City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
June 12, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

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

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

Commission Members Present:	Debra Baskett, Vice Chair David Bangs Jennifer Hunt Jonathan Mihaly
Commission Members Absent:	Steve Brauneis, Chair Cullen Choi, Secretary Jeff Moline
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 **Mihaly**, and adopted by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
Michael Reis, resident, wanted to encourage extra meetings for the Commission to accommodate an expedited process for some affordable housing projects. He said that this would enable them to apply for state grant funding.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

a. **Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment** – Resolution 9, Series 2025 recommending to the City Council approval of a PUD amendment for solar canopies and other exterior building changes on a commercial building in the Colorado Tech Center (CTC) at 600 Tech Court.

Staff Presentation:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the PUD amendment. She said that the proposal was for a solar canopy and signage changes. She covered the background of the site and its current use. She noted the proposed waivers for the yard and bulk standards and for the sign code, and that staff found that these waiver requests were reasonable.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 9, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Bangs asked about the height of the existing storage tanks.
Cline-Gibson said that they were approximately 35ft tall.
Bangs asked to confirm that waivers were required for the 45ft tanks.
Cline-Gibson confirmed this.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
None were heard.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Hunt said she had no issues with the application and was in support.
Mihaly said that he was supportive of both the shade and added solar. He added that his concerns about the tanks had been resolved, leading him to support the application.
Bangs said that he was in support.
Baskett said that she was well-informed by the packet, and was in support. She also noted the importance of landscaping in the CTC.

Motion to approve Resolution 9, Series 2025 was moved by **Mihaly** and seconded by **Bangs**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 4 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None were heard.

STAFF COMMENTS

Hirt provided an update on the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that a public review draft was planned for later in the summer.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Hunt**, seconded by **Bangs**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 6:54 pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
May 8, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
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 Cullen Choi, Secretary David Bangs Jennifer Hunt Jonathan Mihaly Jeff Moline
Commission Members Absent:	Debra Baskett, Vice Chair
Staff Members Present:	Rob Zuccaro, Director of Community Development Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager Matt Post, Senior Planner Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II 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. **General Development Plan (GDP) Yard and Bulk Requirements Code Amendment** – Resolution 6, Series 2025 recommending to the City Council approval of an ordinance amending Louisville Municipal Code Section 17.72.190 regarding Yard and Bulk Requirements for General Development Plans.

Staff Presentation:
Zuccaro introduced the presentation on proposed changes to the yard and bulk requirements in GDPs. He noted that it was proposed by a property owner, but that it would still apply to the whole city. He explained that the change was intended to provide clarity when amending or approving a General Development Plan.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 6, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Hunt asked to clarify the implications of the change. She asked whether this simply allowed applicants to define changes to the standards at the GDP stage rather than requiring waivers at the PUD stage.
Zuccaro said that the change provided additional flexibility, and would make it so that changes to the standards could be made at either the GDP stage or as waivers to the PUD stage as was currently the case.
Hunt asked whether staff would still work with applicants to determine appropriate zoning for the development.
Zuccaro said yes, applicants would still be required to work with staff if the proposed yard and bulk standards were significantly different from the normal standards, and to explain why this would be necessary.
Hunt asked whether the changes would give developers more certainty over their final designs.
Zuccaro said that this change would give developers more assurance that they would be able to proceed with their desired designs.
Hunt asked whether staff would still look at the other uses to set the yard and bulk requirements if the applicant opted not to do it during the GDP process.
Zuccaro said yes, and that they left this language in the ordinance as there were some GDPs that did not have yard and bulk standards.
Bangs asked whether developers would need to seek waivers from the yard and bulk requirements if the Commission did not approve the proposed code amendment.
Zuccaro said yes.
Bangs asked to clarify what comparable zone districts meant.
Zuccaro said that it was generally up to staff to determine which zoning type the proposed development would be most comparable to, though there was a general lack of clarity around this.

Zuccaro added that the proposals from applicants also had to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or another adopted policy of the City, and consistent with the desired character of the district.

Bangs asked why the change was necessary given the current waiver process seemed to work.

Zuccaro said that it was not always possible to guide applicants on what would be appropriate and passable waivers, making the process more complicated than it needed to be.

Bangs asked whether the code amendment would make it harder for the Commission to object to changes to the yard and bulk standards.

Zuccaro said that it would provide more predictability for the Commission and City Council.

Hunt asked whether the Planning Commission would still get a say on changes to the yard and bulk standards in the GDP process.

Zuccaro said that the Commission would still get a say on this when they consider a GDP or GDP amendment. He added that staff would analyze all proposals and provide recommendations to Commissioners.

Bangs asked how much definition of the standards would be in the Comprehensive Plan.

Zuccaro said that the Plan would not include any specific details.

Bangs asked about the downsides and risks of the proposal.

Zuccaro said that the main downside would be making a decision on the yard and bulk standards without seeing the final design, and that Commissioners would not have as specific information.

Brauneis noted that applicants could still apply for waivers beyond what would be approved in the GDP.

Choi asked to clarify whether the amendment would only apply to areas of 30 acres or larger that had a single owner.

Zuccaro said yes, and noted that it would only apply to properties zoned PCZD.

Choi asked how many of these properties existed in the city.

Zuccaro said he believed there were no more than 6.

Choi asked whether the property could then be sub-divided and sold off.

Zuccaro said that the 30 acre requirement only applied at the time of the establishment of the original GDP, and that future property owners could amend the GDP for their individual parcels.

Choi asked about the language regarding potential legal challenges in the amendment.

Zuccaro said that changes to the yard and bulk standards during the GDP process could be subject to legal action relating to their general conformance with the code.

Moline asked when a GDP was required.

Zuccaro said that a GDP was required when an applicant requested the PCZD zone district. He added that this was likely to mainly apply to GDP amendments given the limited scope for the creation of new PCZD zoned areas.

Brauneis asked when the last time an outside party requested a code amendment was.
Zuccaro said that it was pretty rare, and that he did not recall any in the last decade.

Applicant Presentation:
Mark Smith, resident, representing Advent Health Avista, noted that Advent Health had purchased a 40 acre site in the Redtail Ridge area, and were planning its future development. He said that they were in favor of the change as it would provide greater predictability and certainty in their planning and design process.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
Brauneis asked about the applicant's reasoning for their proposed major code change.
Smith said that they felt that the change would give them the clarity needed to make the project viable.
Bangs asked about how this would improve their design process over the existing PUD waiver process.
Valerie Wilkins, non-resident, of the development team, said that they can get through more comprehensive design planning earlier, and that they hope to simplify and speed up this process.
Bangs asked whether the yard and bulk requirements were clear for this development.
Zuccaro said that they were not clear on the GDP, particularly with regards to desired heights.
Bangs asked how long it would be before the applicant came before the Commission with their proposed designs.
Zuccaro said that they were currently discussing this with the applicant.
Wilkins said that they were going through the concept design, and intended to have a PUD ready by the end of the year.

Public Comment:
Tamar Krantz, resident, pooled with **Cindy Bodell**, resident, asked what changes Advent Health from the existing yard and bulk standards. She was concerned that it would just be a means to alter the existing GDP. She also objected to the unusual manner in which this proposal was brought before the Planning Commission.

Applicant Closing Statement:
Wilkins said that they were not planning any changes to setbacks for their future GDP amendment, and that this was just an example brought up in conversation.

Additional Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Mihaly asked how this would affect the GDP amendment process.
Zuccaro said that it would not affect existing GDPs or the GDP amendment process.

Hunt asked to clarify that the references to general conformance would only apply to GDPs that did not specify yard and bulk requirements.
Zuccaro confirmed this.

Commissioner Discussion:
Hunt said that she was in support, and that she liked the idea of providing more certainty to developers.
Moline said that he in support, and that the added clarity would be a benefit to the code and a benefit to the community.
Choi said that he was in support, and thought it would help ease the development process.
Mihaly said that his initial concerns were allayed by the presentations, and that he thought it would help make the city more business friendly. He was in support.
Bangs said that while he did not feel the existing PUD waiver process was broken such that it warranted major changes, he was supportive of the amendment as it would help improve the efficiency of the development process. He was in support.
Brauneis said that he was in support, and said that this would be beneficial for both developers and the city.

Motion to approve Resolution 6, Series 2025, was moved by **Hunt** and seconded by **Moline**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

b. Advent Health PUD Amendment (Signage) - Resolution 7, Series 2025, recommending approval of a request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment to replace existing freestanding signs and add a new wall sign on the hospital campus.

Staff Presentation:
Cline-Gibson introduced the presentation for the PUD amendment. She noted the location of the property, and where the changes to the existing signage were proposed. There had been previous changes to signage in 1997 and 2002 in accordance with periodic hospital rebranding. She also covered proposed waivers for the freestanding and wall signs. Staff found that the application met all of the criteria in the sign code. Staff also found that the requested waivers were appropriate.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 7, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Choi asked whether all of the signs were proposed to be internally illuminated.
Cline-Gibson said yes.

Choi asked whether there would be a change in lumen output from the new signs.
Cline-Gibson said that there would not be any change.
Moline asked about the requirement for architectural base and border in the new code.
Cline-Gibson said that this was a requirement for freestanding signs, but was largely targeted at entrance signs rather than the wayfinding signs proposed here, hence the waiver.
Brauneis wondered about the need and value of the sign facing the golf course and open space.
Cline-Gibson deferred to the applicant, but suggested that it was meant to be viewed from US-36.

Applicant Presentation:
Mark Smith, resident, CEO of Advent Health Avista, spoke to the importance of clear and visible signage for the hospital campus.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
Brauneis asked about the need for the sign facing the golf course.
Smith said that their desire was for the sign to be visible from US-36, as it is otherwise difficult to see the building from the freeway.
Brauneis asked whether the sign adjacent to US-36 would accomplish this.
Smith said that they would prefer to have both.
Hunt asked to confirm that the wall sign would directed towards eastbound US-36 traffic.
Smith said yes.
Moline asked whether there was an existing wall sign.
Brauneis said no.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Applicant Closing Statement:
Smith thanked the Commission for their time.

Staff Closing Statement:
None was heard.

Additional Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Bangs asked whether there was any other illuminated signage in Louisville that faced US-36.
Cline-Gibson said not that she could recall.
Mihaly asked how the wall sign would look if it conformed to the sign code.
Cline-Gibson said that it would be somewhat smaller.

Commissioner Discussion:
Hunt said she thought the requests were reasonable, and was in support.
Bangs agreed.
Moline said he was in support.
Mihaly said that he was supportive, and thought that the waivers were minor enough to be reasonable.
Choi said that he was in support.
Brauneis said that he still had some concerns about the wall sign, but was ultimately in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 7, Series 2025, was moved by **Mihaly** and seconded by **Bangs**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 6 to 0.

c. **Parking Minimums Code Amendment** - Resolution 8, Series 2025 recommending to the City Council approval of an ordinance amending Title 17 of the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC) concerning parking minimums for multifamily and adaptive reuse development to comply with HB24-1304.

Staff Presentation:
Post introduced the presentation for the ordinance. He said that the change was required to bring the City into compliance with a new state law that prohibited minimum parking requirements in some circumstances. He outlined the parts of the city were parking minimums would no longer be permitted, and how the new policy would be implemented.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 8, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Hunt asked whether the City can still apply its EV charging and accessibility requirements if developers choose to provide parking spaces.
Post said yes.
Brauneis asked whether the 228 bus met the definition of frequent transit.
Post said no because it only ran every 60 minutes instead of the 30 minute standard set by the legislation.
Brauneis asked whether a private shuttle that met the requirements could be considered a transit service.
Post said that this was considered by DOLA and could factor into the transit service area.
Bangs asked about the number of units that could be added with a reduced number of parking spaces.

Post said that he would expect the bill to produce greater density, though he noted that the City's density limits still applied.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Staff Closing Statement:
None was heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Hunt said that she was in favor.
Bangs said that he was in favor.
Moline said that he was in support.
Mihaly said that he was in support.
Choi said that he was in support.
Brauneis said that he was in support, and said that he would encourage staff and City Council to consider abolishing parking minimums in other areas of the city.

Motion to approve Resolution 8, Series 2025, was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Bangs**. 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 **Mihaly**, and adopted by voice vote.
The Commission adjourned at 8:35pm.

City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

April 10, 2025
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
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 Debra Baskett, Vice Chair Cullen Choi, Secretary David Bangs Jennifer Hunt Jonathan Mihaly Jeff Moline
Staff Members Present:	Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager Matt Post, Senior Planner Ben Jackson, Planning Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the minutes for the February 13, 2025 meeting was moved by **Mihaly**, seconded by **Bangs**, and adopted by voice vote.

Motion to approve the minutes for the February 27, 2025 meeting was moved by **Choi**, seconded by **Bangs**, and adopted by voice vote, with **Mihaly** and **Brauneis** abstained.

Motion to approve the minutes for the March 13, 2025 meeting was moved by **Bangs**, seconded by **Hunt**, and adopted by voice vote, with **Choi** abstained.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

a. **Planned Unit Development – 517 S Arthur Ave:** Consideration of Resolution 4 to approve a Planned Unit Development Amendment to allow a new industrial/flex building at 517 S Arthur Avenue in the Colorado Technology Center.

Staff Presentation:
Post introduced the presentation for the PUD Amendment. He said that the property was in the Colorado Technology Center (CTC), and was currently a vacant lot zoned for industrial use. He added that this was one of the smallest lots in the CTC. He covered proposed site plan, design, landscaping, and the parking reduction request. He noted that all sites in the CTC required a detention and water quality pond, and that a warehouse was a use by right.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 4, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:
Moline asked about the review process for the parking reduction waiver, and whether staff had considered the potential needs of future occupants of the site beyond the current applicant.
Post said that this was a valid concern, and that it was not part of their review. He said that the review related directly to the proposed design and use of the warehouse, and that any future amendment would require additional examination.
Brauneis noted that on-street parking was prohibited within CTC, but that there had also been a history of overbuilding parking spaces in the area.
Post clarified that this was CTC owners' association agreement, not City policy.
Mihaly asked about the potential for future PUD amendments. He specifically had concerns related to the number of parking spaces.
Post noted that staff would need to carefully review it, and that because office use was a special review use, it would be subject to staff review.
Moline noted that most waivers could be resolved by having a smaller building. He asked how this related to the review process.
Post said that the building size had been reduced over what was initially proposed.
Brauneis asked how the detention ponds would work without the use of turf grass.
Post said that there would be low water seeding grass as opposed to more traditional turf grass.

Applicant Presentation:
None was heard.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
Bangs asked about the size of building that was originally requested.
Kaleb Seal, representing the applicant, said that they had originally planned for around 19,000 square feet, and added that they wanted to maximize balance the between warehouse and office space.
Choi asked whether the proposed area was driven by a particular intended tenant.
Seal said that a specific tenant had not yet been identified, but that the owner had a good idea of the ratio of office space to warehouse space that would be most likely to attract a tenant.
Choi asked about the area thresholds that determined whether the applicant needed to apply for the proposed waivers.
Post said that they discussed ways to address the proposed waivers through a reduction in building size, and that further reductions could have allowed for fewer waivers. He also noted the size constraints of the lot, and that this helped to explain the need for some of the waivers.
Brauneis asked about the number of square feet involved in the reduction of landscaping from 25% to 24%.
Post said that it was a reduction of just under 400 square feet.
Brauneis asked whether there had been any consideration given to dark sky lighting in the parking lot and on the exterior of the building.
Seal said that this was a consideration, and that the exterior lighting would mostly be wall-mounted, limiting upward facing lights.
Bangs asked about the number of EV spaces.
Seal said that there were 4, comprised of 1 EV installed space, 1 EV ready space, 2 EV capable spaces.
Post clarified the number of spaces, and noted that this was in line with the City's EV charging ordinance.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Applicant Closing Statement:
Seal noted they typically developed large commercial buildings. He said that they wanted build something with a purposeful design that was reflective of the area, and that was more progressive for a warehouse. He emphasized their focus on the landscaping.

Staff Closing Statement:
None was heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Choi said that had no issue with the parking waivers, and that they reflected the challenging limitations of the site.
Brauneis agreed, and said that it was a fix for the code's outdated parking standards. He also said that he liked the proposed landscaping.
Mihaly agreed, and said that he did not have an issue with the landscape cover reduction waiver due to the high quality of the proposed landscape cover.
Brauneis said that he was fine with the setbacks.
Choi said that the requirements for landscaping and setbacks seemed fairly arbitrary.

There was a discussion about the trade-offs between the number of parking spaces and amount of landscaping and number of trees.

Baskett said generally comfortable with the proposal, and felt that it fitted the space.
Moline said that he appreciated the discussion, and that he was comfortable with all of the requests.
Bangs said that he appreciated the proposed design, and was in support.
Mihaly spoke about the number of parking spaces, and said that most of his concerns relating to this had been eased by the need for a staff review if the use were to change.
Hunt said that she was in agreement, and thought that it would fit in well with the other uses.

Motion to approve Resolution 4, Series 2025 was moved by **Choi** and seconded by **Mihaly**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

b. **Planned Unit Development – 380 S Taylor Ave:** Consideration of Resolution 5 to approve a Planned Unit Development Amendment to allow new industrial buildings at 380 S Taylor Avenue in the Colorado Technology Center.

Staff Presentation:
Post introduced the presentation for the PUD Amendment. He noted that the proposal was for two new industrial buildings on a vacant lot in the CTC, which was zoned for industrial use. He covered the proposed layout and design of the warehouses. He noted that the applicants were requesting waivers to allow the use of metal as a primary architectural material, and for reduced setbacks and landscaping requirements.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommended approval of Resolution 5, Series 2025 on the condition that the PUD be implemented in a single phase.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Hunt asked to clarify the condition, and whether it would mean that both buildings needed to be completed before a certificate of occupancy could be issued for either building.
Post said yes.
Hunt asked whether this was out of concern that the applicant might not complete the second building.
Post said that staff generally wanted multiple buildings that were not part of a subdivision but were part of the same PUD to be able to be completed in a phased approach. The applicant opted not to use a phased approach, so staff decided that requiring them to build both buildings was the best alternative.
Bangs asked whether it would be possible for one building to be completed with a certificate of occupancy whilst the other was unfinished.
Post said that this would be possible if the other building was only unfinished on the interior.
Hunt asked why the design standards precluded the use of metal cladding.
Post suggested that this could be the result of metal claddings being relatively rare when the standards were drafted in the late 1990s and early 2000s.
Hunt asked whether these materials were aesthetically different now compared to when the standards were drafted.
Brauneis said that they were used differently at that time. He asked whether there was much discussion about this waiver amongst staff.
Post noted that staff had previously supported other metal structures in the area. He showed some images of these other metal buildings.
Mihaly asked whether the proposed design was similar in design to The Spot.
Post said yes.
Hunt asked whether the varied roof heights were intended to break up the buildings aesthetically.
Post said that staff had requested this for greater variation.
Moline asked whether there was still an owners' association for the CTC, and whether the applicant would need to get approval from them for the design.
Post said yes, and noted that staff also refers all CTC projects to the owners' association for review.
Mihaly asked whether the applicant was bound to the two-tone metal application.
Post said that they would be required to have this.
Bangs asked whether there was an applicable FAR requirement.
Post said that there was no requirement in the industrial district.

Applicant Presentation:
Don Russell, non-resident, was representing the applicant. He showed off some full sized samples of the proposed metal sidings. He explained the proposed layout of the site and the design of the buildings.

Dmytri Kalchyk, non-resident, owned the property. He said that he wanted to move his business from Littleton to Louisville. He added that he was planning to occupy the south building for their use and that they wanted to lease out the north building.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:
Choi asked about the durable finishes that could be applied to the metal.
Russell said that they had not decided which one they would use yet, but suggested that they would probably use Kynar.
Bangs asked if the samples reflected the planned colors.
Russell said yes.
Bangs asked if the roof material would be similar.
Russell said that they would be the same material, but would have a different color and pattern.

Public Comment:
None were heard.

Applicant Closing Statement:
Russell said that they had tried to have it fit in with the CTC, and noted that the architectural control committee of the CTC had approved their design.

Staff Closing Statement:
None was heard.

Commissioner Discussion:
Brauneis said that the proposed design was a departure from past designs, but felt that the City was ready for it.
Choi said that he agreed, and added that he appreciated the design and thought the waivers were appropriate. He was in support.
Mihaly agreed, and said that he liked the designs for the metal siding. He was in support.
Baskett said that this was a good use of the site, and that she liked the design and felt that it would fit into the CTC well.
Moline said that he appreciated the design of the building, and that he was in support.
Hunt said she was in agreement, and that she appreciated the architectural effort. She was in support.
Bangs said that he was in support.
Brauneis said that he was in support.

Motion to approve Resolution 5, Series 2025 with the proposed condition was moved by **Hunt** and seconded by **Bangs**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None were heard.

STAFF COMMENTS

None were heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Choi**, seconded by **Hunt**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 8:14pm.