



## Statement of Vision

*Lafayette's panoramic view of the Rocky Mountains inspires our view into the future. We value our heritage, our unique neighborhoods, a vibrant economy and active lifestyles. We envision a future that mixes small-town livability with balanced growth and superior city services.*

### NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP

This meeting will be conducted in person and by electronic and telephonic means pursuant to the Declaration of Local Disaster Emergency issued by the Mayor of the City of Lafayette on March 17, 2020 and City of Lafayette Resolution No. 2020-23 extending the Declaration until terminated by City Council.

SEE BELOW THE AGENDA FOR MEETING ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION OPTIONS

**SEPTEMBER 8, 2021**

## AGENDA

**6:00 PM PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
Council Chambers  
1290 S. Public Road  
Lafayette, Colorado 80026**

- I. OPENING OF MEETING
  - Call to Order
  - Pledge of Allegiance
  - Roll Call
- II. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA
- III. MEETING MINTUES FOR AUGUST 25, 2021
- IV. REGULARLY SCHEDULED ITEMS
  - A. MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE AND PRESENTATION
- V. OTHER BUSINESS
  - A. COMMISSION COMMENTS
  - B. DEPARTMENT COMMENTS
- VI. ADJOURN

### OPTIONS FOR ACCESSING THE MEETING

- Attend the meeting in person. City Hall Council Chambers, 1290 S. Public Road.
- Tune to Comcast Channel 8 or HD Channel 881.
- [View the meeting on your computer at https://www.lafayetteco.gov/627/Streaming-Video](https://www.lafayetteco.gov/627/Streaming-Video)
- Listen to the meeting by calling 1-877-853-5247 (toll free). Once connected, you will be asked for the meeting number. The meeting number is **832 4397 4552**. Then press # after entering the number.

### OPTIONS FOR PARTICIPATING IN THE MEETING

- Attend the meeting in person. City Hall Council Chambers, 1290 S Public Road.
- Submit written comments to [Planning Commission Secretary](#). If your remarks are received by 3:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting, they will be read into the record at the meeting.

**Record of Proceedings**  
**City of Lafayette**  
**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, August 25, 2021**  
**Virtual Meeting**

Chair Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Those in attendance included Chair Thomas, Vice Chair Smith, and Commissioners Fischer, Phillips, and Samson.

Commissioners Stephens and Watson.

Staff Present: Planning and Building Director Jeff Brasel, Planning Manager Jana Easley, City Attorney Mary Lynn Macsalka, and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko

**Items from the Public**

None.

**Meeting Minutes for March 23, 2021 and Workshop Minutes for April 8, 2021, May 26, 2021, and July 28, 2021**

Chair Thomas asked if anyone had any corrections or changes to the Meeting Minutes for March 23, 2021 and the Workshop Minutes for April 8, 2021, May 26, 2021, and July 28, 2021.

*Commissioner Phillips moved to approve the Meeting Minutes for March 23, 2021 and the Workshop Minutes for April 8, 2021, May 26, 2021, and July 28, 2021. Commissioner Samson seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

**Scheduled Items**

**A. Silo Subdivision Vacation of Rights-of-Way and Easements**

Chair Thomas opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Fischer disclosed that she lives in Anna's Farm which is located adjacent to the Silo Subdivision. She stated she does not have a personal interest in the property, and she can be impartial in the review of this application.

Chair Thomas asked staff if the public hearing had been noticed under the applicable regulations for this type of land use hearing. Planning Manager Jana Easley stated that it was.

Ms. Easley entered the staff report into the record and reviewed the order of the public hearing. She explained that this application is a request to vacate portions of the rights-of-way and easements to accommodate a revised lot and street layout for Silo Subdivision Filing No. 1.

Ms. Easley gave a brief background of the property, the property owner, and the location. She presented a slide of an aerial map that showed the location of the property and the surrounding properties. The property is located just west of Highway 287 and south of Arapahoe Road.

Taylor Robertson, Civil Engineering Company, 65 N. Clarkson St., Denver, presented their Vacation application. He presented slides outlining the areas to be vacated and explained

the reasons for the changes. He explained that the land to be vacated is no longer necessary for public use, and the land is still accessible by public roads. The housing unit count was not affected, but adjustments to lots were made to preserve landscaping and increase park land. All vacated land, roadways, and sidewalks will be reconnected to established public accesses upon approval and recording of the minor subdivision, Silo Replat A.

Chair Thomas opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 6:15 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission.

Planning Manager Jana Easley presented staff's analysis and recommendation. She reviewed the application against the Code criteria outlined in Section 26-14-20(c) and discussed staff's findings. Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend approval of the vacation with two conditions.

The Planning Commission asked questions of staff and the applicant about the abandoned gas well and whether there are records of where the flow line might be. Staff noted that the gas well was capped per the State regulations.

Chair Thomas closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission discussion focused on the abandoned gas well and concerns future homeowners may have and what the setbacks from homes the capped well needed to be. Staff gave the Commission an update on what the code requirements are. The Commission noted their appreciation that the applicant had taken steps to improve the plan and address the gas well.

### **Motion**

*Commissioner Samson moved to recommend approval of the Vacation, finding it complies with the findings of Section 26-14-20(c) of the Lafayette Development and Zoning Code, subject to two conditions of approval. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

### **Conditions of Approval:**

1. The Vacation approval shall be conditioned upon City Council's approval of the replat, recording of the replat, acceptance of the dedications therein, and approving of an amendment to the development agreement providing for the changes in the public improvements.
2. All minor corrections to the Vacation Exhibit, based on the most recent plan review comments, shall be addressed prior to the City Council meeting.

### **B. Medtronic Site Plan/Architectural Review Amendment**

Planning Manager Jana Easley entered the staff report into the record and reviewed the order of the meeting. She stated this application is a Site Plan/Architectural Review Amendment for Lot 1, Block, MDT-Ryan Office Campus Subdivision Filing No 1 (aka Medtronic Office Campus). The owner, Ryan Lafayette, LLC, is requesting to add two stories above the one-story connector building for Phase 1. The addition would add another 18,000 square feet to the building area but would not change the footprint of the building. The

addition would have the same architectural treatments, patterns, colors, and materials as the previously approved architecture.

Ms. Easley presented a slide of an aerial map that showed the location of the property and the surrounding properties. The property is located at the northeast corner of US Highway 287 and Dillon Road.

James Driessen, Vice President, Medtronic, Boulder gave a brief background of their business and discussed the need for this addition.

Christine Yarbrough, Architect, MOA Architecture, 414 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Denver, presented their proposal. She explained how they incorporated the addition into the design. She reviewed the site design and layout and the architecture for the building. She discussed how the application meets the City's code and design guidelines. She reviewed the exterior building material and discussed how it will match the Medtronic Office Campus buildings that were recently approved.

Ms. Easley presented Staff Analysis and Recommendation for the Site Plan Architectural Review Amendment. She reviewed the application against the Site Plan/Architectural Review Criteria outlined in Section 26-16-7.1. She reviewed the scale, architecture, design, and architectural treatments for the building. She reviewed the landscaping, traffic circulation, screening of rooftop mechanical equipment, and parking. She also reviewed the building design materials and building elevations. Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Site Plan and Architectural Amendment application.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant about the footprint of the building and whether they have done engineering for the building. The Planning Commission asked whether the additional square footage affects the public art dedication. The applicant and staff responded to the Planning Commission questions.

Planning Commission discussed the merits of the proposal.

### **Motion**

*Commissioner Phillips moved to recommend approval of the Site Plan and Architectural Amendment, finding the amendment complies with the criteria of Section 26-16-7.1 of the Lafayette Development and Zoning Code. Vice Chair Smith seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

### **A. Vista Business Park Planned Unit Development Amendment, Lot 26**

Chair Thomas opened the public hearing. Chair Thomas asked staff if the public hearing had been noticed under the applicable regulations for this type of land use hearing. Planning Manager Jana Easley stated that it was.

Ms. Easley entered the staff report into the record and reviewed the order of the public hearing. She explained that this application is a Planned Unit Development Amendment for Lot 26 of Vista Business Park PUD. She gave a brief overview of the property and presented a slide of an aerial map that showed the location of the property.

Ms. Easley explained the request is to increase the building height from 35 feet to 45 feet. The maximum height in the M1/Industrial zone district is 35 feet. Ms. Easley noted that the existing PUD also has a requirement that all retaining walls be constructed using stacked stone. The applicant is requesting a modification to the PUD to allow for an engineered retaining wall on the site rather than the stacked stone. The Planned Unit Development (PUD) process allows for modifications to certain measurable standards. Since there is already a PUD overlaying Vista Business Park, this would be a PUD amendment for only Lot 26.

Carl Bruzzone, Bruzzone Shipping, Inc. gave a brief background of what their company does and how they would use the proposed building and site.

Peter Heinz, PEH Architects, 1720 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Boulder, presented their proposal and explained why they are requesting the height modification. He presented the site layout, building design, unique site conditions affecting the building, and why they are pursuing the PUD Amendment. He also discussed their request for an engineered retaining wall. He discussed how their application meets the City's Code requirements for a PUD Amendment.

Chair Thomas opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 7:05 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission. Chair Thomas closed the meeting for public testimony.

Ms. Easley presented the Staff Analysis and Recommendation for the PUD Amendment. She reviewed the PUD Review Criteria. She explained how staff found that the application for the height increase does not meet criterion no. 3 regarding the modifications being in the best interest of the city and neighborhood in which the development is occurring. Staff recommended denial of the height modification request.

Ms. Easley reviewed the retaining wall application and discussed staff's support of this request. Staff recommended approval of the request to use an engineered retaining wall system.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to respond to staff's concerns. Mr. Heinz discussed site constraints and their need to increase the building height and disagree that the building will block views.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant about possible redesign or reconfiguration of their building instead of increasing the height, if they could review their site plan and show how the semi-trucks would use the site, explain why they have two curb cuts, and to review their parking. The applicant responded to the Planning Commission questions.

The Planning Commission asked staff about dimensional standards for this lot, what the height of the screening wall would be, and procedural steps for this application such as tabling and providing additional feedback to the applicant and reviewing staff's findings for denial. Staff responded to the Planning Commission questions.

Chair Thomas closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

The Planning Commission discussed tabling the application. They discussed their concerns with the application which included the building height request is too large, the impact their

request will have on the neighboring lots, the need to look at other designs or configurations, and maybe adding a green roof to soften the look of the building.

The Planning Commission discussed their appreciation for a Lafayette business wanting to stay in Lafayette and support economic development within the city.

The Planning Commission continued to discuss their concern with the building height of 45 feet, setting a precedent if this were to be approved, whether the applicant has done enough design configuration, whether other lots will have this issue, and should they look at amending the PUD for the whole subdivision.

City Attorney Macsalka advised the Planning Commission to not separate the retaining wall request from the application. She also discussed that tabling and asking for a new plan is denying their current plan or application.

The Planning Commission reviewed the application against the PUD criteria and questioned whether it met the criteria.

#### **PUD Motion**

*Commissioner Samson moved to deny the Planned Unit Development Amendment finding the plan does not comply with the criteria of Section 26-18-5(d)3, because it is not in the best interests of the neighborhood and the applicant has not proven, based upon the evidence presented, that the modifications requested are necessary to develop the property. Chair Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

#### **V. A. Commission Comments**

Vice Chair Smith gave an update on the Lafayette Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting he attended noting that they reviewed the Mayhoffer Farm management plan.

Commissioner Phillips gave an update on the Historic Preservation Board Meeting he attended noting they had training session with the City Attorney, held board interviews for two openings, awarded five heritage awards, reviewed their preservation plan, released a demo permit, and nominated an alternate for their demo review subcommittee.

Vice Chair Smith thanked everyone for the nomination and vote for Vice Chair. Chair Thomas also expressed gratitude for being renominated as Chair.

#### **B. Department Comments**

Planning & Building Director Brasel stated the next Community Meeting for the Comprehensive Plan is scheduled for September 2, 2021 from 4-8 PM. It will be located on Harrison next to East Simpson Coffee.

Director Brasel noted that they will have a meeting on September 8 regarding an update to the Multimodal Transportation Plan and a meeting on September 22 regarding the City's oil and gas regulations. He thanked staff and the City Attorney for their input.

**Adjourn**

*Commissioner Samson moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Fischer. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.*

City of Lafayette

---

Darcia Thomas, Chair

Attest:

---

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary



## PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MEMO

**MEETING DATE:** September 8, 2021  
**AGENDA TITLE:** Multimodal Transportation Plan (MMTP) Update  
**PREPARED BY:** Jeff Arthur, Director of Public Works

---

### **Executive Summary**

The city initiated its first comprehensive transportation planning effort, the Multimodal Transportation Plan (MMTP) earlier this year. Initial project steps have focused on engaging with community members, local boards and commissions, and regional partners. This agenda item will provide an update on those efforts and feedback received to date.

### **Background Information**

With influence from the City's Comprehensive Plan and other guiding documents, the MMTP will outline the City's vision for its future transportation system, the policies to support that system, and capital projects and programs that are prioritized with consideration of funding constraints and regional project priorities. The plan will include extensive community outreach and input from City Council, City staff, Planning Commission, and regional partners. The MMTP process is anticipated to take approximately 18 months; the project team is approximately 6 months into the process.

In this evening's presentation, the consultant team will present the following:

1. Results of the statistically valid community survey
2. Feedback from the first phase of community and stakeholder engagement
3. Discuss community priorities as well as the vision and goals framework
4. Update on the existing conditions and needs assessment
5. Next steps

This evening's materials will also be presented to the City Council on Thursday, September 9.

### **Next Steps**

Next steps include continuing stakeholder engagement, finalizing an assessment of existing conditions and needs, and finalizing a vision and goals framework. The project team will continue to provide City Council with updates at key milestones.