

Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

December 11, 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

Commission Members Absent: none

Staff Members Present: Jeff Hirt, Planning Manager
Emily Cline-Gibson, Planner II
Matt Post, Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the November 13, 2025 meeting minutes was moved by **Mihaly**, 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- a. **Louisville Center for the Arts Sign** – Application Withdrawn
(Continued from November 13, 2025)

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Commissioners asked clarifying questions regarding the withdrawal and whether any further Commission action was required. **Hirt** confirmed that no action was necessary.

No action was taken due to the withdrawal of the application.

- b. **Nonfunctional Turf Zoning Code Amendment** – Resolution 19, Series 2025, with a recommendation to City Council for an amendment to Louisville Municipal Code Title 17 and supplemental Commercial, Industrial, and Mixed Use Design Standards and Guidelines to address Colorado SB 24-005 and HB 25-1113 that prohibits certain types of landscaping to address water conservation goals.

Staff Presentation:

Cline-Gibson presented a proposed zoning code amendment to address the requirements of Colorado Senate Bill 24-005 and House Bill 25-1113, which prohibit the installation of nonfunctional turf, artificial turf, and invasive plant species in certain new developments and redevelopments beginning January 1, 2026. The proposal included amendments to Title 17 of the Louisville Municipal Code and updates to the Commercial, Industrial, and Mixed-Use Development Design Standards and Guidelines, as well as a minor amendment to the sign code. Staff explained the distinction between functional and nonfunctional turf, outlined where turf would continue to be permitted, and noted that existing turf could be maintained under certain conditions.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of *Resolution 19, Series 2025*.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Commissioners asked questions regarding the definition and enforcement of functional versus nonfunctional turf, the treatment of artificial turf, allowable native and hybridized grass species, and how the proposed amendments would apply to future residential development. **Cline-Gibson** clarified that the proposal aligns with state law, that artificial turf would be permitted only for recreational purposes, and that single-family residential standards required by state law would be addressed in a future code update.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioners expressed support for the proposed amendments, noting consistency with state law and local sustainability and water conservation goals. Commissioners discussed the importance of clear definitions and guidance for enforcement, particularly regarding native and hybridized grass species, and encouraged staff to continue refining implementation details.

Motion to approve *Resolution 19, Series 2025* was made by **Choi**, seconded by **Baskett**, and adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

c. **Redtail Ridge / ConocoPhillips General Development Plan (GDP)**

Amendment, Resolution 20, Series 2025, with a recommendation to City Council for a GDP amendment to change which design standards apply to certain areas of Redtail Ridge to address future proposed light industrial uses.

Staff Presentation:

Post presented a request for a second amendment to the ConocoPhillips Campus General Development Plan (GDP) to allow the application of Industrial Development Design Standards and Guidelines, with enhanced architectural standards, to centrally located parcels within the Redtail Ridge development. Staff explained that the underlying GDP already permits light industrial and research-oriented uses, and that the proposed amendment would better align design standards with those allowed uses while maintaining high-quality architectural expectations. **Post** described enhanced standards related to building transparency, entry features, material variation, and pedestrian-oriented facades.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of *Resolution 20, Series 2025*.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Commissioners asked questions regarding building height, applicability of the enhanced industrial standards, transparency and fenestration requirements, and whether the proposed standards would apply elsewhere in the city. Staff clarified that building heights would remain comparable to commercial standards, that the enhanced standards would apply only to the specified parcels within the GDP, and that transparency requirements were intended as minimum standards.

Applicant Presentation:

The applicant stated that the intent of the amendment was to accommodate permitted industrial uses while maintaining a design-forward development. The applicant emphasized that the enhanced standards would ensure long-term architectural quality and compatibility with surrounding development.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

None were heard.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioners expressed support for the amendment, noting that the proposal balanced flexibility for industrial uses with strong design requirements. Commissioners acknowledged the benefit of the enhanced standards and discussed the importance of clarifying transparency requirements as minimums.

Motion to approve *Resolution 20, Series 2025* was moved by **Choi** and seconded by **Baskett**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

- d. **Redtail Ridge Planned Unit Development (PUD) No. 1 for Light Industrial Buildings**, *Resolution 21, Series 2025*, with a recommendation to City Council for a PUD for new light industrial buildings in the central area of Redtail Ridge (Lot 1, Block 1 of Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1).

Staff Presentation:

Post presented a request for approval of Planned Unit Development (PUD) No. 1 for the Redtail Ridge development, allowing construction of two light industrial buildings totaling approximately 236,993 square feet on Lot 1, Block 1 of Redtail Ridge Filing No. 1. **Post** explained that the PUD was reviewed under the Industrial Development Design Standards and the enhanced architectural standards associated with the recently approved GDP amendment. The proposal includes building heights consistent with code, internal circulation and pedestrian connectivity, landscaping, open space areas, and electric vehicle charging infrastructure exceeding minimum requirements.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommended approval of *Resolution 21, Series 2025*.

Commissioner Questions of Staff:

Commissioners asked questions regarding building height, parking counts, pedestrian circulation, application of the enhanced industrial standards, and compatibility with surrounding development. Staff clarified that building heights comply with industrial standards, parking exceeds minimum requirements, pedestrian connectivity is provided throughout the site, and the proposal aligns with the enhanced design standards intended for this area.

Applicant Presentation:

The applicant described the proposed development, emphasizing high-quality architectural design, incorporation of enhanced entry features, transparency, pedestrian-oriented elements, and long-term compatibility with the broader Redtail Ridge development. The applicant noted that the project is intended to deliver a design-forward industrial campus consistent with the vision of the GDP.

Commissioner Questions of Applicant:

Commissioners asked the applicant questions regarding the long-term buildout of Redtail Ridge, architectural quality, pedestrian-oriented design elements, and how the enhanced industrial standards would be applied over time. The applicant explained that the project is intended to deliver a design-forward industrial campus, emphasized a commitment to maintaining enhanced architectural standards, and described how building entries, transparency, and circulation features support a cohesive campus environment.

Public Comment:

None were heard.

Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioners expressed support for the proposal, noting the quality of the architectural design, pedestrian-oriented features, and consistency with the recently approved GDP amendment. Commissioners commented positively on the enhanced industrial design approach and its contribution to overall site aesthetics and functionality.

Motion to approve *Resolution 21, Series 2025* was moved by **Moline** and seconded by **Hunt**. The motion was adopted by a vote of 7 to 0.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner **Moline** was recognized as he is ending his time serving on the commission.

Chair **Brauneis** mentioned lessons learned from the previous meeting related to ensuring the public addresses comments to the commission.

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff mentioned items which will be scheduled for the January 8 Planning Commission meeting including the comprehensive plan and the EV charging zoning code amendment to address HB 24-1173.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The Commission adjourned at 8:41 PM.