



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
Wednesday, 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.

Absent: 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 and slides outlining the areas to be vacated. He explained the reasons

for the change is that the land to be vacated is no longer necessary for public use. Mr. Robertson stated that the land is still accessible by public roads and the housing unit count was not affected. He stated that adjustments to the residential lots were made to preserve landscaping and increase park land and 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 the meeting for public testimony on this agenda item at 6:15 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission although one resident sent an email about reconnecting sidewalks and zoning requirements for emergency access.

Planning Manager Jana Easley presented the staff analysis and recommendation. She stated that staff 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 City Council approve 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 and capped gas well, the concerns future homeowners may have about this well, and if the city code identified a setback requirement for capped wells in relation to homes. Staff confirmed that the Lafayette city code does not identify setback requirements between capped and abandoned wells and residential buildings. 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). Ms. Easley explained that 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 company and discussed the need for this addition.

Christine Yarbrough, Architect, MOA Architecture, 414 14th 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 the staff analysis and recommendation for the Site Plan Architectural Review Amendment. The analysis included a review of the application against the Site Plan/Architectural Review Criteria listed in Section 26-16-7.1, a review of the scale, architecture, design, and architectural treatments for the building, and a review of the landscaping, traffic circulation, screening of rooftop mechanical equipment, and parking. Staff also reviewed the building design materials and building elevations. Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the Site Plan and Architectural Amendment application.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant about the footprint of the building and 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.

C. Vista Business Park Planned Unit Development Amendment, Lot 26

Chair Thomas opened the public hearing. She 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 and stated that 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. Ms. Easley explained that the applicant is requesting a modification to the PUD to allow for an engineered retaining wall on the site rather than the stacked stone. She stated the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process allows for modifications to certain measurable standards and 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 his company and how the company would use the proposed building and site.

Peter Heinz, PEH Architects, 1720 14th 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. However, Brian Fricano of Sustainable Supply and owner of Lot 21 and Jackie Hueftie of Boulderling Institute and Kilter Grips and owner of Lot 20 sent emails expressing their concerns with allowing an increased building height in this location. 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 modification 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 the need to increase the building height.

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

The Planning Commission asked staff about dimensional standards for this lot, the proposed height of the screening wall, and possible procedural steps for this application including tabling the vote to a later date. Staff responded to the Planning Commission questions.

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

The Planning Commission discussed their concerns with the request for a 10-foot increase to the building height request, 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 from the lots above the building.

The Planning Commission's other concerns included setting a precedent if the Commission approved higher building height, whether other lots will have a similar issue with topography, and whether the City needs to amend the PUD for whole subdivision. The Commission expressed their support for the retaining wall.

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

City Attorney Macsalka advised the Planning Commission to not vote on the retaining wall request separate from the other request in the application. She informed the Commission that the situation did not allow the Commission to table the vote on the application and that the Commission's options were to approve the application as presented, approve the application with conditions, or deny the 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 based on the Planning Commission's findings that the plan does not comply with the criteria of paragraph(d)(3) of Section 26-18-5, specifically, that the plan is not in the best interests of the neighborhood because the requested height increase would not be compatible with the surrounding properties, which are subject to the height limitation of the overall P.U.D., and because the applicant has not proven, based upon the evidence presented, that the requested height increase is 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 stated the Committee reviewed the Mayhoffer Farm management plan. Commissioner Phillips gave an update on the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. He stated they had a 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.