

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

September 25, 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
Jonathan Mihaly
Jeff Moline

Commission Members Absent: Debra Baskett, Vice Chair
Jennifer Hunt

Staff Members Present: Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II
Rob Zuccaro, Community Development
Director

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

- a. **Avista Adventist Hospital GDP, Amendment No. 2** – Resolution 12, Series 2025 presented together with **ConocoPhillips Campus GDP, Amendment No. 1** –

Resolution 12, Series 2025 recommending to the City Council approval of both the Avista Adventist Hospital General Development Plan, Amendment No. 2 and the ConocoPhillips Campus GDP, Amendment No. 1.

Staff Presentation:

Zuccaro introduced the presentation for the GDP Amendments. He presented two linked applications from PorterCare Adventist Health Systems involving amendments to the Avista Adventist Hospital and Redtail Ridge general development plans. The proposal shifts unused development capacity from the existing Avista campus to Redtail Ridge, where a new hospital campus is planned. Specifically, the Avista development cap would be reduced from 750,000 square feet to 398,694 square feet, while the Redtail Ridge cap would be increased to accommodate future construction. The amendments also include establishing building height, massing, and architectural standards for the new hospital campus and dedicating a 7.5-acre parcel on the north side of the current hospital site.

Pause for Commissioner Questions:

Moline asked for clarification to confirm whether the stated number corresponds to the square footage already built.

Zuccaro explained that the number reflects the existing development, which includes the main hospital, Centennial Peaks Hospital, and medical office buildings. He noted that if approved, the applicant could demolish and rebuild under the new maximum cap, but the total development could not exceed that cap.

Bangs pointed out that a table on page four of the staff report shows the existing square footage as slightly different (349,977 sq ft) and noted that the proposed GDP change still results in a higher square footage than what currently exists, suggesting there may be a net change that needs clarification.

Zuccaro noted that there may be a typo in the presentation, but would need to refer to staff report, but that the GDP represents the new cap.

Staff Presentation continues:

Zuccaro explained that the applicant is requesting an additional 364,400 sq. ft. of development capacity within the ConocoPhillips/Red Tail Ridge GDP, limited to their parcel. This would raise the overall cap from 2.5 million to 2.9 million sq. ft., though after swapping capacity with the Avista campus, the net increase is only about 13,000 sq. ft. The intent is to ensure adequate utilities and limit traffic impacts, which were key concerns in earlier approvals.

He outlined zoning and design standards for the hospital parcel: height limits for 3–5 story zones (with the hospital at five stories), step-backs above 45 feet, footprint reductions for taller levels, and rooftop enclosure setbacks. These measures are intended to minimize visual impact and promote architectural variety.

He described a 7.5-acre open space dedication north of the Avista campus, which combined with an earlier dedication, would total 17.5 acres. While the applicant has already satisfied public land requirements, this addition would expand the City's open space. The Open Space Advisory Board recommended approval, though noted the applicant's request that the land remain natural space without trails, with future management discussions suggested.

Pause for Commissioner Questions:

Moline asked if there had been a staff open space recommendation as part of the prior night's discussion.

Zuccaro confirmed that City open space staff had reviewed the proposal, supported incorporating the parcel into open space, and noted the Open Space Advisory Board had already identified it as a high-priority area in 2023.

Brauneis asked what specifically made the property a priority citywide.

Zuccaro explained that the entire parcel was designated high priority because of its value as a buffer contiguous to existing open space and factors like vegetation. He added that this site was one of several (about six to eight) identified across the city in 2023 for potential acquisition.

Staff Presentation continues:

Zuccaro reviewed proposed setback changes for the Avista campus GDP, reducing requirements to 5 feet for parking/drive aisles and 20 feet for buildings, while maintaining large buffers to the Cole Creek neighborhood. Staff supports the change, emphasizing that the campus will still provide significant separation and protection.

He explained that the GDP functions as customized zoning and must meet municipal code standards for coordinated design. Staff found the proposal consistent with these principles, citing clear massing standards, compatibility with nearby Broomfield buildings (4–5 stories), adequate utilities, limited traffic impacts, and expanded buffers/setbacks. The proposal also aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, which allows taller buildings when clustered and buffered, a condition achieved through major open space dedications in both Louisville and Broomfield. He noted Broomfield is finalizing a conservation easement on adjacent land, further strengthening buffers. Historical approvals for the site had

permitted heights up to 95 feet, making the current request consistent with prior expectations.

Zuccaro reported that traffic impacts were analyzed with primary access planned off Rock Crest Drive. Red Tail Ridge is building supporting infrastructure, but additional refinements will occur at the PUD stage, with a development agreement to assign costs to the hospital. On utilities, staff confirmed that existing water and wastewater infrastructure, including the Red Tail Ridge lift station, can handle the additional demand without new facilities.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of both **Avista Adventist Hospital GDP, Amendment No. 2** – Resolution 12, Series 2025 and **ConocoPhillips Campus GDP, Amendment No. 1** –Resolution 12, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Bangs asked whether transportation improvements at the PUD stage would include public transit as well as cars.

Zuccaro clarified that the traffic study focuses on vehicles but Redtail Ridge includes multimodal planning such as trails, sidewalks, and a microtransit shuttle. He added that while there is no RTD service, the City plans to meet with RTD about future options.

Moline raised a concern about the “density swap,” asking how to ensure it couldn’t later be reversed or changed by subsequent amendments.

Zuccaro explained that while this approval would set zoning and caps, future city councils could change them through ordinance or GDP amendment, though that is not the current intent. He noted that utility capacity and planning would also be reassessed if future changes were proposed.

Choi asked whether the Avista open space dedication would be permanent.

Zuccaro confirmed the land would transfer to City ownership, be zoned as open space, and could not be rezoned without a citywide vote.

Brauneis asked about the unusual nature of the “swap,” noting the City lacks a formal transfer of development rights program.

Zuccaro explained this was not a formal TDR program but rather a negotiated approach to address community concerns about traffic and infrastructure.

Bangs confirmed the GDP changes apply only to the 40-acre hospital parcel and asked whether the hospital intends to build to full density immediately.

Zuccaro said the applicant could best address phasing plans.

Bangs also asked if open space trail restrictions could change in the future.

Zuccaro responded that trail access could be reconsidered through future amendments if ownership or use changed.

Choi sought clarification on whether reducing Avista's development cap while dedicating seven acres of open space would increase the development ratio on the remaining parcel.

Zuccaro confirmed the ratio would increase, though Avista's GDP is governed by a square-footage cap rather than a floor area ratio. He said the specific ratio could be calculated.

Moline asked whether there are existing or planned trails in the open space area.

Zuccaro said there are social trails and past golf course access routes, and that trail connections to US 36 were studied in 2018 with several possible alignments, some of which may cross the dedicated acreage.

Brauneis questioned the value of restricting trails in open space and suggested the city might prefer to hold the property unencumbered.

Zuccaro explained that some city open space parcels are designated as "no activity," and while trails would not be planned, public access would not be prohibited. He added it is better to secure the land now and leave room for future discussions.

Mihaly asked whether the amendment would negatively affect traffic planning for Campus Drive, noting the packet suggests it may even improve outcomes.

Zuccaro deferred to the applicant's traffic engineer to address the analysis but acknowledged that the redistribution of density could be the reason for improved traffic projections.

Applicant Presentation:

Mark Smith (CEO, AdventHealth Avista Hospital)

- Introduced AdventHealth, noting it operates 55 hospitals in nine states with over 100,000 employees.
- Explained that AdventHealth recently purchased 40 acres in Redtail Ridge to construct a replacement hospital for Avista, which has served Louisville since 1990.

- Cited the Marshall Fire evacuation challenges and the need for better access, expansion capacity, and modern facilities as reasons for relocation.
- Emphasized that the GDP approval is an early step, with a detailed PUD submission to come in November, covering site access, plans, and compliance with city requirements.
- Thanked staff for collaboration and framed the project as necessary to meet the community's evolving health needs.

Valerie Wilkins (Adams Management, Program Manager & Owner's Rep)

- Introduced her role managing the Avista campus project on behalf of AdventHealth.

Afsaneh Makooi

(Smith Group, Design Team Project Manager)

- Explained rationale for five-story hospital height, noting operational efficiency, patient adjacencies, and wayfinding visibility.
- Outlined design standards: step-backs above 45 feet (15 ft), limitations on upper-story square footage (50% of base footprint), architectural roof screening, and additional step-backs above 95 feet.
- Provided examples of comparable five-story hospitals in Colorado (Good Samaritan, UC Highlands Ranch, St. Anthony North, UC Health Medical Center of the Rockies).
- Noted hospitals require greater floor-to-floor heights due to structural, medical gas, ventilation, and infection-prevention systems.
- Highlighted contextual fit: across Northwest Parkway are existing four- and five-story multifamily and office buildings.

Wilkins (on Phasing & Trails)

- Shared that Phase 1 will include the hospital and one medical office building.
- Future phases may add a second office building and a bed tower expansion.
- Addressed trail concerns: AdventHealth opposes trail development on the parcel while it functions as a secure medical campus (safety, liability, parking impacts).
- Stated willingness to revisit trail discussions if land use changes in the future.

Curtis Rowe (Kimley-Horn, Traffic Engineer)

- Addressed traffic concerns, specifically Campus Drive.
- Confirmed that the planned roadway network, including Campus Drive, will adequately accommodate hospital and Redtail Ridge traffic at full buildout.

- Concluded that no additional roadway improvements are required to support the hospital project.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Bangs asked if the traffic study assumed use of the proposed micro-shuttle service or was based solely on personal vehicles.

Rowe explained that the study used national Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standards, which are vehicle-centric and provide a conservative baseline. He noted that Colorado's strong multimodal options would likely reduce actual vehicle trips compared to the national averages.

Bangs followed up on whether bikeways and pathways were factored in. **Rowe** confirmed they were not directly factored in, but they would reduce traffic if used, meaning the study was intentionally conservative.

Choi asked whether the traffic projections included the entire Redtail Ridge buildout as well as full development of the Avista parcel.

Rowe confirmed that the analysis accounted for both: full Redtail Ridge and the hospital parcel at maximum buildout, including office buildings and the bed tower expansion.

Choi asked about the actual heights of adjacent Broomfield residential buildings shown in the applicant's contextual slides.

Makooi explained that five-story residential buildings are about 60 feet tall plus 10–12 feet of rooftop mechanical screening, for a total of roughly 70 feet. In comparison, the hospital would be up to 105 feet with its mechanical penthouse.

Choi questioned whether the additional 350,000 square feet in the development cap was driven by programmatic needs or simply maximizing allowable space.

Wilkins said it was based on master planning to meet projected community healthcare needs, particularly bed capacity and medical office space, not just maximizing square footage.

Choi asked about the difference in bed count between the current Avista and the proposed hospital.

Wilkins explained the current Avista has 90 beds, while the proposed design in schematic planning is 373,000 square feet with 150 beds, close to the existing development cap.

Public Comment:

Cindy Bedell (Louisville resident) asked for clarification about Centennial Peaks Hospital, noting she thought she heard it was a separate entity from AdventHealth. She wanted to know whether Centennial Peaks would remain in its current location or be affected by the proposed changes.

Smith (AdventHealth CEO) responded to public comment, confirming that Centennial Peaks Hospital operates under a long-term land lease exceeding 50 years and will not be affected by the new hospital plans.

Brauneis asked how the applicant would feel about a condition requiring reconsideration of trails on the donated open space.

Smith said AdventHealth is open to continuing conversations, though they remain cautious about trails in close proximity to medical facilities.

Moline asked about future plans for the current Avista campus once the hospital relocates.

Smith said the future use is still under evaluation, with no final decisions, though inpatient services would move to Redtail Ridge.

Bangs asked what assumptions were made in the traffic study regarding the existing Avista site once operations move.

Rowe (Traffic Engineer) explained the study assumed continued medical use at the site; if it became another use, such as high-density residential, traffic impacts would differ.

Zuccaro provided the floor area ratio (FAR) calculation after the open space dedication. With the cap of 398,894 square feet, the FAR is approximately 14%, and with the open space dedication, it increases slightly to 16%.

Commissioner Discussion:

Moline supported the proposal, praising staff and the applicant for balancing hospital retention, open space dedication, and traffic/utility concerns, and found the massing and height standards thoughtful.

Mihaly agreed, noting his height concerns were eased by design standards and the site's low location; he supported the redistribution of development capacity and highlighted the long-term benefit of added open space.

Bangs concurred, cautioning against confusion around the "land swap" terminology, urging diligence in monitoring the future of the Avista campus, and emphasizing multimodal access.

Choi voiced support, acknowledging initial concerns about the Avista parcel's development ratio but accepting staff's FAR calculations; he praised the applicant's efficient, vertical design approach.

Brauneis also supported the project, recognizing its visibility but valuing the placement of taller buildings at the low point, the step-backs, and the balance of traffic, utilities, and open space; he suggested further discussion on trail access.

The commission agreed not to impose a binding trail condition but to echo the Open Space Advisory Board's recommendation for continued talks with the applicant. **Choi** moved, with **Brauneis** seconding, to forward this recommendation to City Council, and the motion passed unanimously.

Motion to approve **Avista Adventist Hospital GDP, Amendment No. 2** – Resolution 12, Series 2025 was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Brauneis**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 4 to 0.

Motion to approve **ConocoPhillips Campus GDP, Amendment No. 1** –Resolution 12, Series 2025 was moved by **Choi** and seconded by **Brauneis**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 4 to 0.

- b. **811 Walnut Rezoning** – Resolution 14, Series 2025 recommending to the City Council approval of a rezoning from Residential Medium (R-M) to Community Commercial (C-C) for 811 Walnut.

Staff Presentation:

Emily Cline-Gibson presented Resolution 14, Series 2025, a request to rezone 811 Walnut Street from Residential Medium Density (RM) to Commercial Community (CC). The property, originally platted in 1880 and built out in 1954 for telephone operations, has housed various commercial uses but today only retains a valid professional office SRU, with other past approvals expired. Rezoning would align the site with its long-standing commercial function, extend the adjacent CC district, and allow 23 new uses (10 by right, 13 by SRU with public hearings). No exterior changes are proposed, and future redevelopment would require a PUD. Staff recommended a follow-up text amendment to bring the property into the Downtown Design Handbook area. Concluding that the request meets rezoning criterion #2 (area change in the public interest), staff found the property's small scale limits redevelopment, the rezoning would reasonably extend downtown, and the proposal supports the 2013 Comprehensive Plan goals of revitalization, job creation, and local revenue growth.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of **811 Walnut Rezoning** – Resolution 14, Series 2025.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Choi asked whether staff had verified if the property at 811 Walnut Street was outside the required distance buffer for natural medicine healing centers, which were recently added as a permitted use.

Cline-Gibson responded that staff had not specifically verified that distance for this site but confirmed that if an application for such a use were submitted, staff would conduct the verification at that time. (see verification below that property would not currently be eligible for such a use with the buffer requirements from certain land uses).

Applicant Presentation:

JD Green, property owner of 811 Walnut Street, requested rezoning from Residential Medium Density (RM) to Commercial Community (CC). He explained that the change would align zoning with the building's long-standing commercial use and support small, locally owned retail consistent with Old Town Louisville's walkable character.

George Colbert, co-owner of Colbert Hat Co., presented his family-owned custom hat business specializing in cowboy hats, fedoras, and trucker hats with personalized fittings and styling. He described the shop as a low-impact, appointment-driven model (about 80% by appointment) that generates limited traffic while attracting destination customers who spend time and money in downtown. Colbert emphasized the company's community engagement through successful pop-ups, local sponsorships, and event partnerships, noting the business would complement existing retailers, contribute to local jobs and tax revenue, and that 811 Walnut Street's size, layout, and parking make it an ideal first storefront, with the potential to open by the holiday season.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Moline asked if the applicant anticipated any exterior changes to the building.

Colbert replied that only minimal changes were considered, such as small signage or window frosting. Any formal signage proposal would be brought back for approval.

Bangs asked whether the business would use outdoor space.

Colbert said no, apart from possibly placing chairs outside for waiting customers. He added that the business had just launched a website, so there might be limited product shipping, though mostly localized.

Green noted the building already accommodates UPS deliveries through the back door, similar to its current use.

Brauneis asked about ADA access, noise impacts, and overlay requirements. **Zuccaro** clarified there was ADA access at the back and occasional outdoor seating would not trigger a Special Review Use (SRU) so long as it wasn't tied to sales or displays. Noise would be governed by the city's "unreasonable noise" standard.

Cline-Gibson explained that while the property is currently outside downtown Louisville's defined overlay, staff recommends initiating a text amendment to include it, ensuring consistency with downtown design standards. **Zuccaro** added that the property would fall within the "transition area," requiring architectural standards to ensure compatibility with adjacent residential uses. **Green** voiced support, noting he owns another Main Street property already subject to such standards.

Choi asked whether including the site in the downtown overlay would be a condition of approval.

Zuccaro said staff did not propose it as a condition but intends to pursue the amendment with the property owner's support.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Choi said the decision was straightforward, noting the property has been non-conforming for 75 years. He supported rezoning to bring it "into the fold" and appreciated staff's plan to adjust the downtown overlay language to ensure integration with design standards if exterior modifications occur.

Mihaly agreed with **Choi** and voiced support for the small business but raised concern about natural medicine healing centers being allowed adjacent to a residential neighborhood. After **Cline-Gibson** clarified that the property lies within a 1,000-foot buffer and therefore such a use would not be permitted, **Mihaly** said that addressed his concern and he was supportive.

Bangs expressed general support, seeing the rezoning as consistent with decades of prior commercial use and hoping it will be a success.

Moline also supported the rezoning.

Brauneis closed by stating he too supported the request for the reasons cited by his fellow commissioners.

Motion to approve **811 Walnut Rezoning** – Resolution 14, Series 2025 was moved by **Moline**, seconded by **Choi**, and adopted by a vote of 4 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Choi and **Mihaly** both noted they will be absent for the October 9th meeting.

Choi inquired about a second October meeting besides the October 9th meeting. **Hirt** responded no.

Choi asked if there exists standard language around when there is a conflict. **Brauneis** responded that he could work with staff on that.

STAFF COMMENTS

None were heard.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The Commission adjourned at 8:46 PM.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**October 9, 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
David Bangs
Jennifer Hunt
Jeff Moline

Commission Members Absent: Cullen Choi, Secretary
Jonathan Mihaly

Staff Members Present: Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II
Rob Zuccaro, Community Development
Director
Matt Post, Senior Planner
Cameron Fowlkes, City Engineer, Public
Works

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None were heard.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – NEW BUSINESS

- a. Coal Creek Village Mixed Use Development** – Resolution 15, Series 2025 with a recommendation to City Council for a rezoning, subdivision, and Planned Unit Development (PUD) request for the 10.7-acre vacant property located near the southwest corner of South Boulder Road and Highway 42.

Staff Presentation:

Post introduced the presentation for the **Coal Creek Village Mixed Use Development** – Resolution 15, Series 2025. The plan would rezone the site from CCMU and RM to MUR, enabling 188 housing units and 13,500 square feet of commercial space within five blocks of townhomes, mixed-use, and multifamily buildings. A revised traffic study—requested after 2024 hearings—found that the planned Front Street connection is essential to reduce unsafe U-turns and maintain circulation, projecting 1,839 daily trips. Staff supports six design waivers to allow compact, walkable development and confirms the project aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, Highway 42 Revitalization Plan, and Housing Plan. Twelve percent of units will be affordable, and the design includes 316 parking spaces, sidewalks, open space, and public right-of-way dedication. City Engineer **Fowlkes** emphasized that the Front Street connection is recommended for safety, emergency access, and balanced traffic distribution, concluding that the proposal meets transportation and policy goals.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of **Coal Creek Village Mixed Use Development** – Resolution 15, Series 2025.

Applicant Presentation:

Applicant representative Sam **Coutts** of Ripley Design presented updates to the Coal Creek Village proposal on behalf of Markel Homes, emphasizing refinements made since 2024 to enhance connectivity, aesthetics, and neighborhood livability. The updated site plan includes two parks, a central plaza between mixed-use buildings, drought-tolerant landscaping, and cohesive architecture across housing types. Coutts highlighted a revised 2025 traffic study that analyzed “with” and “without” Front Street connection scenarios, confirming the connection improves safety, circulation, and pedestrian conditions while keeping traffic under 1,000 vehicles per day. In response to neighborhood feedback, the applicant introduced a compromise design: a raised, shared-use crossing that maintains emergency access but discourages cut-through traffic. The plan also includes off-site improvements such as turn-lane extensions and enhanced crosswalks. Overall, **Coutts** said the project supports the city’s Housing Plan by providing diverse, attainable housing and advancing walkable mixed-use redevelopment along the Highway 42 corridor.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Moline confirmed that staff would still recommend the Front Street connection even without rezoning.

Fowlkes affirmed and explained the connection is needed under existing zoning for safety and circulation.

Moline asked about timing for the Future 42 corridor improvements.

Fowlkes said Future 42 is unfunded, in long-range planning, and likely five to twenty years away.

Bangs asked if the SRU for ground-floor residential would increase apartment count.

Post said no, the SRU only changes layout, not total units.

Moline requested clarification on the alleyway behind Little Italy.

Post explained staff will ask the applicant to improve the alley and coordinate with property owners.

Moline confirmed the alley is outside the application area.

Post affirmed and clarified it is within city right-of-way south of the site and notes the applicant hasn't yet been informed about the alley-improvement request.

Bangs asked whether the alley is accessed from the east.

Fowlkes replied it is accessed from the west via Highway 42, with no connection to Front Street.

Bangs raised drainage concerns voiced by the public.

Fowlkes explained drainage flows to the detention pond and across Highway 42, not toward Little Italy.

Moline clarified a drainageway crosses the site and under Highway 42.

Fowlkes confirmed and noted overflow from the Goodhue Ditch goes the same way.

Brauneis asked why roads aren't wider and about level-of-service standards.

Fowlkes said intersection limits, not site design, cause failures and Future 42 will address them.

Brauneis confirmed Future 42 will have two lanes each direction and multimodal upgrades.

Fowlkes confirmed.

Applicant Presentation:

Applicant Sam **Coutts** of Ripley Design presented updates to the Coal Creek Village plan for Markel Homes, highlighting refinements made with staff and neighbors to improve connectivity, design, and livability. He described two parks, a pedestrian plaza, drought-tolerant landscaping, and cohesive architecture across housing types. Coutts reviewed the updated 2025 traffic study, which found the Front Street connection improves safety and circulation while staying below 1,000 daily vehicles. To address resident concerns, the team proposed a raised, shared-use crossing that allows local and emergency access but discourages cut-through traffic, emphasizing the project's alignment with city housing and walkability goals.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Moline asked where diverted traffic would go if drivers avoided the raised crossing.

Coutts responded that most westbound drivers would continue east to Highway 42 before turning north or using a right-then-right route, while residents would still use the raised connection.

Moline asked whether the raised section would be public or private.

Coutts explained it would be a private drive with a public-access and emergency-access easement.

Bangs asked if flashing pedestrian beacons were still planned.

McDowell-Schrader replied that beacons were considered but not warranted, and staff preferred raised crossings, bump-outs, and signage.

Fowlkes confirmed that RRFBs would not be installed unless warranted and said the crosswalk would be raised and signed.

Hunt asked whether the raised design would slow traffic and deter navigation apps from routing drivers through.

Coutts agreed and said terminating and renaming the street would prevent mapping apps from identifying it as a through route, reducing cut-through traffic.

Public Comment:

David Finamore opposed the Front Street connection, saying traffic already cuts through his neighborhood and additional volume would endanger children walking to Coal Creek Elementary. He urged the Commission to find another solution or keep the road closed.

Juliana Massaro (Attorney for Snarf Sandwiches) spoke on behalf of Snarf's Sandwiches, which operates nearby, expressing concern about access changes, potential congestion, and how construction or rerouting could impact local business operations and deliveries.

Annabelle Maas opposed the street connection and said neighborhood safety and quality of life would be reduced by increased cut-through traffic. She stressed that once opened, the road could not easily be closed again.

Andy Maas echoed concerns about the Front Street link and argued that the area's infrastructure could not safely accommodate additional traffic. He urged the City to block the connection or limit it to emergency access only.

Conrad Zemen said the project was too dense and out of scale with surrounding homes. He cited worries about noise, drainage, and light pollution, asking for lower building heights and reduced unit counts.

Robert Kulicowski said parking overflow was already an issue nearby and would worsen with the new development. He requested stricter parking requirements and on-street management to protect residents.

Linda Cateora urged the Commission to consider wildlife and environmental impacts, emphasizing that bright lighting along Coal Creek would disturb owls and foxes that live in the corridor.

Anita Menendez said the developer had responded to some neighborhood feedback but the project remained too tall and dense, especially next to smaller homes. She requested upper-story step-backs or height reductions along the residential edge.

Mark Zemen spoke against the project's height and massing, saying five-story buildings were incompatible with nearby one- and two-story homes. He urged the developer to step upper floors back or reduce building height near the neighborhood edge.

Rita Zamora raised concerns about parking overflow during community events and requested that the city require on-site guest parking or residential parking permits to protect nearby streets from congestion.

Jody Ash discussed the impact of bright parking-lot lighting on local wildlife and supported requiring full cutoff, dark-sky-compliant fixtures to preserve the natural character of the Coal Creek corridor.

Colby said the project looked nice but argued that narrower sidewalks and higher traffic would reduce pedestrian safety, worsen congestion, and threaten neighborhood pets and wildlife.

Caitlin Sagrillo described existing speeding issues on Front Street and urged the city to install traffic-calming features—like speed humps and raised crossings—before construction begins, not after problems arise.

Mark G. warned that drivers from Broomfield would cut through the Del apartment lot and narrow private alleys to reach the new development, creating safety and congestion issues for residents.

Jean Morgan urged the city to pause approval until a comprehensive traffic-management plan is completed, saying individual projects like this one contribute cumulatively to worsening congestion.

Cindy Bedell said the project would push cut-through traffic onto neighborhood streets, creating safety hazards and parking conflicts, and asked the Commission to reconsider the street connection.

Andre Armijo focused on drainage, noting that stormwater already pools near Canon Circle and asking the city to guarantee proper detention-pond maintenance and protection for nearby yards.

Michael McClure said repeated neighborhood input had led to few visible changes and urged commissioners to take residents' safety and traffic concerns more seriously in their decision.

Jet Sandoval (pooled time with Joyce Goglio) reminded the Commission of Louisville's small-town character, warning that large, high-density projects erode that identity and requesting that Coal Creek Village be scaled back or denied.

Sonam Pejuhesh, a Canon Street resident and child therapist, warned that the Front Street connection would endanger children and disrupt Little Italy's quiet, family-oriented character, urging growth that prioritizes neighborhood safety.

Laurel Danuff (pooled time with Jack Sagrillo) supported adding housing but said 12 percent affordability was inadequate if rezoning increases density; she urged a higher on-site affordable-unit percentage.

Lauren Foster (pooled time with Daniel Alejandro) raised safety concerns at the Canon Circle intersection, said turning left onto South Boulder Road is already difficult, and warned that added traffic would make it unsafe without a signal or protected turn.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Bangs asked about Snarf's Sandwiches' concern over business access.

Markel said they worked with Snarf's and city staff to shift the curb cut at Canon to preserve full turning access, which would be added as a project condition.

Brauneis asked about staff's proposed conditions.

Markel said the project aimed for a “win-win-win” outcome by redesigning the Front Street connection as a private drive that breaks up the right-of-way to deter cut-through traffic. He explained that two-thirds of prior traffic counts were from cut-through drivers, which the new design would largely eliminate, reducing projected volumes. Further stated that landscaping, curves, and a less direct route would further discourage both navigation apps and habitual cut-through drivers.

Moline asked about the northwest property owner surrounded by the project.

Markel said they'd worked with that owner for several years, offering access, parking spaces, landscaping, and sidewalk connections but felt repeated requests had become unreasonable despite their efforts to accommodate him.

Brauneis asked why Markel Homes didn't pursue a single-family neighborhood similar to North End.

Markel said city plans require higher density and that the project intentionally includes diverse housing—micro homes, townhomes, multifamily, and affordable units—to address regional housing affordability gaps. He said smaller units naturally improve attainability and align with city housing goals.

Bangs asked whether the traffic study distinguished resident versus cut-through traffic.

Markel confirmed it did, explaining that charts in the report identified internal (residential and retail) traffic separately from external cut-through traffic, which accounted for roughly 60 percent of existing volumes and would be reduced by the private drive design.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Brauneis asked staff to respond to the applicant's statement that the city's housing and comprehensive plans reflect an active city push for higher density and diverse housing types.

Post explained that multiple adopted plans—the Housing Plan, Comprehensive Plan, South Boulder Road Small Area Plan, Highway 42 Revitalization Plan, Mixed-Use Overlay, and Mixed-Use Design Standards—all call for added density and connectivity in this corridor. Affirmed the applicant's interpretation was accurate and that staff administers policies adopted by prior councils and commissions that intentionally support such density and connections in this location.

Brauneis confirmed that the Front Street connection comes down to the u-turns.

Post added that the Front Street connection addresses safety issues like dangerous U-turns on South Boulder Road and that the city's policy framework consistently promotes connected street networks in mixed-use districts.

Bangs asked whether the Front Street link could be limited to emergency access only, rather than open to general traffic.

Post responded that emergency-only access would conflict with adopted city policies favoring full vehicular and multimodal connectivity; said that approach might fit denser, transit-heavy urban areas but not Louisville's current context.

Zuccaro emphasized that limiting the connection would worsen safety by forcing westbound drivers to make hazardous u-turns and reiterated that the connection supports both policy goals and practical circulation needs. Noted that these policies also advance transit-oriented development near the future commuter rail station planned for 2029, aligning with regional transit goals.

Bangs reflected that the Commission must weigh adopted policies against on-the-ground neighborhood realities and deferred further discussion to deliberation.

Zuccaro Clarified that the Planning Commission is free to disagree with staff's recommendation; staff's duty is to implement adopted policies while seeking balance between growth goals and neighborhood concerns.

Hunt asked if there were active plans to improve the Highway 42 and South Boulder Road intersection alongside the transit-oriented redevelopment.

Zuccaro confirmed the city and CDOT have adopted the Highway 42 Vision Plan and begun design work for intersection and capacity upgrades, though construction likely remains five to ten years away.

Fowlkes added that funding is not yet secured but the city is pursuing DRCOG master planning and funding processes to advance multimodal and intersection improvements along the corridor.

Commissioner Discussion:

Hunt thanked residents for their engagement and acknowledged their valid concerns and said the Front Street connection appears necessary under both current zoning and city plans. She noted that rejecting the project would effectively prevent any development on the property, which would conflict with the city's adopted comprehensive and housing plans. She concluded that, despite concerns, the proposal aligns with established policies and should move forward.

Moline said the project presented difficult trade-offs—supporting affordable housing goals but potentially harming nearby neighborhoods. He expressed concern that allowing the Front Street connection would have a detrimental impact on adjacent residents and questioned approving the project before intersection and traffic issues are addressed. He suggested exploring alternatives that permit development without opening Front Street to through traffic.

Baskett said she was convinced by neighbors that allowing the Front Street connection would be untenable and expressed support for pursuing a version of the development that proceeds without the connection in future plans.

Bangs said he was generally comfortable with the project's waivers, drainage design, parking, rezoning, and overall density, noting it aligns with city housing and comprehensive plans. He thanked the applicant for revising the proposal and addressing traffic concerns but said he remained conflicted about the Front Street connection. He suggested a possible compromise of allowing an emergency-access-only connection, though he acknowledged that could later change, and said he was still struggling with including the full connection in the recommendation.

Brauneis agreed with colleagues that the project's requested accommodations were reasonable and praised the diverse housing mix as something new for Louisville. However, he said the Front Street connection remained the core issue, noting that it would permanently alter the adjacent neighborhood and that this concern left him conflicted about supporting the proposal.

Commissioners agreed to add a condition to designate the Front Street connection emergency access only at the cost of the developer.

Motion to approve **Coal Creek Village Mixed Use Development** – Resolution 15, Series 2025 was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

- b. **Louisville Center for the Arts Sign** – Resolution 16, Series 2025 with a recommendation to City Council for a PUD amendment to allow a new sign for the Louisville Center for the Arts located at 801 Grant Ave.

Motion to reschedule **Louisville Center for the Arts Sign** – Resolution 16, Series 2025 to November 13 was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Bangs**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 5 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Moline thanked staff for their work on the Coal Creek Village Mixed Use Development issue.

STAFF COMMENTS

Hirt stated that a special meeting may be called to address the backlog of issues and reminded Commissioners of an upcoming joint discussion with City Council.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was moved by **Moline**, seconded by **Baskett**, and adopted by voice vote. The Commission adjourned at 10:12 PM