM – NEW BUSINESS

- a) **Comprehensive Plan Update** – Discussion related to draft vision and values statements for upcoming community engagement and project update.

Staff Presentation:

Hirt introduced the presentation for the Comprehensive Plan update. He said that the purpose of the presentation and discussion was to provide the final results from the first round of community engagement and discuss the plan's vision and values for upcoming engagement. He also updated the Commission on new legislation passed by the Colorado Legislature that impacted the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Discussion:

Mihaly asked how the legislation would impact existing neighborhoods that had already been built out, and whether it would apply to vacant lots in those neighborhoods.

Hirt said that this was something staff was still trying to determine. He added that there were questions as to whether the new ADU rules would contribute to the density requirements. He said that it was the understanding of staff that the density requirements were applied across the whole transit area, and that any deficits in existing neighborhoods would have to be made up elsewhere.

Mihaly also asked whether the new rules would apply to open space.

Hirt said that those areas were exempted.

Mihaly asked whether the average density could be applied across the two transit corridors, or if each one had to meet the average.

Hirt said that the density could be extended beyond the bubble, but it would have to be a contiguous area of increased density.

Moline spoke to the importance of these changes to the drafting of the Plan.

Hirt agreed, and noted that there were still more details that needed to be worked out.

Hunt asked about how the purchase of Cinebar by the University of Colorado would play into this, as it was located right in the transit-oriented circle.

Hirt said that the impact of that redevelopment would be discussed over the coming months as it went through the planning process.

Mihaly noted that most of the existing DASH bus route area had already been developed.

Brauneis asked whether there was a formula that meant the DASH was included but the 228 was not.

Hirt spoke to how a transit corridor was defined in the legislation, and noted that it required a 15 minute headway between services, something the DASH was proposed to have in future, but that the 228 would not.

Brauneis noted that the 40 dwelling units per acre requirement could mean five or six story building with average unit sizes.

Hirt said that he did not think unit size had been defined. He said that the state would be issuing guidance on issues like this by the end of 2024.

Bangs wondered whether this would be a disincentive to adding more transit corridors. He asked about the penalties the City would face for not complying with the new laws.

Hirt said that the initial proposal to reduce state highway funding was removed from the bill.

Moline asked if staff could start to drill down on what residents meant when they talk about Louisville's "small town atmosphere".

Hunt said that housing affordability challenges would likely outweigh concerns about the consequences of increasing transit service from the bill.

Mihaly asked if there was a timeline for when staff would know how existing developments would be impacted by the bill.

Hirt said that staff should know more about this by the end of the year.

Brauneis moved the discussion onto the proposed vision statement.

Hunt said that Council had captured her thoughts about changes to the language.

Brauneis spoke about his concerns about the way the term "sustainability" was being used, and its potential implications in excluding economic and social sustainability.

Hirt noted that there had been some discussion about the use of the phrase "builds on" when referring to the City's "small town atmosphere", with particular focus on replacing it with "preserves".

There was an extended discussion of the specific phrasing of the idea of the “small town atmosphere”.

Hirt noted that staff was trying to understand what “small town” meant to residents.

Brauneis moved the discussion onto the proposed values.

Baskett noted that the proposed values needed to be better defined, and that they needed to get a better sense of how residents of Louisville related to them. She suggested that the term “transportation choices” could be too jargony.

Hirt noted that there would be a reliance on imagery for this to help convey its meaning with community engagement.

Mihaly suggested that it could be rephrased as “support a multitude of transportation options and connections to places for all abilities”.

There was a consensus that “options” would be a more appropriate word to use.

There was further discussion of how the proposed values would be interpreted, and their potential implications.

Baskett suggested that there be an additional value statement to address regional partnerships with other local governments.

Mihaly asked whether a point about affordable housing would be added.

Hirt said that there had been a serious discussion, but the consensus was that it was covered by the point about “inclusivity”.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None were heard.

STAFF COMMENTS

None were heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Baskett**, seconded by **Hunt**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 8:33pm.