

Pagosa Springs Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2008

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Bunning. Commissioners Hart, Lattin and Atkinson were present. Staff Allen and Nigg were present.

II. Announcements

III. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of the April 22, 2008 meeting minutes – Cmmr. Atkinson motioned to approve the April 22, 2008 meeting minutes. Cmmr. Hart seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

IV. Design Review Board

A. Pagosa Springs Farmer's Market Off-Site Signage – Staff introduced the request by the applicant, Pagosa Springs Chamber of Commerce, for consideration of proposed off-site signage to promote the Farmers Market that would operate from June 27th thru the end of September. Staff stated the proposal included the placement of banners on seventeen (17) light poles (4.5 sq. ft) from Hot Springs Boulevard to Lewis Street. Staff noted the applicant was additionally requesting the ability to place two (2) sandwich board signs (6 sq. ft) on the former CDOT property (Hwy 160) and near the existing Town entry monument sign (East Hwy 160). Staff stated at the May 1, 2008 Town Council meeting the Chamber of Commerce received approval to operate the Farmers Market at the 'Overlook' parking area. Staff stated the sandwich board sign near the entry monument as proposed would not be allowed in the CDOT right-of-way and reiterated that the applicant would need to find a secondary location. Staff continued to explain that the Wayfinding & Signage Steering Committee reviewed the proposed off-site signage at the May 12th meeting and suggested only three (3) banners be allowed. Staff noted a condition of approval as drafted in the staff report cited the reduction of banners to the light poles in close proximity to the event. Project representative, Mary Jo Coulehan introduced revised graphics which replicated the sandwich board design on the banners and removed the vegetables. Coulehan stated the proposal of seventeen banners was an attempt to capture visitors and ultimately agreed a reduced number of banners may be more appropriate. Coulehan stated the design between the sandwich board signs and banners would be consistent and submitted to staff for approval prior to placement. Cmmr. Lattin questioned whether the banners placed on the poles near the 'Overlook' would impede pedestrian traffic on sidewalks. Coulehan stated the banners would overhang the sidewalks and would not cause problems with pedestrians. Cmmr. Hart stated signage in-front of the courthouse may be appropriate. Cmmr. Atkinson stated the Wayfinding and Signage plan was near completion and reminded the commissioners to be cognizant about placement of banners on a temporary basis. Cmmr. Atkinson noted a consistent palette of signage was important. Coulehan stated the Chamber of Commerce understood that future signage would need to comply with the recommendations as established in the Wayfinding & Signage Plan. Chairman Bunning suggested the Chamber of Commerce require vendors to park in areas away from the 'Overlook'. Cmmr. Hart stated the applicant should be allowed to place banners to the east and west of the Farmer's Market to draw attention to the event. Chairman Bunning opened the agenda item for comment. No comment was received. Chairman Bunning closed the item

Pagosa Springs Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2008

for comment. Cmmr. Hart motioned to approve the request contingent upon the following: (1) sandwich board signs shall be removed immediately following the event and shall only be erected the morning of the event; (2) submit verification that property owners have granted the Chamber of Commerce the ability to place off-site signage on the identified property; (3) light pole banner signage shall be maintained by the applicant and removed/replaced upon any deterioration and the method of attachment shall be approved by the Town's Street Department; (4) the applicant is allowed to place seven (7) banners and poles shall be in close proximity to the event; and (5) light pole signage shall be removed immediately following closure of the Farmer's Market. Cmmr.

Atkinson seconded the motion. Cmmr. Lattin stated the second sandwich board sign location should be approved by staff. Cmmr. Hart modified the motion to include Cmmr. Lattin's request. The motion was unanimously approved.

B. 169 Pagosa Street Exterior Alterations – Staff introduced the request by the applicant, Teddy Herzog, to review exterior alterations to the building located at 169 Pagosa Street. Staff stated the structure currently includes approximately 1,000 square feet of commercial space and a one (1) and two (2) bedroom apartment. Staff stated the applicant would like to complete the following alterations: (a) remove roof and increase building height by 10 feet on the southern structure; (b) remove roof and increase building height by 8 feet on the structure abutting Pagosa Street; (c) add natural stone veneer to the existing walls on the southern structure; (e) add new porch on second story of the structure abutting Pagosa Street; and (e) install new corrugated steel roof system on the entire building. Staff noted, upon completion of the alterations, the one (1) bedroom apartment on the second floor of the southern building will be converted into a two (2) bedroom apartment. Staff stated the additional 8 feet of building height on the structure abutting Pagosa Street will only increase ceiling heights and no additional commercial square footage will be added. Staff continued to explain per the LUDC sidewalks are required in all zone districts (excluding PE-R, PE-MF) on both sides of the street unless waived by the Design Review Board. Staff stated the existing parking lot along the Pagosa Street frontage allows space for three (3) vehicles and the existing sidewalk terminates at the east property boundary. Staff requested direction from the DRB, and recommended the applicant install a roll curb and concrete sidewalk, consistent with the width of the adjacent sidewalk, to define a pedestrian pathway and continue the extension of the sidewalk. Project applicant, Teddy Herzog addressed the DRB and further explained the proposed alterations. Herzog stated he was okay with staff's recommendation but noted Farrago's does not currently have concrete sidewalks. Chairman Bunning stated pedestrian connections are important and need to be completed at some point. Cmmr. Atkinson questioned whether the applicant would continue to utilize on-site parking abutting Pagosa Street. Herzog stated he had no intention of revising the parking arrangement. Cmmr. Hart stated he was not opposed to the idea of retaining the existing asphalt and/or contacting the adjacent property in an attempt to facilitate the completion of sidewalks on this side of the street. Chairman Bunning suggested the developer be allowed the choice to escrow funds to complete the sidewalk at a future time. Chairman Bunning opened the agenda item for comment. No comment was received. Chairman Bunning closed the item for comment. Cmmr. Lattin motioned to approve the request as submitted contingent upon the following: (1) install roll curb and concrete sidewalk consistent with the width of the adjacent sidewalk. Cmmr. Lattin included the option for the developer to escrow the funds for sidewalk installation. Cmmr. Atkinson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

V. Planning Commission

Pagosa Springs Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2008

A. The Springs Resort Sketch Plan, Planned Unit Development – Staff introduced the request by the applicant, Springs S2 Development Inc., Pagosa Spring Inc., & Gulfstream Worldwide LTD, to review the sketch plan PUD of the Springs Resort. Staff stated the proposed project includes approximately 300 hotel rooms, 193 timeshare/townhome/condominium units and 61,000 square feet of commercial/restaurant/service space. Staff explained the project is located on approximately 30 acres and upon subdivision six (6) parcels would be created. Staff provided a brief background on the Hot Springs Neighborhood Plan and stated the town contracted with Albert Moore & Partners to complete research and prepare the Urban Design Plan in 1999. Staff stated the Council adopted Resolution No. 99-26 which established zone districts, land uses and block development for the defined planning area. Staff stated in 2001 Council adopted ordinance No. 563 which established design guidelines based on the concepts incorporated within the Neighborhood Plan. Staff continued to explain the proposed development plan deviates from the principles as established in the adopted Hot Springs Boulevard Neighborhood Plan in regards to proposed uses and compatibility with existing overlay districts. Staff noted, in contrast, the development plan is compatible with the principles and land uses as defined in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. Staff stated under the PUD provisions in the LUDC the applicant has the ability to establish a permitted use chart for each parcel based on the underlying zone district which may address inconsistency issues between the Comprehensive Plan and existing overlay districts. Staff stated the development plans reach an FAR calculation of 0.44 which is below the recommendations as established in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommended that the applicant increase site density and additionally complete a shared parking analysis to determine appropriate reductions. Staff noted structures located in proposed Parcel B, Parcel C and Parcel F exceed the allowed height limits as established in the LUDC and the recommendations as established in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff recommended the applicant produce cross sections from Hot Springs Boulevard to S. Sixth Street, representative of the grades and proposed building heights. Staff stated these drawings will provide the Planning Commission and Council with adequate information to review the impacts of the requested height modifications during preliminary plan submittal. Chairman Bunning stated the cross section should include the S. Sixth Street bluffs to the top of Reservoir Hill and should also depict lines of sight. Staff stated submitted development plans show the riverwalk trail alignment outside the Springs Resort property boundaries. Staff recommended the trail alignment follow the travertine bench near the rear of the proposed 250 room hotel buildings within the subject property boundary. Staff explained this alignment will reduce wetland impacts and significantly reduce construction costs. Staff noted the applicant has requested the ability to construct buildings and infrastructure that directly abuts the floodway boundary. Staff stated the LUDC does not currently include river setback provisions; however, the adopted Comprehensive Plan states new development should be designed to protect water features. Staff stated concerns from adjacent property owners (Lot 6 & 7, Block 51) were received in regards to access and previously negotiated easements. Staff referenced Ordinance No. 333 which establishes access and utility easements to the property. Project representative, Tracy Reynolds introduced owners Bill Whittington and Matt Mees and project team members Courtney King and Charmain Smith. Reynolds stated the applicant was striving for LEED certified (gold designation) structures and a greenbuilt project. Reynolds stated Spring Street would serve as the main entry and two secondary entries were also shown on the development plans. Reynolds explained the applicant intends to implement timeshare or fractional ownership models versus single family occupancy which will increase the number of visitors and turnover in the downtown core. Reynolds

Pagosa Springs Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2008

stated project density could be increased by approximately 40 residential units depending on the results of the shared parking analysis. Reynolds stated the applicant should additionally be able to reduce the on-site parking by 15-20% based on the results of the analysis. Reynolds continued to explain each parcel in detail and included commentary on the following: a mixture of uses abutting Hot Springs Boulevard, the possibility of a Senior Housing Facility near the Community Center and a potential small parking garage to reduce on-site surface parking within the development. Reynolds stated the applicant would like to incorporate a commercial component along the river with commercial kiosk opportunities and outdoor dining. King stated the project provides pedestrian connectivity and establishes six (6) foot internal sidewalks and bicycle lanes. King continued to explain the project would include a number of pedestrian plazas and amenities. King stated the applicant intended to align Phase II of the riverwalk through the wetlands for compatibility with Phase I. Staff stated Phase I was not built within the delineated wetlands and reiterated that re-alignment behind the 250 room hotel would reduce construction costs and wetland impacts. Reynolds stated the trail location was designed based on the placement of the proposed pedestrian bridge and noted the wetland map and plans were already approved by the Army Corp of Engineers based on Design Workshops previous rendering. Reynolds explained that architectural styles within the development may include victorian, rustic and elements that include natural stone and/or log elements. Cmmr. Lattin questioned the project timeline. Reynolds stated the applicant has planned a 10-15 year buildout. Chairman Bunning opened the public hearing for comment. Jean Gray, representing Ilame Watters (Lot 6 & 7, Block 51) stated her primary concern is access to the property. Gray stated the property has a defined building envelope and according to Ordinance No. 333 the Springs Resort is required to provide access and utility easements to the Watters property. Gray noted the proposed development plan does not include any access to the subject property. Gray stated she agreed with staff report condition No. 4 which required the Springs Resort to address access easement concerns onto adjacent Lot 6 & 7, Block 51. Gray stated the second concern regarded the location of the riverwalk trail. Gray stated the trail is currently shown on the Watters property and they concur with the staff report that the trail should follow the travertine bench and be located on the Springs Resort property. Gray noted her willingness to work with staff and the Springs Resort to reach a solution. Ken Levine requested that the interpretive signage around the source pool remain and stated the riverwalk was an attraction for the community. Bill Hudson stated the development plans show lots of green areas and suggested that the applicant use xeric landscape treatments to reduce water dependence. Ken Levine stated the project is close enough to the new sewer treatment plant and the developer could utilize sewer effluent. Carl Valdejuli questioned the preliminary score on LEED certification. King stated the developer was targeting 29 credits with 12 additional credits that may be achievable. Valdejuli commended the developer on the diversity of uses within the project. Michael Whiting stated the project seemed sensitive to community values and expressed concern about redevelopment within the wetlands. Teddy Herzog stated the development plan included too much surface parking and recommended the developer construct a parking garage. Herzog also noted that the alternative for Parcel A showing mixed-use abutting Hot Springs Boulevard was most desirable. Cmmr. Atkinson expressed concern regarding the relation between proposed buildings and the river. Cmmr. Atkinson stated the applicant should implement double sided architectural and suggested guidance on the riverwalk alignment was premature. Cmmr. Hart questioned whether the Watters property had the ability to construct within the referenced building envelope. Gray stated they indeed have the ability to construct buildings on the property. Chairman Bunning closed the public hearing for comment. Cmmr. Atkinson stated the architectural renderings of the 250

Pagosa Springs Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2008

room hotel are important as the usage of materials and façade modulation will reduce the overall mass of the building. Cmmr. Atkinson motioned to approve the sketch plan for the Springs Resort contingent upon the following: (1) establish permitted use chart based on the underlying base zone district for each proposed parcel; (2) establish cross sections from Reservoir Hill to the bluffs on S. Sixth Street, representative of the grades and proposed building heights showing mass and scale of the proposed structures; (3) participate in joint utility meeting prior to preliminary plan submittal; (4) address access easement concerns onto adjacent Lot 6 & 7, Block 51; (5) submit shared parking analysis concurrently with preliminary plan; (6) modify site plans to include additional access point into the 265 stall parking lot; (7) revise subdivision summary form, as necessary; (8) submit sidewalk reimbursement; and (9) establish multi-modal/transit options within the development plan or Hot Springs Boulevard. Cmmr. Lattin seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

V. Reports and Comments

- A. Staff** – Next meeting June 10, 2008 @ 5:00 p.m.
- B. Land Use and Development Code Update** – Staff stated Clarion & Associates along with market analyst Arne Ray will be in Town on June 10th thru the 12th to discuss and present East Village and Downtown Core design standard modeling. Staff stated the LUDC advisory committee should be prepared to spend time with the consultants on these dates. Staff noted module 2 of the draft code is expected in early June.
- C. Wayfinding Signage, Streetscape Furnishings and Logo Development** – Staff stated Nuszer-Kopatz presented the draft wayfinding and signage, streetscape and logo development plan on April 16th to the Steering Committee. Staff noted the committee met on May 12th to discuss sign messaging, locations and further iterations of the logo.
- D. Regional Growth Management IGA** – Staff stated a joint worksession between the County and Town Planning Commission's was tentatively scheduled on May 28, 2008 to discuss the process for creating a regional growth management IGA. Staff informed the Planning Commission that the regional growth management IGA was a policy direction council wished to pursue, based on direction at the May 6, 2008 meeting, pending a commissioner willing to participate. Chairman Bunning, Cmmr. Lattin and Cmmr. Atkinson stated their schedules could not accommodate additional meetings at this time. Cmmr. Hart stated he did not feel comfortable taking on this responsibility until he had more time on the board. The Planning Commission determined it was not the right time to pursue this growth management IGA. Ray Keyawa stated the County Planning Commission is desperate to move forward with the IGA. Keyawa stated he would like to see a County Planning Commission member on the Town Planning Commission and vice-versa. Chairman Bunning stated that a member attending seven (7) meetings per month was unrealistic but welcomed any County Planning Commission member to the meetings. Keyawa stated he would like to see the member have a vote on the board.
- E. Lewis Street Re-Design and Improvements** – Staff stated a final design concept for Lewis Street was completed based on public comment and forwarded to the Town Engineer for design.
- F. Annexation Training** – Staff stated a petition from Blue Sky Village was received to annex 96 acres along Hwy 84. Staff noted the petition was forwarded to town

Pagosa Springs Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes – May 13, 2008

legal counsel to determine whether the proposed flagpole annexation is feasible. Staff stated the annexation training worksession is scheduled for May 28th with Andy Hill from the Department of Local Affairs.

G. Off-Site Signage – Chairman Bunning questioned whether the modifications to the off-site sign regulations were drafted. Staff stated they would attempt to have them ready for the May 27 meeting. Cmmr. Lattin stated the group agreed to address real estate off-site signage only and felt this was a mistake as other businesses would come to the table requesting special consideration. Discussion focused on the definition of special events and whether the real estate industry should be allowed off-site signage and no other business. Bill Hudson stated the LUDC already treats real estate signage differently and suggested this industry has special needs and these modification addressed the concern.

Minutes approved: _____
Tracy Bunning, Chairman