City of Louisville
COLORADO ▪ SINCE 1878

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

November 14, 2024
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – Vice Chair **Moline** called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

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

Commission Members Present:	Jeff Moline, Vice Chair Debra Baskett, Secretary David Bangs Cullen Choi Jennifer Hunt Jonathan Mihaly
Commission Members Absent:	Steve Brauneis, Chair
Staff Members Present:	Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes for the August 2024 meeting was moved by **Choi**, seconded by **Baskett**, and adopted by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

a. Minor Subdivision and Subdivision Modifications – 824 Lee Avenue: Consideration of Resolution 12, Series 2024, regarding a recommendation to City Council for a Minor Subdivision and Subdivision Modifications to replat three existing lots.

Staff Presentation:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the minor subdivision modification. She explained why a PUD was not needed for this application, and spoke about the location and surroundings of the proposed location. The property was in the Miners Field neighborhood, in the R-M zoning district, and within the Old Town Overlay. She also explained the proposed lot sizes and dimensions, and all the requested modifications from the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC). Staff found that the application met all requirements of the LMC, and was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Highway 42 Framework Plan.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 12, Series 2024 with no conditions.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Choi asked about the length of Park Street as was shown on the zoning map.
Cline-Gibson said that this was likely from an outdated map.
Moline asked to clarify whether the alleyway adjacent to lot 3 had been vacated.
Cline-Gibson clarified that this was the only part of Park Street that had been vacated.
Mihaly asked if there were concerns about emergency vehicle access.
Cline-Gibson said that the fire district had reviewed the plan and had not raised any concerns.
Hunt asked what the address of the new units would be.
Cline-Gibson said that this would be determined during the permitting process.
Choi asked if there were any height restrictions for this lot.
Cline-Gibson said that a 27 foot height limit for primary structures would apply as the lot was within the Old Town Overlay District.
Choi asked if this height limit played into the conceptual imagery requested by staff.
Cline-Gibson said that the focus of staff was on lot coverage and setbacks, but that the development would have to comply with height limit.

Applicant Presentation:
Michael Reis, resident, was part of the ownership group. He explained why Park Street had been vacated historically, and said they anticipated the units having Park Street addresses. He explained the history of the existing house and of the lot, and noted the lack of redevelopment and private development in the neighborhood.

Eric Hartronft, resident, architect, agreed with Reis' desire to build additional smaller, affordable housing units for the City. He suggested that the existing zoning code was no longer fit for purpose, and added that he hoped to set a precedents for a better zoning code in the future. He also said that if the subdivision were not approved, their alternative was to build a condo or apartment building.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
Baskett asked if they had yet been able to decide whether the units would be made permanently affordable.
Reis said that they had not decided this yet.
Bangs asked if there were any other variances being requested.
Cline-Gibson referred back to the five modifications that were covered during the staff presentation.
Bangs asked if there was any concern about rear access to the lots.
Cline-Gibson said that there was nothing in the code to prohibit this, and that staff decided this was the best option as opposed to an access easement.
Moline asked if the inclusionary housing ordinance applied to this subdivision.
Hirt said no.

Public Comment:
Jean Morgan, resident, said that she had some concerns about the proposed setbacks. She was also concerned that new residents would park on Park St, and noted the limited space for parking. Her particular concern was for the smaller lot that was off of the alley.

Cyndi Bodell, resident, said that she had some concerns about setbacks and about wanting to preserve the character of the neighborhood. She would have also liked to have seen the units be set aside as permanently affordable.

Applicant Closing Statement:
Hartronft said that their initial intent was to match setback of the outlot cabins so that they would fit in with the neighborhood. However, due to neighborhood opposition, the opted to instead move to standard setbacks. As a result, they were not requesting any setback waivers. He also noted that they were asking for maximum number of units allowed within the Old Town Overlay District. Regarding parking, he said that the City could pursue parking restrictions for the area if they felt it were necessary, though this would be more of a public works issue. He added that they did not anticipate parking in the alley, and that there were also two on-site parking spaces for each lot.

Staff closing statement:
Cline-Gibson noted staff did not anticipate the need for on-street parking spaces given the provided off-street spaces.

Commissioner Discussion:
Baskett said that she liked the proposal and appreciated that it would be respectful of the neighborhood context. She was in support.

Mihaly said that he agreed with the applicant's comment about archaic zoning code, and agreed that the proposal was in keeping with the existing neighborhood context. He also appreciated the diversity of housing types it would create for the City. He was in support.
Choi agreed with Mihaly, and said that the application was far more appropriate for the neighborhood than an apartment block. He also appreciated the diversity of housing stock it would produce. He was in support.
Hunt agreed, and said that she was in support.
Bangs said that he was supportive of the application, and thought that it was an appropriate development for the Old Town area.
Moline said that he was in support, and that he agreed with the previous comments. He added that it was a small scale but very beneficial project.

Motion to approve Resolution 12, Series 2024 was moved by **Hunt** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Baskett spoke about the upcoming Boulder County Board of County Commissioners meeting on affordable housing.

STAFF COMMENTS

Hirt provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the recent open house was productive and well attended.

Hirt also noted that the City Council had funded an update to the City development code, and that staff intended to issue a request for proposal after the completion of the Comprehensive Plan.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Mihaly**, seconded by **Choi**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 7:24pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

October 10, 2024
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 Debra Baskett, Secretary David Bangs Cullen Choi Jennifer Hunt
Commission Members Absent:	Jonathan Mihaly
Staff Members Present:	Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community Development Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager Matt Post, Senior Planner Cameron Fowlkes, City Engineer Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes for the July 2024 meeting was moved by **Hunt**, seconded by **Moline**, and adopted by voice vote with **Brauneis** abstaining.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

a) **Zoning Code Amendment – Natural Medicines:** Consideration of an amendment to Louisville Municipal Code Title 17 (Zoning) to allow Natural Medicine Businesses in compliance with Colorado Senate Bill SB 23-290.

Staff Presentation:
Post introduced the presentation for the zoning code amendment. He explained why this change was necessary, and noted that there was a strict deadline from the state for the City to adopt the ordinance. He showed a map of the areas of the City where natural medicine businesses would and would not be allowed to operate. He also noted that the ordinance included changes to Title 9 of the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC), though this was not within the purview of the Commission.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 11, Series 2024.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Hunt asked what would happen if a new child care facility opened within the buffer of an existing natural medicine business.
Post said that this was the subject of discussion amongst staff, but their understanding was that the subject natural medicine business would become nonconforming.
Hunt asked whether a new child care facility would know this before opening.
Post said that licensing child care facilities was not within the jurisdiction of the City aside from any business licenses, and that the state was instead responsible for regulating child care facilities.
Bangs asked about how the City controlled variables of time, place, and manner as defined with relation to natural medicine business. He added that he was most interested in the "manner".
Post said that staff thought manner largely referred to the City's nuisance codes for issues like noise and odors.
Bangs asked if staff had compared the proposal to the existing policies of other cities.
Post said that very few other cities had already implemented these policies due to the short time frame imposed by the state. He added that the proposal was generally in line with the proposals from the City of Boulder.
Choi asked why the land use for healing centers was to be considered a medical office use.
Post clarified that they were not being wrapped into the medical office use category in the LMC, but were instead being aligned with the regulations for medical offices due to the licensing requirements from the state.
Bangs asked whether the City would be able to revisit the policy if the state deemed it to be too restricted.
Post said that this would likely require the City to adopt a new ordinance.

Public Comment:
Mark Cathcart, resident, said that he had concerns that the implementation of this policy could produce the negative consequences for nearby residents as the initial regulation of marijuana sales. He asked that the Commission recommend City Council adopt the same regulations for natural medicine businesses as were then in place for marijuana dispensaries.

Commissioner Discussion:
Moline said that he concurred with the staff assessment, and noted the difficult position the City was in given the requirements from the state.
Hunt said that she agreed with Moline, and was in support.
Baskett said that she was in support.
Choi said that he would abstain as he did not feel comfortable voting for the proposed ordinance.
Bangs said he was reluctantly in favor of the proposed ordinance.
Brauneis noted that the City was in a challenging position but was ultimately in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 11, Series 2024 was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0 with **Choi** abstaining.

b) ***CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 12, 2024*** **- Preliminary PUD, Preliminary Plat, Land Use Exhibit Amendment, Rezoning, and Special Review Use - 1032, 1034, and 1040 E South Boulder Road**: Consideration of Resolution 10, Series 2024, regarding a recommendation to City Council for a mixed use project with 188 residential units and 13,534 square feet of commercial space.

Staff Presentation:
Post provided a recap on the application. He also introduced new evidence related to a traffic study from November of 2022, and from the 2019 Transportation Master Plan.

Public Comment:
Lauryl Sagrillo, resident, pooled with **Tami Cantrel**, resident, said that the connection of Front Street to South Boulder Road no longer made sense given that there was no longer going to be a train station there in the near future. She spoke about the dangers of traffic for children walking and biking to the nearby middle school. She asked that approval be delayed until a more in depth traffic study had been completed.

Bob Tofte, resident, said that he was opposed to the application due to the additional traffic it would create. He also noted that this additional traffic could pose a safety hazard to children riding their bikes to and from the nearby middle school.

Sam Rizzo, resident, said that he worked near the proposed development. He was not sure that it would add much economic development to the area, and compared it to similar developments. He noted that there was the potential for his workplace to lose parking spaces on Cannon Street, and that he was opposed to this.

Andy Maas, resident, said that he was a nearby resident, and that he felt the traffic study was flawed as it did not include cars travelling down Griffith. He was opposed to the application.

Nick Facemire, resident, had serious concerns about the potential traffic impacts and on the related issue of traffic safety in the area. He was opposed to the application.

Jody Ash, resident, said that she feared for the future of the Little Italy neighborhood, and that the new traffic would drastically alter the character of the City. She asked that the Commission reject the application.

Tamar Krantz, resident, pooled with **Mike Putney**, resident, said that she was opposed due to lack of a public land dedication. She felt that it would be a necessary addition given the City Code, and would help offset some of the costs for existing residents. She also voiced concerns about the eligibility of the land to be rezoned.

Jeremy Carlson, resident, said that though he was in favor of the application conceptually, he had concerns about the implementation of it. He suggested that adding new traffic lights at Griffith and Main and at Griffith and Highway 42 would help to alleviate some of the traffic safety concerns. He felt that the application was not yet ready for approval.

Joan Doolittle, resident, said that her main concern was with the Front St cut through and the traffic issues that could stem from this. She felt that more work was needed to address this issue.

Josh Cooperman, resident, said that he was supportive of aspects of the development, such as the affordable units and the walkability. However, he wondered why the application had not first gone to a concept plan review, and also noted his concerns about the Front Street connection. He also suggested that there were natural features in the area that should have factored into the rezoning review.

Cindy Bodell, resident, said that she was opposed to the application due to its potential traffic impacts. She asked that the Commission include a condition to require a larger public land dedication, and also noted her concerns about the proposed design of the buildings.

Wendy Appel, resident, said that she was concerned about the impact that the other developments in the area would have on traffic when combined with this application. She was also concerned about worsening air quality and increasing noise pollution.

Cynthia Corn, resident, felt that the developer had not properly consulted with the local community. She urged the Commission to reject the application.

Kyle Cantrel, resident, had concerns about the ability for emergency services to adequately respond to emergencies in the neighborhood with the projected traffic volumes.

Jason Farren, resident, felt that the development was not a good fit for the area or for Louisville more broadly.

Rita Zamora, resident, had concerns about traffic safety in the neighborhood. She noted that a nearby crosswalk sign had been run over repeatedly, and she feared that the development would only make it worse.

Applicant Closing Statement:
Jason Markell addressed the concerns raised about the Front Street connection. He noted that they had conducted extensive consultation around this issue since the previous meeting. They felt that the connection would be advantageous, and that Front Street had the capacity to support the additional traffic volumes. However, he added that the development could still work if the Commission decided to remove the connection, and asked the Commission for guidance as to their preference.

Commissioner Questions of the Applicant:
Baskett asked about the alternative options to the Front Street connection.
Markell suggested that one option was for a through street that would only allow access for emergency vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.
Baskett asked if the applicant would be responsible for designing the street.
Zuccaro said that they would be working with the applicant on the street design, and that the applicant would be responsible for building the street. He noted that staff had concerns about not including a street connection, and that further analysis would be required for this.
Hunt asked why staff felt that a through road was important.
Zuccaro said that it related to the mixed use development design standards, and went in depth about what the guidelines specified, particularly related to the importance of a grid street network to disperse traffic and provide transportation mobility options.

Kari McDowell Schroeder, non-resident, conducted the applicant's traffic study. She said that the restricted connection option was viable. She explained the findings of the study, and noted that Griffith Street was covered in the most recent study.
Moline asked whether there was a point at which a grid street network becomes small enough that it is no longer useful.
Schroeder said yes, as eventually the intersections could become too frequent such that they would begin to impede the flow of traffic. It also depended on pedestrian walkshed.
Moline asked whether the constricted access to this site could become problematic for a gridded street network.
Schroeder said that the site would effectively act as one block due to the surrounding constraints like Highway 42 and the BNSF tracks.
Bangs asked if they had enough info from past traffic studies to extrapolate the traffic produced by eliminating the Front Street connection.
Schroeder said that she did not know.
Bangs asked to confirm that the applicant would require a new traffic study to examine this option
Schroeder said yes.
Hunt asked whether bollards could be used for to allow for emergency vehicle and bike only access.
Schroeder said yes, and noted that there was the possibility of using retractable bollards.
Baskett asked if staff had given thought to possible street design regarding traffic calming.
Fowlkes noted that the City had implemented traffic calming devices like speed humps that could also be implemented on Front Street. He added that the City was planning upgrades to the Highway 42 corridor that would aid in increasing vehicle capacity in the area around the development.

There was an extended discussion about how traffic from the development could impact Highway 42, and how the Front Street connection would play into this. There was also further discussion about the scope of the traffic study, what kinds of trips were covered, and what future traffic movements and access points could look like, particularly with regard to left turns from Front Street onto South Boulder Road.

Zuccaro suggested that the Commission continue the item as it appeared they were interested in seeing an updated traffic study before voting on the proposal.
Moline said that he felt this was a really important issue, and that it would be incumbent on the Commission to review this study before they voted.
Moline asked about the applicant's plans for vegetation, and whether they planned to retain any of the existing trees. He also asked for the applicant's views on the open space dedication.

Markell said that they had consulted with an arborist to do a tree study of the site, and they had identified which trees were to be preserved. Many of the trees were invasive species. He added that the open space dedication was the subject of discussion with staff.
Zuccaro said that the City typically did not seek a public land dedication for areas that had already been subdivided.
Choi asked about the applicant's approach to the topography of the site, and how they planned to handle a storm water event.
Joel Seamons, non-resident, was the applicant's civil engineer. He said that water was intended to flow into a detention pond in the southeast corner of the site, and said that it was designed to handle a 100 year historic flood.
Choi asked what additional measures would be necessary to withstand a 100 year flood given the amount of impermeable surface.
Seamons said that he was not exactly sure, but noted that many detention ponds were not filled during the 2013 100 year flood.
Hunt asked about the market research the applicant had conducted for the very small units.
Markell said that they believed there was demand for non-deed restricted units like these, which would be more affordable due to their size rather than through artificial restrictions.
Hunt asked whether the remaining homes would be marketed as luxury, high-end units, or if they would be targeted at the middle of the market.
Markell said that they were planning to market them as mid-range units.

Staff Closing Statement:
Post provided the staff closing statement. He said that staff would appreciate some further direction about what the Commission wanted to see from a new traffic study, and how they wanted staff to reshape the proposal. He noted that the proposal had gone through a very long period of staff review. He also went into depth about the relevant design guidelines.

Commissioner Discussion:
There was a discussion over the logistics of rehearing the proposal at a later date, and about possible changes to the road network near the site.

Bangs said that though he would like to find a way to approve the application, he thought that the traffic issues needed further study. He added that he would have like to have seen more open space, but he recognized the reasoning used by staff against this.
Choi said that he agreed with staff's reasoning for the rezoning, and felt that development on the site would be of great benefit to the City. However, he felt that the Front Street connection would not be necessary, and that it could be removed from the plan.

Baskett felt that more work was needed with Planning Commission before providing a recommendation to City Council.
Moline said that he wanted to see more information about the impact of removing the Front Street connection.
Hunt said that she appreciated the large volume of public comments, and understood the complexity of the traffic situation. She was supportive of continuing the item so that the issue could be studied further.
Brauneis agreed that the issue of the connection was very complicated, and thought that additional time was warranted.
Zuccaro suggested that the Commission continue the item to the December 2024 meeting.

Motion to continue the item to the December 12, 2024 meeting was moved by **Choi** and seconded by **Moline**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None were heard.

STAFF COMMENTS

None were heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Moline**, seconded by Baskett, and adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 9:43pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

December 12, 2024
Virtual Meeting
6:30 PM

Call to Order – Chair **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
	Debra Baskett, Secretary
	David Bangs
	Cullen Choi
	Jennifer Hunt
	Jonathan Mihaly
Staff Members Present:	Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager
	Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

a. Preliminary PUD, Preliminary Plat, Land Use Exhibit Amendment, Rezoning, and Special Review Use - 1032, 1034, and 1040 E South Boulder Road: Consideration of Resolution 10, Series 2024, regarding a recommendation to City Council for a mixed use project with 188 residential units and 13,534 square feet of commercial space. ***REQUEST TO TABLE INDEFINITELY***.

Hirt explained why staff was recommending the Commission table the item indefinitely. He noted that the item would need to be re-noticed before it came back before the Commission.

Motion to table the item indefinitely was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Brauneis gave thanks to staff and his fellow Commissioners for their work over the past year, and to the public for their input and participation.
Moline echoed this sentiment.

STAFF COMMENTS

Hirt provided an update on the cases expected for the Commission in 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Mihaly**, seconded by **Moline**, and adopted by voice vote.

The Commission adjourned at 6:36pm.