Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments & Design Review Board
Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, April 26, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.

Town Hall, Council Chambers, 551 Hot Springs Boulevard, Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

I. Call to order / Roll Call

II. Announcements

III. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the March 8, 2016 and April 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

IV. Public Comment

A. Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda.

V. Design Review Board

A. Continued Public Hearing, Application for Major Design Review for Pagosa 322 Harman Park Drive. (Public Hearing / Quasi-Judicial Matter).

VI. Public Comment

A. Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda.

VII. Reports and Comments

A. Staff Report_ Projects, Updates and Upcoming Development Applications.
B. Planning Commission – Comments, Ideas and Discussion.
C. Upcoming Town Meetings Schedule

VIII. Adjournment

_____
James Dickhoff, Planning Director

Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments, & Design Review Board

Staff Report – Tuesday, April 26, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

I. Call to Order / Roll Call:

II. Announcements:

III. Approval of Minutes:

A. March 8, 2016 and April 12, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

Approval of Minutes:	Staff recommends approving Minutes from the March 8, 2016 and April 12, 2016 Planning Commission Meetings, upon finding they are accurate.

IV. Public Comment:

A. Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda.

a.	At this time, Public Comment will be accepted for items not included as an agenda item. Interested persons have the opportunity to address the Planning Commission and express your opinions on matters that are not on the agenda or not listed as a public hearing item on the agenda. Public comments on any pending application that is the subject of a public hearing at the current or a future meeting may only be made during such hearing. The total time reserved for Public Comment at each meeting is 20 minutes, unless extended by a majority vote of the Planning Commission and each comment is limited to 2 minutes.

Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments & Design Review Board
Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, March 08, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.

Town Hall, Council Chambers, 551 Hot Springs Boulevard,
Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

I. **Call to order / Roll Call:** Commission Chair Maez called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM. Commissioners present were Commissioner Maez, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Parker, and Commissioner Giles. Also in attendance were Planning Director James Dickhoff and Associate Planner Rachel Novak.

II. **Announcements:** None

III. **Approval of Minutes**

A. *Approval of the February 9, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes:* Commissioner Giles moves to approve the minutes as they stand. Commissioner Martinez seconds. Unanimously approved.

IV. **Public Comment**

A. *Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda*: None Received

V. **Board of Adjustments**

A. *Application for Variance for Front Yard Set Back reduction, Mesa Heights West*: Planning Director James Dickhoff provided background on the project. The site is zoned as R-6 and the setbacks in this area have a 25ft minimum setback. The application is for a reduction in this setback to 15ft, a ten-foot reduction. As of today, staff has not received any public comments for this application. There are 10 criteria that variances must meet prior to approval. Applicant Brad Ash is working with the land owner on a variance for development. Brad Ash states that there is a 60ft ROW and the newer setback reduction of 10ft will greatly help with development. Lots 26 and 25 are not seeking a variance of these sites as they are not as challenging for development. Lots 27 and 28 could have development starting at 15-16ft above the roadway. Currently, the Mesa Heights West development does have variable setbacks as it is. Lots 30-27 the applicants are asking for a variance due to the steepness of the terrain. The building height could be extremely high and Brad Ash states that he is trying to keep the feeling of the neighborhood, 1500-1600sqft with a two car garage. Commissioner Parker asks if there are drawings of the properties yet. Brad Ash states that the drawings are complete. Commissioner Parker asks about the appearance of the driveways. Brad Ash states that all of the driveways will have a 12% grade and it's the garage that will be encroaching the most upon the setback. Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses the 10 criteria that must be met by the applicant to get approval for this variance. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that this is a unique circumstance, as most of the Mesa Heights West R-6 district is relatively flat. The requested setback option is a reasonable request for allowing the development to occur on the sites. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the likelihood of needing to widen this road in the future is very low and the closeness of the lots to the street should not be a factor. He shows the commission photographs of the sites and property lines in relation to the ROW. The applicant is proposing single family homes. This request does fit with the existing development in the area. There currently no

DRAFT

other application on this issue and there are no attachments. Commissioner Maez asks about the height of the back of the structures. The midspan cannot exceed 28ft. Brad Ash states that none of the proposed development does not exceed that. Aaron Wamsley lives right next to lot 25 and is concerned about moving the variance. He states that everyone has a front yard and there is plenty of space. He wants Pagosa to be a pretty place and suggests widening the plots. He isn't sure what will actually be built there. States the developers knew the rules when they plotted the sites. Mr. Wamsley also states that the appearance of the neighborhood will change. Davilyn Valdez states that houses could potentially top out at 28ft, but is concerned with the height. The maximum height allowed is 32ft and Brad Ash states that most of the units will be 22-24ft. Ms. Valdez lives behind these sites and doesn't want to look at a 28ft wall. She wishes to have known about the platting in 2012. This is a very friendly neighborhood, but instantly traffic could change with these houses. She states that traffic on 3rd street is a concern. James Olson agrees with his neighbor Ms. Valdez. Mr. Wamsley is concerned with putting a lot of houses in a small space. With the proposed small driveways, he is concerned about the on-street parking, 28ft walls, and increased traffic. Ms. Valdez and Mr. Wamsley are concerned about what will be built and would like to be part of the review process. She would like a guarantee that the units will be single family homes. Brad Ash states that duplexes are permitted in an R-6 district. The developer decided to mesh with the current feel of the neighborhood and chose single family homes instead of duplexes. There will also be a double parking, 20ft driveway into each home. Mr. Wamsley comments that he respects the developer, but states that the platting is terrible. He also states that the developer platted the sites wrong and the laws shouldn't be bent for him to make his money back. Commissioner Maez states that the developer is within his bounds and they are trying to adhere to the Land Use Development Code. Mr. Wamsley states that it makes a lot more sense to build 8 houses instead of 10. Commissioner Martinez states that the houses will have about 23ft of front yard space. Could you build on Block 4 lot 17 without a variance? Brad Ash states yes, but the homes will appear taller, closer to neighbors, and potentially costlier. Commissioner Parker states that the developer is ding the best they can to make certain things work. He also states that we need to find a common ground. Commissioner Parker states that there is a great opportunity here and he hopes that the neighbors continue to communicate with the developer. Davilyn Valdez asks about how drainage will be addressed. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that drainage is a Town wide issue. He states that the developer has taken several provisions to redirect water. Commissioner Martinez asks about the size of lots behind the sites. Planning Director states that those lots are roughly .5 or .75 acres. Commissioner Giles states that these homes are reasonable and not luxury homes. The developers are meeting a shortage in the community. Brad Ash states that the R-6 district does allow duplexes and the developer also considered consolidating lots. If the developer was to consolidate lots, those homes would be over 3,000sqft. Aaron Wamsley is concerned that these houses will be too expensive because the one house that is already built there is well over 2,600sqft and $400,000. Davilyn Valdez states that she recognizes that they are trying to build affordable homes, but the 1,500sqft home is still an eyesore because of the vertical distance. Commissioner Maez states that it is not our place to say what type of home they can build. Commissioner Parker states that there is still a landscape code that the developer must adhere. Mr. Wamsley asks if there is a back variance. Planning Director states that an R-6 district has a back setback of 10ft. Ms. Valdez states that there is still concern on the overall size of the homes and that working with the geography in this location is difficult. Commissioner Giles moves to approve the front yard setback variance application, allowing a reduction from 25ft to 15ft for lots 27-30 of block 1 and lots 15-19 of block 4 for the Town of Pagosa Springs, Mesa Heights West subdivision. Commissioner Parker seconds. Unanimously approved. Brad Ash states that neighbors can stop by his office fro any further questions. Commissioner Maez states that he would like to have those homes further away from his backyard than the sidewalk.

DRAFT

VI. Public Comment

A. *Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda:* None Received

VII. Reports and Comments

A. Staff Report_ Projects, Updates and Upcoming Development Applications: Historic Preservation Board meeting February 18, 2016 discussed sandwich board signs and a survey. Sandwich board signs are currently allowed with a permit. Staff is planning to reach out with businesses prior to amending the code to prohibit these signs from the ROW. Lindsey Smith was elected vice-chair and Peggy Bergon was elected as the chair. Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses various tax credit opportunities for businesses to take advantage of. The HPB is currently creating a themed calendar for historic preservation month activities. The Board is currently looking for speakers for presentations during historic preservation month.

B. Planning Commission – Comments, Ideas and Discussion: Two rivers gravel pit has a through town route. The Town wants to ensure deliveries don't come down 8th Street currently. The number of trips through the downtown will be minimized by thoroughly looking at other routes. The upcoming 8Th Street project will need to accommodate these truck weights. The gravel pit will be a great benefit to our community. Commissioner Martinez asks about other pits in Archuleta County. There aren't really any full-scale operations. The Town Council moved the Wal-Mart hearing to an April 14 date at 6:00 PM. Public notification will be mailed at least 15 days prior to this meeting. This is an appeals hearing and the public will not be permitted to comment. This hearing is strictly for the interpretation of the Planning Director's interpretation of the code. If found that the Director's ruling was correct, Wal-Mart can appeal to a district court. The Planning Director has received two plans to modify the lights for some shielding. Waterworks Facility was not awarded and SHF grant in our last attempt. Associate Planner Rachel Novak is currently rewriting the application and will submit for a draft review prior to a final submittal on April 1, 2016. Rumbaugh Creek Bridge is currently undergoing an RFP to get out bidding for contractors. Commissioner Giles asks about the 5th Street Bridge. The Town Council is holding a work session next week at 5:00 PM, March 17th. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the volume of traffic is an issue at this location and this bridge would a reasonable solution on 5th Street. If a bridge was to be built on 2nd Street instead, it would require a new traffic light and would cause traffic to be let out onto San Juan Street. If a bridge was to be built on 6th Street, we would be dealing with a flood plain issue and the cost would easily triple in scale. There are many future benefits to this bridge for the community. Commissioner Giles asks when the bridge could be built. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that it has to go through due process. The developer has the right to build or not build the bridge. It is more reasonable to work with the developer to ensure this project gets completed. The town has motivation to secure this property for the creation of the bridge because we will need a bridge in the future.

C. Upcoming Town Meetings Schedule

VIII. Adjournment: Commissioner Parker moves to adjourn. Commissioner Martinez seconds. Unanimously approved.

_____

Commission Chair Ron Maez

DRAFT

Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments & Design Review Board
Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.

Town Hall, Council Chambers, 551 Hot Springs Boulevard, Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

I. **Call to order / Roll Call:** Commissioner Maez calls the meeting to order at 5:30 PM. Present were Commissioners Parker, Giles, Martinez, and Adams. Also present were Planning Director James Dickhoff and Associate Planner Rachel Novak.

II. **Announcements:** NONE

III. **Approval of Minutes**

A. *Approval of the March 8, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes*:
Commissioner Maez tables this until the next meeting.

IV. **Public Comment**

A. *Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda:*
None received.

V. **Design Review Board**

A. Application for Major Design Review for Pagosa 322 Harman Park Drive. (Public Hearing / Quasi-Judicial Matter): Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses the Pagosa Fun Park application. The conditional use permit was approved for this project. The majority of the properties are mixed use within the vicinity of the application site. The applicant changed the scope of their project from the cancelled March 23rd meeting. Staff received a revised permit application on March 17th. Today is for the Major Design Review of the application and the zoning does allow the uses suggested. The building cannot exceed 35ft to the mid-span and an additional 6ft for a maximum of 41ft overall. The proposed development suggests a maximum height of 36 ft and a 60ft setback off the road. The development meets all setback and height requirements. It is the Planning Director's opinion that the paintball netting does not obstruct the views nor does it pose a visual distraction to the development. Art Dilione and Bob Hart are the applicants and they present their major design review to the board. Art Dilione discusses the overall site design. He states that they have added a new sidewalk, a graded swale for better drainage and a retention pond that ties into the existing drainage. Commissioner Giles asks about parking and suggests that this development will be very successful. He asks if there will be emergency parking available? Art Dilione states that they are working on arrangements with a nearby church for overflow parking. Commissioner Giles asks how these discussions are going. Bob Hart states that they have contacted the church, but nothing has been finalized. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that it was reasonable for the applicants the start off with the suggested 25 number of spaces if they can arrange parking accommodations with the nearby church. He also states that this is appropriate because it is likely most people will be arriving in groups per vehicle or dropped off by parents and not individually. Commissioner Martinez raises concerns for snow storage. She states that they are supposed to have 1 sqft for every 2 sqft of parking. The applicants are in compliance for this with their revised plans. Commissioner Adams asks about discussion with the HOA. Art Dilione states that these discussions are going well and the applicants have attended a number of meetings. He states that the HOA is ready to approve their application. He also states that they will have a written agreement between them and the Harman Park HOA. Planning Director James Dickhoff addresses the site's drainage and that the

DRAFT

applicants will need to direct water, control erosion, and silt after development and during construction. After reviewing the drainage plan, Planning Director James Dickhoff addressed some drainage easements within the property. He suggests that this falls onto the HOA so that it corrected appropriately. Commissioner Parker asks about drainage to the retention pond. Art Dilione shows the board how the site will drain water. He states that it's a relatively small amount of drainage to accommodate. Commissioner Parker states that they are only at 40% of maximum capacity and states that this may be a problem once they max out. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the retention pond was sized for maximum build out of these Harman Park lots, but is waiting on a confirmation of this. The pond is 43 cubic feet and Planning Director James Dickhoff is working with the engineer to verify this. Commissioner Adams asks about the size of the retention pond. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the applicants are providing more than the minimum requirements for drainage with the retention ponds. Planning Director says that fire hydrants will be assessed based on the full build-out of the site. Bob Art states that the building will also have sprinklers inside for safety. He also states that there aren't any designated wetlands on the site. Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses access and traffic through the site. He says that the roadways and intersections were designed based on full build-out of Harman Park and there is potential to connect to downtown. Commissioner Parker states that the number of parking spots is still a concern. He suggests that people may park on the street. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the applicants must show over-flow parkers where to park if the lot is full. The applicants are required to supply one tree for every eight parking spaces. Parking lot landscaping is meant to breakup the asphalt parking lot and could include landscaped spaces or bulb outs. Exterior lighting has not been suggested by the applicants as of yet, but Planning Director James Dickhoff will review these additions as they are presented to staff. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the applicants are required to provide connectivity to their site and says this could tie into Piedra Road and Harman Park Hill phased trail segments. There is a pedestrian trail easement on the north side of the property as well. The building is fairly large and has 30% corrugated metal, in addition to siding and a stone base. As the building is large, Planning Director James Dickhoff suggests the applicants to off-set the roof. Commissioner Martinez states that the east facing wall is too plain. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that building designs need to be four sided. Commissioner Adams asks bottom line if it meets the Town's code. Planning Director James Dickhoff states no because of the roof line and the east facing wall. Commissioner Parker suggests that breaking up the roof line could prove to be beneficial to the laser tag area as visual interests. Art Dilione states that it would be easier to manipulate the interior than adjust the roof line. He says that they will work with staff on this issue. Commissioner Adams asks about adding hips to the roof to break up the roof line. Bob Hart states that it is a metal building and the snow coming off the roof was also taken into consideration. Commissioner Parker says the more trees the applicants can save, the better because the building is so large. Commissioner Martinez asks about the difference between a hip and a dormer. Commissioner Adams demonstrates the difference. Commissioner Giles suggests a hip or dormer with fake windows. Bob Hart states that they would need to look at the costs. Commissioner Giles states that the building is crisp and clean, but rules are rules and they must adhere to the code. Commissioner Parker asks about a minimum for the number of trees on the property. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that he has met with arborist professionals on how best to preserve the trees from paintballs. The applicants state that they are going to wash the impacts trees once a week. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the arborist professional recommended 4-6 inches of mulch around the impacted trees to dissipate the paint into the ground. He also suggested some sort of possible screening for maximum protection around the base. Bob Hart states that there are already a lot of pine needles there, but will look to include more as needed. Art Dilione states that he doesn't want to be held to a weekly requirement if the natural weather can take care of this issue. Bob Hart states that they intend to repurpose the trees taken down during the construction process as blinds in the paintball arena. Commissioner Adams asks about the possibility of a group sign instead of just a sign for this business. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that he will mention this to the HOA. Commissioner Parker asks about the positive drainage in the parking lot and freezing in winter. Planning Director James Dickhoff suggests a raised sidewalk and will work with the applicants on this. Commissioner Adams asks about the washing of the trees trunks and striking this from the recommendations. Planning Director James Dickhoff says yes, this

DRAFT

item can be removed. Commissioner Adams asks about the agreement with the HOA and shared parking. Art Dilione says that the approval of the conditional use permit was to include communication with the Harman Park HOA. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that the board cannot direct the HOA rules or direct them how to govern. Commissioner Parker asks about removal of the paintball netting during winter. Art Dilione states that all of the netting will come down during the winter months. Commissioner Adams asks about having the 4-6 inches of mulch reach the drip line. Planning Director James Dickhoff states yes, this would be to the drip line. Commissioner Parker is concerned about the number of trees on the property and wants to make sure as many are saved as possible. The applicants state that they have positioned the development in such a way that a minimal numbers of overall trees will be removed. Planning Director James Dickhoff states that trees do not qualify to break up the roof line. Commissioner Martinez asks about continuing this until next meeting. Commissioner Parker has three main concerns parking lot, sidewalks, and the roof line. Commissioner Parker moves to continue this public hearing for 322 Harman Park Drive until April 26, 2016. Commissioner Martinez seconds. Unanimously approved.

VI. <u>Public Comment</u>

A. *Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda*:

None received.

VII. <u>Reports and Comments</u>

A. Staff Report_ Projects, Updates and Upcoming Development Applications.
B. Planning Commission – Comments, Ideas and Discussion.
C. Upcoming Town Meetings Schedule

VIII. <u>Adjournment:</u> Commissioner Parker moves to adjourn. Commissioner Martinez seconds. Meeting adjourns at 7:00 PM.

_____

Commission Chair, Ron Maez

DRAFT

V. Design Review Board:

A. Continued Public Hearing, Major Design Review Application for the Pagosa Paint Ball Park located at 322 Harman Park Drive. (Public Hearing / Quasi-Judicial Matter).

Project Location:	322 Harman Park Drive
Property Zoning:	Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C).
Nearby Land Use/Zoning:	Zoning to the South: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C). Zoning to the East: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C) on undeveloped lot. Zoning to the West: Open Space (OS) and Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C). Zoning to the North: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C).
Property Owner #1:	Janice Scott
Applicant:	Pagosa Paintball, LLC., Doing Business as "Pagosa Fun Zone"
Representatives:	Art Dilione and Bob Hart
Pre-Application Conference:	The applicant has met with the Town Planning Department a number of times in their preparation of submitting an application for Major Design Review.
Application Received:	The applicant originally submitted an application on February 25, 2016 and then decided to pull the application as the scope of the project increased to include a larger building to accommodate additional indoor activities. On March 17, 2016, the Town Planning Department received a revised Major Design Review Application. Additional revisions were received on April 11, 2016 and then again on April 22, 2016.
Public Hearing Notifications:	Published public notice in the Sun Newspaper occurred on March 24, 2016. Town Hall posted public notice was posted on March 18, 2016. Neighborhood public notifications were mailed on March 24, 2016. Property posted public notice was posted on-site on March 18, 2016.
Additional Permits:	Pursuant to Ordinance 834, Conditional Use Permit to conduct outdoor recreation business, Pain Ball Park at 322 Harman Park Drive, Approved by Planning Commission on February 9, 16.
PC Action:	Review of Major Design Review application and determination regarding compliance with the Town's Land Use Development Code.

BACKGROUND

On April 12, 2016, the Design Review Board conducted a Public Hearing on the Major Design Review application, and decided to continue the hearing on April 26, 2016, for a final determination. Since then, staff has met with the applicant to address some of the items addressed at the April 12th public hearing.

The applicant intents to address a number items based on comments from the April 12th hearing, during the continued hearing on April 26th.

Staff had provided a full analysis of the proposed development at the April 12 meeting. Following are items the applicant has provided additional details, with staff's comments underlined.

a. ***LUDC 6.7.A.5: Pedestrian Environment:***
a. Site design shall locate pedestrian routes connecting residential, recreational, and commercial uses to minimize contact with normal vehicular traffic. This can be achieved by designing crossings at traffic stop points, and/or by announcing crossings with signage, pavement changes, and landscape features.
b. Pedestrian use can be increased by the addition of amenities such as benches, drinking fountains, planters, trash receptacles, path lighting, and bicycle racks.
c. When existing sidewalks, curbs, gutters, or other public improvements have deteriorated, the development shall be required to replace and/or repair the public amenities.
d. New development required to install sidewalks may be assessed an in lieu fee for pedestrian improvements, as determined appropriate by the Director and Town Engineer, to mitigate the construction of certain pedestrian improvements.
e. When sidewalks exist or are proposed, new development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.
f. Construction of and/or land dedication for pedestrian improvements may be required pursuant to the subdivision/development regulations and/or development improvement agreement.
~ The applicant has not provided connectivity to the existing sidewalk network within the development. There is an approximate 175 lineal foot section along the TOPS owned open space parcel that is void of any sidewalk. With the staff recommended requirement to provide a shared parking agreement with the neighboring property due to the alternative parking calculation proposed, and the nature of the expected youth clientele, staff believes sidewalk connectivity is very important to ensure pedestrians are not forced to walk in the street to access to development and business.
~ ADA access to the arena viewing area has not been provided. Staff recommends requiring a hard surfaced access to the Paint Ball Arena viewing area.
~ Perimeter sidewalks in the Parking lot are separated with a vertical curb, however, without parking blocks, vehicles can pull forward to the curb, and have the front end of the vehicle hanging over the sidewalk and effectively blocking 3 feet of the width of the sidewalk, which would encroach into the accessible width of access. Staff realizes there is benefit to not have parking blocks due to plowing operations, however, the potential for encroaching into the ADA access width will be an issue.

b. LUDC 6.7.B: Building Design:

1. Building massing and form. *Unless otherwise provided in this Land Use Code, building form may vary widely, as long as certain features of building form are considered:*

a. Within the development, variability in size and shape of buildings shall occur.

b. Incorporating human-scaled features at the ground level, referred to as "differentiation of ground level," will help to encourage pedestrian use. Examples are: articulated entries and windows, canopies, arcades, recessed entries, changes in color, material, or texture.

c. Façade modulation shall be utilized to reduce the apparent bulk of a large building, where applicable.

~ The applicant proposes the installation of shed roofs along the perimeter of two sides of the building, gable roof over main entrance to break up the facades. There are no roofs planned along the east building elevation.

~

d. Large, unbroken expanses and long, continuous rooflines shall be avoided.

~ The applicant proposes the use of 4 roof cupolas to break up the roof expanse.

2. ***Exterior building materials.***

a. Unless otherwise provided in this Land Use Code, a wide range of exterior building siding materials is acceptable, including, but not limited to wood, brick, stone, (metal) and stucco.

b. Materials appearing to derive from local natural settings, such as timber and native stone, are strongly encouraged.

c. The use of multiple exterior siding materials, siding textures and/or architectural wall features is required.

d. Metal may be used on the exterior of buildings for architectural features. Metal may be used as an architectural feature covering no more than thirty-five (35) percent of any building facade, unless the decision-making body determines that additional metal in the design creates a high-quality or unique building design that meets the purpose and intent of the standards in this section. Metal roofs are allowed and are exempt from the limitation on percentage of metal.

e. Wainscot treatments are encouraged and should generally be a minimum of three (3) feet in height, not to exceed four (4) feet in height.

f. Vinyl and plastic may be considered for sign letters only.

~ All Building Elevation materials proposed shall be noted on the elevation plans.

3. ***Architectural style.*** *The architectural character of new buildings or additions shall complement the architectural character of adjacent existing buildings.*

*4. **Four-sided design.** All building facades shall be designed with a similar level of design detail. Blank walls void of architectural detailing shall not be permitted. Exceptions may be granted for those areas of the building envelope that the applicant can demonstrate are not visible from adjacent development, public rights-of-way, trails, or the San Juan River.*

***~ The east building elevation** has little design details for consistency and four sided design.*

5. Applicant should provide a note on the site plans indicting the removal of the arena netting in winter months.

6. Provide an offsite parking agreement in conformance with section 6.9.5.B. for a minimum of 12 parking spaces. Staff recommends that after each of the first three seasons of operation, the applicant shall provide the Town with an assessment of the results of the alternative parking calculation and shall provide additional parking lot area if determined to be needed by the planning director. Compliance with these terms shall be required for renewal of business license.

7. The applicant has provided the following design corrections:
   a. The roof height dimension has been displayed on revised building elevation plan sheet.
   b. The applicant has provided a note and designated area for snow storage.
   c. Provided cross section design for the driveway access from Harman Park Drive that includes drainage considerations.
   d. Provided note on landscape plan regarding the application of 4” of pine needle mulch around tree bases in the arena area.
   e. Provided a note regarding the dumpster enclosure plan, stained to match a building color. and the weekly maintenance of washing the tree trunks, indicate the areas to remain in their natural conditions and areas that will be revegetated after construction.

8. Staff recommends the following to be included in the project:
   a. ADA access to the arena viewing area should be provided and indicated on the site plans and Building Permit Plans.
   b. Provide sidewalk connectivity from the terminus of the existing Harman Park Drive sidewalk network and submit design and construction plans to Planning Department.
   c. Defined or indicate the required 10% parking lot landscaping inclusion on revised parking lot and landscaping plans.
   d. Provide storm water runoff protection during construction.
   e. Provide protection to trees identified to be preserved during construction and in perpetuity.

APPLICATION ANALYSIS

Parking and Loading Areas:

The development proposes to install 25 parking spaces with one ADA space. A loading area is not designated or determined to be needed.

Parking Area Layout and Design:

1) *Stall Dimensions:*

- Parking lot vehicle stalls are designed at a 90-degree angle and dimensioned at 10 feet wide and 20 feet long in compliance with LUDC table 6.9-4.
- Parking lot isles are designed for two-way traffic and are dimensioned at a minimum of 24 feet wide in compliance with LUDC table 6.9-4.

2) *Number of Parking Spaces:*

- LUDC 6.9 Off-Street Parking Requirements, generally requires one parking space for each 300 sf of building space and one space for each 3 out recreation occupancy. Using this calculation, the current building sf is 14,592 (49 spaces) and the paintball arena will require one space for each 3 of the proposed 30 occupants (10 spaces) for a total of 59 spaces. The LUDC provides for an alternative calculation, based on sf of specific uses in the building, and further allows 20% reductions for MU-C districts, 10% reduction if Transit stop in near vicinity, reduction of two parking spaces if 10 bike rack spaces are provided, and Director approved reductions based on applicant's proposal.
  The applicant has provided an alternative parking space analysis for their proposal of 25 parking spaces, based on their business model, Families and groups arriving in one vehicle, Parents dropping kids off, employees and living quarters, and limited occupancy levels in portions of the building. In essence, the applicant provided the following analysis (full analysis is included in the applicant's submittal).
  Paint Ball Arena (10): 30 maximum occupants. LUDC allows 1 space/ 3 outdoor recreation occupants.
  Laser Tag Room (8): 24 maximum occupants, and similar to above, 1 space/ 3 occupants.
  Escape Rooms (2): These rooms accommodate group activities and participants are expected to arrive in one vehicle.
  Party Rooms (2): Based on square footage and shared vehicle transportation.
  Food Service Serving Area (2): Based on square footage and employee parking inclusion and that the guests will most likely be there as part of an activity taking place on the property.
  Employees (6): 6 at a time.
  Apartment Living Quarters: This is included in the above employee consideration.
  20% reduction for development within MU-C district (-6):
  This analysis equates to 24 spaces and the applicant proposes 25 spaces, one of which will accommodate ADA van parking. On-Street parking is not allowed on Harman Park Drive.
  Staff is comfortable with this analysis, IF the applicant provides evidence of a shared parking agreement would be considered by a neighboring property owner and that the applicant agrees that when the parking demand exceeds this proposed reduction, the applicant expands the hard surfaced on-site parking lot. H shared parking scenario is reasonable given the neighboring parking lots (both

churches) have very limited use of these parking areas Mon-Sat, however, pedestrian connectivity will be very important for this consideration.

3) *Parking Area Layout:*

- The parking lot surface will be an asphalt pavement surface.
- The Parking lot design provides drainage to sheet flow into adjacent drainage swales. No curb and gutter is proposed.
- Additional design cross sectional details shall be submitted regarding the connection with Harman Park Drive.

4) *Parking Lot Landscaping:*

- LUDC requires one tree for each 5 parking spaces. There are 8 total ponderosa trees that are proposed to be preserved within close proximity to the parking area, that if determined, could be considered as complying with the 5 tree minimum. LUDC 6.10.3.B would indicate these preserved trees would need to be with 20 feet to be considered. It would appear at least 3 trees are within 20 feet of the parking lot, thus two tree islands maybe considered for 2 new trees. se regulations would require the trees to be provided immediately adjacent or within the parking lot, as well as the landscaping or aesthetic treatments.
- LUDC 6.9.4.C requires 10 percent of the parking lot shall be used for landscaping. The applicant has not defined or indicated the 10% landscaping inclusion on the submitted plans.

5) *Circulation Area Design:*

The one access from Harman Park Drive appears to be sufficient based on the number of spaces provided, however, cross sectional design details for this connection are not included in the MDR plan set and shall be provided to the Town.

6) *Exterior Lighting:*

Exterior parking lot lighting is not proposed. If any exterior lighting is installed at a later date, Compliance with the Town regulations is required at that time.

7) *Parking Lot Drainage:*

Parking lot drainage is directed to swales along the asphalt edge and then along the eastern edge of the property to the swale the extends to the detention pond located on lot F.

8) *Loading/Unloading Areas:*

No loading and/or service dock areas are proposed.

Landscaping and Buffers:
15% of the site is required to be landscaped per LUDC section 5.1.2. The applicant has provided a landscaping plan that identifies existing ponderosa trees to be saved and considered as credit towards the 15% requirement, pursuant to LUDC 6.10.3.B.1. and table 6.10-1.

- The project proposes 40 existing mature ponderosa trees (approximately 8" diameter) will be preserved and considered as credit towards the landscaping requirement. Approximately 16 trees will be removed to accommodate the building and arena areas. LUDC 6.10.3.B.
- Staff has met with a local Arborist for an opinion of the preserved trees within the arena area to ensure their long term health. The Arborist suggested applying 4"-6" of wood or pine needle mulch around the base of each tree, to help absorb the paint ball materials and weekly washing of the trunk to remove pain ball materials. The applicant agreed to these terms.

Based on the above, staff believes preserving 40 trees would satisfy the landscaping requirements for the development.

1) *Design Standards:*
   a. *The arena will be mulched and remaining property will be undisturbed in its natural condition.*
   b. *There are picnic benches planned for arena viewing areas.*
2) *Protection of Existing vegetation:*
   40 existing mature ponderosa trees (approximately 8" diameter) will be preserved and considered as credit towards the landscaping requirement.
3) *Maintenance:*
   The applicant has agreed to apply and maintain 4"-6" of mulch and weekly tree truck washing.
4) *Plant Materials:*
   With the exception of the preserved trees, the arena will be mulched and remaining property will be undisturbed in its natural condition. All areas of construction disturbance are required to be revegetated.
5) *Visibility and Security:*
   No visual obstructions or security concerns have been identified.
6) *Landscape Plan Required:*
   The applicant has provided a landscape plan. Staff recommends the applicant add language to the landscape plan that:
   1) *Details the application of mulch around tree bases in the arena and the weekly washing of the paintball paint from the tree trunks.*
   2) *Indicates the areas to remain in their natural conditions and areas that will be revegetated after construction.*

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

Staff recommends the PC consider the Applicants Major Design Review application, Staff's analysis and all public comments as they relate to the Land Use Development Code. Staff has the following alternative actions for the PC's consideration only, as the PC is not limited to these alternative actions.

1. Approve the Pagosa Fun Zone Major Design Review Application submitted by Pagosa Paintball, LLC., finding the application to be in substantial compliance with the Town's adopted Land Use Development Code, contingent on the following items to be included as conditions of approval:
   a. Applicant shall provide a note on the site plans indicting the removal of the arena netting in winter months.
   b. Provide an offsite parking agreement in conformance with section 6.9.5.B. for a minimum of 12 additional parking spaces. After each of the first three seasons of operation, the applicant shall provide the Town with an assessment of the results of the alternative parking calculation and shall provide additional parking lot area if determined to be needed by the planning director at such time. Compliance with these terms shall be required for renewal of business license. If parking along the street becomes an issue, the applicant shall pay for no parking signs approved by the town for installation along the roadway. Signage indicating the location of overflow parking shall be provided.
   c. Provide sidewalk connectivity from the terminus of the existing Harman Park Drive sidewalk network and submit design and construction plans to Planning Department.
   d. Provide ADA access to the arena viewing area and indicate on the site plans.
   e. Provide note on landscape plans indicating tree washing as needed to ensure preservation of trees indicated to be protected and saved, and Provide protection to trees identified to be preserved during construction and in perpetuity.
   f. Defined or indicate the required 10% parking lot landscaping inclusion on revised parking lot and landscaping plans.
   g. Provide a note of the materials proposed in the roof drip line for erosion protection.
   h. Provide storm water runoff protection during construction.
   i. PLUS, ADDITIONAL CONTINGIUENCIES AS DETERMINED BY THE DRB……

2. DENY the Pagosa Fun Zone Major Design Review Application submitted by Pagosa Paintball, LLC., finding the application is not in substantial compliance with the Town's adopted Land Use Development Code.

VI. Public Comment:

A. Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda.

a.	At this time, Public Comment will be accepted for items not included as an agenda item. Interested persons have the opportunity to address the Planning Commission and express your opinions on matters that are not on the agenda or not listed as a public hearing item on the agenda. Public comments on any pending application that is the subject of a public hearing at the current or a future meeting may only be made during such hearing. The total time reserved for Public Comment at each meeting is 20 minutes, unless extended by a majority vote of the Planning Commission and each comment is limited to 2 minutes.

VII. Reports and Comments:

A. Planning Director Report –

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD (HPB)
The HPB is currently finalizing a list of area Historic Preservation Month Activities and Events that include activities hosted by the HPB. The tentative schedule is being completed and will be distributed as soon as it is finalized.
The HPB has distributed a survey within the Historic District regarding sandwich board signs, results will be tallied at the end of April.

NORTH PAGOSA RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL SIDEWALK GRANT AWARDED
We received notification of our Safe Routes to School grant application being awarded approximately $350,000, for the construction of a sidewalk along N. 8th Street and Florida Streets for access to the 8th Street lighted intersection and the Elementary School. Design will occur in 2016 with construction expected in 2017.

200 BLOCK PAGOSA STREET SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
The sidewalk project between 2nd and 3rd streets on the north side of Pagosa Street is expected to be designed for late 2016 construction.

S. 8TH STREET 2016 RE-CONSTRUCTION PROJECT REPAVING PROJECT
Staff continues to work with Davis Engineering in the preparation of design and construction plans in preparation for bidding the project in June for construction this summer. The project will include a 10-foot-wide multi-use non-motorized trail along the western side of the street and on street parking only on the east side in the 200 and 300 blocks.

SPRINGS PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE REPLACEMENT
The design of the Springs Pedestrian Bridge replacement and construction RFP's is underway. We unfortunately did not receive a GOCO grant award, so the Town will pay for the bridge replacement project without financial assistance.

WALL MART
Public Notification has been published for an Appeals Hearing from Wal-Mart on May 10, 2016 at 5pm in Town Hall, regarding the planning director's determination regarding the parking lot lights not complying with town codes. Wal-Mart has stated they are in the process of designing and manufacturing shields for the parking lot lights, and the planning director has received some shielding design and opportunities to provide comments regarding such designs.

EAST PHASE OF TOWN TO PAGOSA LAKES COMMUTER TRAIL
ROW clearance approved by CDOT. Town staff is waiting on approval to advertise for construction bids for construction this summer.

WEST PHASE OF TOWN TO PAGOSA LAKES COMMUTER TRAIL
We are waiting on one trail easement donation, expected very soon. Once we receive this, we will request ROW clearance and approval

RUMBAUGH CREEK BRIDGE UPDATE
We have received the signed grant contract awarding the town $166,000. The RFP is being drafted for the restoration of the bridge in 2016. The Design is being created by the Collaborative, Inc for the restoration and environmental assessments are being conducted soon.

TWO RIVERS GRAVEL PIT
Archuleta County is considering an application for a proposed gravel pit operation 14 miles south on Trujillo Road. The Planning Director has identified a number of issues related to increased heavy truck traffic in residential districts, pedestrian safety and impacts to our Town road infrastructure. The Planning Director has met with the applicant County Planning Department to discuss refining the traffic projects and delivery routes based on delivery zones within our community, as a means to better understand the proposed traffic impacts and to consider an equitable route selection through the community. Town's Legal Counsel has identified potential means of ensuring the town has some sort of financial remediation for damage caused by the proposed increased traffic on Town Roads. Options will come to Town Council in the future for consideration.

B. Planning Commission –

Planning Commission Open Discussion, Ideas and Comments.

C. Upcoming Scheduled Town Meetings.

a.	Next Scheduled PC Meetings: ~ Tuesday, April 26, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting. ~ Tuesday, May 10, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting CANCELLED. ~ Tuesday, May 24, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting.
b.	Next Regular Scheduled Historic Preservation Board meetings: ~ Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 5:45pm in Town Hall. ~ Wednesday, April 27, 2016 at 5:45pm in Town Hall.
c.	Next Regular Town Council Meetings: ~ Thursday, April 14, 2016 at 6pm, Walmart Exterior Lighting Appeals Hearing in Town Hall. ~ Thursday, April 21, 2016 at 5pm in Town Hall. ~ Tuesday, May 3, 2016 at 5pm in Town Hall.
	Next Regular Parks and Recreation Board Meeting: ~ Tuesday, April 26, 2016 at 5:30 pm in Community Center. ~ Tuesday, May 10, 2016 at 5:30 pm in Community Center.