Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments & Design Review Board
Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, June 28, 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 June 14, 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. Major Design Review Application for 52 Village Drive, Axis Health Systems Facility.

VI. Planning Commission

A. Additional Discussions Regarding Minimum Lot Sizes in the R-12 and R-18 Districts.
B. Vacation Rental Zoning Discussions.
C. Zoning Map Discussions.

VII. Public Comment

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

VIII. Reports and Comments

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

X. Adjournment

_____
James Dickhoff, Planning Director

Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments, & Design Review Board

Staff Report – Tuesday, June 28, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

I. Call to Order / Roll Call:

II. Announcements:

A. Heidi Martinez has submitted her resignation for serving on the Planning Commission, effective immediately. Staff would like to recognize her service to the community and note that she has provided valuable perspectives on matters considered by the Planning Commission during her tenure. She will be missed.

Staff would encourage the Planning Commission to solicit other interested individuals to serve a four-year term on the commission. Heidi's departure leaves one open regular member seat and one Alternate member seat.

Staff will advertise for an interested community member(s) to fill the vacancies.

III. Approval of Minutes:

A. June 14, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

Approval of Minutes:	Staff recommends approving Minutes from the June 14, 2016 Planning Commission Public Hearing and/or Meeting, 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, June 14, 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 Maez, Adams, Giles and Parker. Also present were Planning Director James Dickhoff and Associate Planner Rachel Novak.

II. Announcements: NONE

III. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the May 24, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes: Minutes 6.D the entire country "IS" dealing with this problem. Commissioner Giles moves to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Parker 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. Design Review Board: None.

VI. Planning Commission

A. Additional Discussions Regarding Minimum Lot Sizes in the R-12 and R-18 Districts: Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses the minimum lot sizes. He says that Town Council would like to have a work session with the Planning Commission to discuss the smaller lot sizes, vacation rentals, and work force housing. Staff is currently trying to schedule this work session with the Town Council and have a representative from the Affordable Housing Task Force. Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses the potential half lot sizes with alley and street access within the R-12 districts. He recommends 3,630 sqft for these lots instead of a typical 50 ft x 150ft lot. These would be for single family dwelling lots. A 1,770 sqft building footprint would accommodate all of the necessary setbacks, landscaping requirements, and driveway measurements. If on-street parking is available, then only one parking space in the driveway is required. Commissioner Adams discusses that the lots could be split length ways to make the lots 25ft x 150ft. This could be used for town homes. He says that there currently is a Town Home similar to this design on 8th Street. Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses some in Town examples of multi-unit homes. He says that the development of condos due to strict Colorado laws isn't as common as they used to be. Commissioner Adams would like to strategize how to give incentives to developers for building higher density dwellings. Planning Director James Dickhoff discuses changing the R-18 district to an R-20 district. This would have a 2,200 sqft minimum lot size and a 750 sqft building footprint. Commissioner Maez asks how many lots would fit this description within the proposed R-20 district. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that all of the lots should be 50ft x 150ft and eligible for the 4 town home configuration. Commissioner Adams discusses providing incentives for developers to build higher density dwellings. This would only help the Town. Commissioner Maez

DRAFT

asks about how the impact fees would change. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that the 4 town home configuration would have four times the impact fees. He says that the Town needs to adjust these. Commissioner Adams asks if the Town could include the County in these impact fees. Planning Director James Dickhoff says the County had participated in impact fees in the past, but has not participated as of recent. Collected impact fees must be spent within the designated entity within 10 years of the original collection date or the money goes back to the original developer. Commissioner Parker asks about raising the impact fees for larger structures. Planning Director James Dickhoff says this is always a possibility because larger developments tend to increase traffic, wear and tear on the roads, etc. He says that the impact fees are based on square footage. Commissioner Maez says that these fees help maintain the infrastructure. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that there are many different configurations with these smaller lot sizes and the potential R-20 district. Commissioner Giles says that not many people are building condos based upon the current state regulations. He asks would it not make sense to steer this conversation towards town homes. This would be the most user friendly and convenient for all parties. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that this should be left up to the developers. Commissioner Adams asks about how the MU-R districts would change if the density of the R-18 and R-20 districts changes. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that currently MU-R is allowed 16 residential units per acre.

B. Vacation Rental Zoning Discussions: Staff has prepared a spreadsheet of other similar Towns in Colorado with vacation rental zoning restrictions. Planning Director James Dickhoff suggests another work session with Town Council on this issue. Town Council was concerned with the splitting and smaller lots sizes being purchased only for vacation rentals. They would like more information on this prior to making a decision on the smaller lot sizes. Commissioner Giles says he is surrounded by vacation rentals in his neighborhood. He feels the problem with the vacation rentals is finding a balance between smaller homes and larger homes. He feels that the “cuter” these homes look and the nicer the updates are, the more likely they will be rented out. Commissioner Parker says that if he were to purchase an expensive home next to a full time vacation rental, the Town would feel like a skeleton of a Town and your neighbors are constantly changing. Commissioner Giles says that homeowners will make more money on the short term market than the long term market. Commissioner Parker says that if the vacation homes weren’t here, guest would stay at a hotel that could be in Town. A new hotel could accommodate larger families with separate rooms, full kitchen, with more spaces. Commissioner Adams says that the vacation rental market is starting to level off. He says that there are many residents wanting a new living arrangement and not enough homes to go around. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that a large portion of the homes in Town are just second home owners where the owners come here for a few weeks out of the year and then they go home. The market is going to continue to change. Commissioner Adams asks how to possibly limit the number of vacation rentals in Town. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that this would need to be written in the code and enforceable somehow. Commissioner Giles says that the market will level off and fully saturate and would like to see how the market looks after 12 months of leaving the market alone. Commissioner Parker says that with the addition of the hospital he would like to see this housing issue addressed now. Commissioner Maez asks if the commission should address the density and vacation rental issues together. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that it would be best to handle these issues together. Commissioner Adams would like to see all of the current vacation rentals come into compliance. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that there would be an effort to look through all mediums to make sure all vacation rentals come into compliance. Commissioner Giles asks about

DRAFT

talking to a company or an expert to get their opinions on this issue. Commissioner Parker says that the commission needs to direct this effort and to not let the homeowners dictate the process. He asks where to draw the line on at home businesses. Commissioner Maez says that to have a legal at home business you must reside at the residence full time. Commissioner Parker suggests only having vacation rentals in mixed use areas. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that people can have businesses at their primary, full-time residence, but there are restrictions on the types of businesses that may have negative impacts on the neighborhood. He then asks the commission how staff handled the most recent CUP for a vacation rental. The Commission felt it was a good process. Commissioner Giles feels there needs to be a compromise and not to deter homeowners from not renting to anyone. Commissioner Maez asks about why the commission has not heard these CUP's in the past. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that they were administratively approved by him, but felt the neighbors were being left out in this decision. The Commission feels this is a better process and would like to see all vacation rental CUP's in the future. Planning Director James Dickhoff recommends adding some new language to the LUDC for denying a CUP for vacation rentals. Commissioner Adams asks if the Commission could use the Comprehensive Plan. Planning Director James Dickhoff suggests the Commission come up with 5 points for approval of a CUP for a vacation rental. Commissioner Adams asks the Planning Director to facilitate the work session with Town Council. This work session would be one hour. Commissioner Adams asks about the denial criteria. 1. If the majority of residence don't want it there. 2. Have only 2 vacation rentals per block. Commissioner Giles suggests all of the commissioners come up with 5 points to consider. Planning Director James Dickhoff agrees and would like to have this on the next agenda to flush out more ideas to present to Town Council. Ultimately, the goal is to ensure there are no negative impacts on the neighborhoods. Commissioner Parker: neighborhood approval, accept the CUP requirements, have in more intense areas for density, having up to 2 per block in denser areas and 1 per block in less dense areas (less as you get further away from downtown), allow mixed use areas for vacation rentals. Commissioner Giles: license approved, sales tax, fire inspection, neighborhood approval, no restrictions on a number. Commissioner Maez: neighborhood approval, 2 per block, can't exceed house capacity, parking, licensing and compliance with inspections. Commissioner Parker would like to give Town Council as many options and opportunities as possible. He doesn't want to see dark neighborhoods and have a vibrant downtown area. Commissioner Maez agrees that they need to provide Town Council with as many options as possible. Planning Director James Dickhoff would like a substantial list that will make the work session as productive as possible and hone the direction of this discussion. Commissioner Parker emphasizes his concern for finding a balance. The Commission decides to table this item until the 28th meeting until more research can be obtain.

C. Zoning Map Discussions: Commissioner Adams says that putting vacation rentals in an overlay district would be a good idea. Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses his concerns of the current zoning map. Commissioner Adams asks how the owners of properties with no interest in changing the zoning get on board with this change. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that this would be a discussion between staff and the owners and how it's to their benefit. The Commission would like to have staff provide a list of properties in need of a zoning change. Commissioner Adams would like to see the R-6 Hermosa Street neighborhood have an increased density. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that the Comprehensive Plan update is this year and these types of questions would be flushed out in work sessions. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that there have been some zoning changes since the map update in 2009. He also says that the Commission would bring any recommendations to Town Council first and then he would contact property

DRAFT

owners. Planning Director James Dickhoff feels that the Hermosa Street area would need to come out of the Comprehensive Planning process and would provide the justification for changing the zoning. Commissioner Adams asks if the Comprehensive Plan comes first or zoning changes. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that the Comprehensive Plan would come first. Commissioner Maez would like more research on the Hermosa Street rezoning. The Commission discusses various Town parcels in need of rezoning. Commissioner Maez feels that all of the HWY 160 properties should be MU-C and MU-TC. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that these properties could be backed with MU-R. The uptown property, 6th street property and the 14th/15th street for consideration in a rezone.

VII. <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

VIII. <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

<u>Adjournment</u>: Commissioner Parker moves to adjourn at 8:36PM. Commissioner Giles seconds. Unanimously approved.

_____

Commission Chair, Ron Maez

DRAFT

V. Design Review Board:

A. Major Design Review Application for a 10,200 sqft Health Services Facility at 52 Village Drive. (Public Hearing / Quasi-Judicial Matter).

Project Location:	52 Village Drive
Property Zoning:	Commercial (C).
Nearby Land Use/Zoning:	Zoning to the South: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C). Country Center shopping center and vacant lot. Zoning to the East: Commercial (C). Lot Currently vacant. Zoning to the West: County Planned Unit Development. Currently, Shang Hi Restaurant, Real Estate Office and the Fire Station. Zoning to the North: County Planned Unit Development. Lot currently vacant.
Property Owner #1:	Southwest Colorado Health Center, dba AXIS Health Systems.
Applicant Representative:	Jeff King
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 submitted an application on June 10, 2016 with drainage report and plan provided on June 17, 2016.
Public Hearing Notifications:	Published public notice in the Sun Newspaper occurred on: June 16, 2016 in the Too Late to classify section and June 23, 2016 in the public notice section. Town Hall posted public notice was posted on June 13, 2016. Neighborhood public notifications were mailed on June 13, 2016. Property posted public notice was posted on-site on June 13, 2016.
Additional Permits:	No additional Land Use permits required. The applicant has requested an excavation permit that will be administered administratively.
PC Action:	Review of Major Design Review application and determination regarding compliance with the Town's Land Use Development Code.

BACKGROUND

<u>The LUDC section 2.4.6 reviews Major Design Review applications:</u>

2.4.6. DESIGN REVIEW

A. Purpose:
The purpose of the design review process is to ensure compliance with the development and design standards of this Land Use Code prior to the issuance of a building permit or concurrent with other required permits, and to encourage quality development reflective of the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

B. Applicability:
Design review is required for:
1. All new commercial and mixed use development;
2. All new multi-family residential development including condominiums, townhomes, and apartments;
3. Any change of use from one primary use classification to another (for example, residential use to commercial use);
4. Any expansion of existing development, not including single-family, that results in a change to a building footprint of more than 5,000 square feet; and
5. All publicly owned and operated buildings.

C. Types of Design Review:
1. Administrative Design Review
The following types of projects may be approved by the Director through the Administrative Design Review process:
a. Any expansion of existing development, not including single-family, that results in a change to a building footprint of at least 1,000 square feet but less than 5,000 square feet.
b. Duplexes and live/work units.

2. Major Design Review
Any development, with the exception of single-family detached or duplex dwellings, that exceeds the size threshold for administrative design review approval shall require approval by the Design Review Board through the Major Design Review process.

LUDC section 2.4.6.E reviews procedures and processing Major Design Review applications:

Figure 2.4-12 shows the steps of the common development review procedures that apply in the review of applications for Major Design Review. The common procedures are described in Section 2.3. Specific additions and modifications to the common review procedures are identified below.

1. Step 8: Town Issues Decision/Findings.
   a. Design Review Board Review and Decision.
      The Design Review Board shall consider the application and the Staff Report and recommendation from the Director, and approve, conditionally approve, or deny the application, based on the criteria below.
   b. Approval Criteria.
      The Design Review Board may approve a Major Design Review application if all of the following criteria are met:
      (i) The development plan is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and all other adopted Town plans;
      (ii) The development plan complies with all applicable development and design standards set forth in this Land Use Code, including but not limited to the provisions in Article 3, Zoning Districts, Article 4, Use Regulations, Article 5, Dimensional Requirements, and Article 6, Development and Design Standards;
      (iii) The development plan will not substantially alter the basic character of the surrounding area or jeopardize the development or redevelopment potential of the area; and
      (iv) The development plan is consistent with any previously approved subdivision plat, planned development, or any other precedent plan or land use approval as applicable.
   c. After review and approval by the Design Review Board, the applicant shall submit a revised set of final development plans based on any conditions of approval from the Design Review Board.

APPLICATION ANALYSIS

LUDC Article 3, Zoning:

Commercial (C) definition:

> "The C district is intended for retail and office uses. The district includes existing retail centers that provide shopping service to surrounding neighborhoods and the community."

LUDC Article 4, Allowable Uses:

Medical Offices are an allowable use by right in the "Commercial" district.

LUDC Article 5, Dimensional Requirements:

Building Height:

Maximum allowed in the C district is 35 feet to the roof mid-span or 41 to the peak.

The proposed project appears to represent 38-foot height to the highest point of the building roof, complying with the LUDC.

Yard Setbacks:

Minimum setbacks include: Front: 20 feet from secondary roads and Side/Rear: 5 feet.

The project proposes a 135 + foot front setback, a 100 + foot front west side yard setback, a 170 + foot front east side yard setback and a 100 + foot front rear yard setback, complying with the LUDC.

LUDC Article 6, Development and Design Standards:

Flood Damage Protection Regulations:

The subject property is outside of the special flood hazard areas as defined by FEMA FIRM maps, thus requirements are not applicable to this project.

Site Development Standards:

Construction Erosion Control:

State of Colorado "Storm Water Management Permit" requires the submission of Storm Water Management plans to the State of Colorado in conjunction with a State of Colorado Storm Water Management Permit application, for development phases that affect 1 acre or more. Though this project will not affect more than 1 acre, thus not requiring a state permit, storm water protection is required using Best Management Practices (BMP's) for the installation of silt fencing, temporary swales, straw waddles and other devices and procedures for the protection of downstream waters and neighboring properties from storm waters flowing from construction sites, during the project construction activities.

Site Drainage / Drainage Analysis:

Peak Discharge Control is required when the post-development runoff rates exceed historic 100-year base storm runoff rates due to the change in site conditions as a result of the development. Adding impervious surfaces (paved parking/roofs/sidewalks/ect..) increases the runoff rate because the moisture runs off these surfaces instead of soaking into the soils.

The engineer has provided a drainage report and plan identifying the drainage flows and detention pond. The design includes segregating the on-site flows from the off-site flows that enter the property. The provide report and plan satisfies the LUDC requirements.

Snow Storage:
LUDC 6.3.3: "Adequate space for snow storage shall be provided. For planning purposes, one (1) square foot of snow storage space is generally necessary for each two (2) square feet of area to be cleared".

A snow storage area was not designated on the site plans. The applicant should provide a designated area on the site plan that formally notes the areas provided or an exhibit and explanation for snow storage areas that indicates the sf to be cleared and the sqft of storage area.

The Parking lot is approximately 22,950, including drive aisles, requiring 11,475 sqft of snow storage area.

Sanitary Sewer:
The applicant has initiated conversations and design considerations with the "Pagosa Area Water and Sanitation District" (PAWSD) for the proposed developments sanitation needs.

Potable Water:
The applicant has initiated conversations and design considerations with Pagosa Area Water and Sanitation district for the proposed development potable water needs.

Fire Hydrants:
Additional review of existing facilities will be conducted by the Fire Code Official (TOPS, Building Official) as part of the building permit application review. Also, the building is proposed to be fire-sprinkled.

Electrical Power Utility:
The applicant has initiated conversations and design considerations with LPEA.

Natural Gas Utility:
The applicant has initiated conversations and design considerations with Blackhills Gas Company (formerly Source Gas).

Sensitive Area Protection:

Slopes:
The subject property is relatively flat in nature, however, it does slope to the NE corner.

Natural Features:
There appear to be two wetland areas on the lot. These are avoided in the design plans and disturbance is required to be avoided and wetlands protected during construction activities.

Areas of Special Flood Hazard:
The subject property is outside of the FEMA FIRM maps for flood hazards.

Areas of sensitive Hazard Areas:
Sensitive Hazard Areas have not been identified on this subject property.

Geologic Hazard Areas:
Geologic Hazards are not identified on this subject property.

Wild Life Hazard Areas:
The Town's Comprehensive Plan includes a "Wildlife Habitat" map. The subject property is within the "Black-Bear and Human conflict Area, as is the entire Town of Pagosa Springs. The subject property is outside any delineated areas for Geese Brooding Concentration, Elk Migration and Osprey Foraging.

Perimeter Fencing:
Perimeter fencing has not been proposed for this development project.

Riparian Setbacks:
There are no Riparian features on the subject property.

Access and Circulation:

Connectivity:
The subject property is currently accessed from Village Drive, a Town owned roadway.

Traffic Generation:
Anticipated traffic generation created by the proposed project will not require a CDOT access permit or other special considerations.

Roadways:
Village Drive is an 80 foot + wide improved ROW.

Roadway Classification:
1) The classification of Village Drive is a Major Collector Roadway More than 2500 Average Daily Trips This roadway is existing and improvements are not required with the increased ADT's expected.

Parking and Vehicular Access:

Private Driveway:
The Private driveway design includes two -way 25-foot-wide accesses from Village Drive. The eastern access aligns with a future access on the south side of Village Drive, per the Town Planning Directors request.

Parking and Loading Areas:

Parking Area Layout and Design:

1) *Stall Dimensions:*
   - Parking lot vehicle stalls are designed at a 90-degree angle and dimensioned at 9 feet wide and 20 feet long in compliance with LUDC table 6.9-4.
   - Parking lot isle is designed for two-way traffic and is dimensioned at 24'-0" wide. The LUDC indicates a minimum of 24 feet wide for compliance with LUDC table 6.9-4
2) *Number of Parking Spaces:*
   - *Table 6.9-1 indicates a professional office building at* 10,278 sqft of building space requires 1 space for each 300 sqft of building, equating to a minimum of 35 spaces are required.
     The applicant proposes 60 total spaces that includes:
     Three HC spaces will be provided (minimum 1 per 25 spaces is required).
     Two oversized parking spaces (11'-0" wide x 24"'-0" deep) are also provided.
   - Section 6.9.3.D addresses maximum parking spaces shall not exceed 125 percent of the minimum required (equates to 44 spaces). The applicant should provide an analysis justifying exceeding the maximum number of spaces are an optimal and needed number of parking spaces. Number of anticipated employees and patients for example.
3) *Parking Area Layout:*
   - The parking lot surface will be an asphalt pavement surface.
   - The Parking lot design provides with curb and gutter to direct drainage on the surface to the detention pond.
4) *Parking Lot Landscaping:*
   - LUDC requires one tree for each 5 parking spaces. 60 spaces = 12 trees.

   The applicant has provided 5 trees within the parking lot area and has retained one existing tree in the near vicinity of the parking lot. A minimum of an additional 6 trees within the parking lot should be provided.
   - LUDC 6.9.4.C requires 10 percent of the parking lot shall be used for landscaping.

   The Parking lot is approximately 22,950 including drive aisles. 10% minimum = 2,295 sqft for parking lot landscaping. The applicant has provided approximately 2,300 sqft of landscaping immediately adjacent to and within the parking lot.
5) *Circulation Area Design:*
   Two 25'-0" wide accesses from Village Drive are proposed.
   Pedestrian connectivity from the public sidewalk shall be provided.
6) *Exterior Lighting:*
   Exterior parking lot lighting is proposed. The applicant has provided a cross sectional view demonstrating the useful light area and spill light area.

The applicant should also provide a cross sectional view that demonstrates the line of sight to the light source (bulb or LED board) demonstrating the light source will be completely shielded from view from the property line at a 5'-0" height.
All exterior lighting shall be inspected after installation to confirm LUDC section 6.11 compliance. All light sources shall be completely concealed so as not to be visible from off site.

7) *Parking Lot Drainage:*
Parking lot drainage is conveyed on the surface via curb and gutter to the designed detention pond.

8) *Loading/Unloading Areas:*
A service / loading area is not proposed.

Sidewalks, Multi-Use Paths and Trails:

1) Sidewalks along Village Drive do not currently extend to this property. The applicant will provide a public sidewalk improvement along their property, for future connectivity.
2) Internally, pedestrian paths are provided around the building.
The Davis Engineering plans show a pedestrian path connection from the Public Sidewalk, however, the architectural plans do not show this cone action. The applicant should the sidewalk connection in the architects site plan to ensure consistency and installation.

Commercial and Mixed-Use Design Standards:

1) *Site Layout:*
The proposed development is a new development on a vacant 2.62-acre lot.
2) *Building Orientation:*
Orientation has the main entrance, both vehicular and pedestrian, on the south side.
3) *Pedestrian Environment:*
The applicant has provided an exterior pedestrian siting area at the main building entrance.
4) *Building Design:*
The proposed 10,278 square foot building design has provided:
   a. Walls contain no more than 35% metal siding on each facade.
   b. Wall modulation is proposed and provided on all 4 sides.
   c. The roof line has been broken with a number of roof angles of differing heights.
   d. Architectural style is appropriate for the area.
   e. Four sided design has been provided.
5) *Building Materials:*
LUDC section 6.7.3.B.2 supports the use of a wide range of building materials, including but not limited to: wood, brick, stone and stucco.
Proposed exterior building materials include the use of:
   a. Metal wall Siding / Wainscoting.
   b. Horizontal lap siding.
   c. Cultured stone columns.

d. Stucco.
e. Complementary colored materials.
f. Wood post details.
g. Raised Seam Metal Roofing.
h. Ect…

6) *Architectural Style:*
Staff believes the structure complies with LUDC 6.7.B.3, "Architectural style compliments the character of the adjacent existing buildings".

7) *Four-Sided Design:*
Four sided design has been provided.

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 locations and plant species as well as mulched areas and re-vegetation after construction.

1) *Design Standards:*
Living plants and cobble rock is proposed in most planting areas.
2) *Protection of Existing vegetation:*
6 existing mature ponderosa trees are proposed to be saved and preserved.
3) *Maintenance:*
The property owner is required to maintain all plantings associated with the plan submitted and approved by the DRB. An Irrigation system does not appear to be proposed.
4) *Plant Materials:*
Plant species and materials are called out on the landscape plan.
5) *Visibility and Security:*
No visual obstructions or security concerns have been identified.
6) *Landscape Plan:*
The applicant has provided a landscape plan for the DRB's consideration.

2.62 acre (114,127.2 sqft) lot size. The developed area is approximately 69,000sqft. 15% of the developed area equates to 10,350 sqft.
The applicant proposes landscaped areas include between the building and the parking lot and adjacent to the parking lot, equating to approximately 7,350 sqft with an additional 8,100 sqft of area proposed for revegetation with wildflower seed mix. 45,000 sqft of the lot will be undisturbed.

Buffering and Screening:

1) *Loading and Service Areas:*
No loading areas incorporated into building design.
2) *Mechanical Equipment:*

Mechanical Equipment has not been indicated on the building elevation or site plan. The applicant should provide the proposed location for mechanical equipment and appropriate screening buffering plan for such. An illustration will be required to ensure equipment is screened and design consistency with the building.

3) *Dumpsters and Trash Storage Areas:*
The applicant has provided a trash enclosure location. Design details should be provided to ensure consistency with the development.

Exterior Lighting Plan:

1) *Light Sources Shielded from View:*
The applicant has provided a cross sectional view in site plan sheet A-1, however, a more detailed cross sectional illustration should be provided that demonstrates the light source will be completely shield from view from off site (at a point 5" vertical at the property line).
The visibility of the light source will be inspected for compliance after fixture installation.

2) *Foot Candle calculations:*
The applicant should provide an illumination plan showing foot candle readings along the property lines, which should indicate no foot candles crossing the property line. The actual foot candle readings will be inspected with a meter for compliance after fixture installation.

Sign Code:

The applicant has submitted a sign plan for a free standing monument sign.

1) *Freestanding Signs: Monument style sign required, up to 100 sq. ft. per side and 20' tall maximum.*
Applicant proposes a monument style sign with approximately 20 sqft of signage per side. Applicant has provided the required 1 foot perimeter landscaping by noting a 2 foot wide perimeter Lavender Planting around the base of the sign structure.

2) *Wall signage:* No wall signs proposed.

Building Code and Building Permit:

1) The applicant has indicated the submission of a building permit following a determination on the developments Major Design Review application DRB public hearing.

Impact Fees:

1) The proposed development is subject to Impact fees pursuant to LUDC article 10.
50,000 sqft new Industrial building square footage. The fee can be deferred over 10 years, with annual payments at 3% interest.

	Roads	Reg. Pub Building	Emer Serv Pro	Total
Per 1,000 sf	$1,694.00	$159.00	$741.00	$2,594.00
10,278 sf=	$17,410.93	$1,634.20	$7,616.00	**$26,661.13**

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

Staff recommends the DRB 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 DRB's consideration only, as the DRB is not limited to these alternative actions.

1. Approve the AXIS Health Systems Major Design Review Application submitted, finding the application to be in substantial compliance with the Town's adopted Land Use Development Code, contingent on the following items:

a. The applicant shall provide a snow storage plan or exhibit indicting designated snow storage areas, the square feet to be cleared and the square feet of storage area.

b. The applicant shall provide design details regarding the dumpster/trash collection enclosure.

c. The Applicant shall identify the location of mechanical equipment on the property / building and provide design details regarding screening / buffering as needed.

d. Provide illumination plan indicating foot candle readings around the perimeter of the property and cross sectional views demonstrating complete shielding of light source from the property line. LUDC Compliance will be determined by physical inspection after installation of fixtures.

e. Provide Storm Water Management notes / narrative on the construction plans confirming the requirement for the contractor to incorporate "best management practices" (BMP's) during construction activities and revegetation period.

f. Provide the minimum of 12 trees in the parking lot and add to the landscape plan.

g. Provide a written justification for exceeding the maximum number of parking spaces allowed.

h. Provide private sidewalk connection with public sidewalk represented on engineering site plans on the architectural site plan.

i. PLUS, ADDITIONAL CONTINGIUENCIES AS DETERMINED BY THE DRB……

2. DENY the AXIS Health Systems Major Design Review Application submitted, finding the application is not in substantial compliance with the Town's adopted Land Use Development Code.

VI. Planning Commission:

A. Additional Discussions Regarding Minimum Lot Sizes in the R-12 and R-18 Districts.

BACKGROUND

PLEASE NOTE: This item is for information and brief discussions in preparation for a Town Council and Planning Commission work session.

The Planning Commission had begun discussions on this matter in 2015, with the first recommendation to Town Council **on October 13, 2015**: *"Approved a recommendation to Town Council in support of allowing 3750 S.F. minimum lot sizes for single-family dwellings within the R-12 and the R-18 residential zone districts, if the applicant can provide adequate access and infrastructure."*

To ensure Town council was aware of the proposed LUDC revisions prior to staff drafting an Ordinance for consideration, staff presented the matter conceptually to Town Council **on October 22, 2016** at which time Town Council considered the recommendation from the Planning Commission regarding the allowance of smaller residential lots within the R-12 and R-18 residential districts. Below are the minutes from the Town Council meeting from October 22, 2015.
"New Business Agenda Item V.4: Consideration of Allowing Smaller Residential Lot Sizes in the R-12 and R-18 Districts – Staff has had and continues to receive many inquiries into the concept of allowing smaller single family homes on smaller residential lots. Staff believes there is good reason and merit to consider such a concept, as nationally, average family incomes and family sizes are reducing, not increasing, and there is a national trend to allow smaller lots for smaller homes as well as allowing accessory structure dwelling units (sheds/garages/outbuildings converted into dwelling units). Research has indicated a growing national trend for allowing smaller single family lots and in Colorado, many communities allow 2500 – 3500 sq ft lot sizes in downtown and urban residential districts. The current lot size for single family home is 7,500 on 150'x50' lot. Council Member Bunning asked about set backs, Town Planner said the joining center line would not require the easement set back, perhaps get it down to 7 foot. Council Member Bunning liked the idea, but would like the R-18 to split into three and then condominium the area to assist the center home to have access into the unit. Council Member Alley says it gives options to developers for work force housing. Mayor Volger wants to encourage work force housing and not necessarily restrict vacation rentals but find a good balance. Council Member Lattin said there needs to be restrictions on use including work force housing, she was also concerned about the alleys and development of the alleys. Council Member Schanzenbaker wants to support vacation rentals, but he wants to also support development of work force housing. He would like to look at the flexibility of accessory dwellings. He wants to look to reduce the impact and tap fees which is currently over $13,000 per dwelling unit. Staff has enough information to move forward to bring back a draft ordinance. "

Since then, Staff and the Planning Commission have continued to discuss and fine tune recommendations on the matter.

On November 24, 2016, the Planning Commission considered the input from Town Council and approved the following recommendations for Town Councils consideration:

Minimum Lot Size in the R-18 District

APPROVE a recommendation for Town Council to Approve Amending the Land Use Development Code, Allowing a 2,420 square feet Minimum Lot Size for Single Family Dwellings in the R-18 District.

Minimum Lot Size in the R-12 District

APPROVE a recommendation for Town Council to Approve Amending the Land Use Development Code, Allowing a 3,630 square feet Minimum Lot Size for Single Family Dwellings in the R-12 District.

Accessory Dwelling Units in the R-6 District

APPROVE a Recommendation for Town Council to Consider Amending the LUDC Regarding Increasing the Allowable Density Level in the R-6 District for Accommodating Accessory Dwelling Units.

Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Units

APPROVE a Recommendation for Town Council to Consider Amending the LUDC Regarding Adjusting Impact Fees for Residential Dwelling Units.

Allowable Districts for Short Term Vacation Rental Businesses

APPROVE a Recommendation for Town Council to Consider creating a task force to look into amending the LUDC regarding Short Term Vacation Rental Businesses within the Town of Pagosa Springs. Maez opposed, motion carried.

On February 09, 2016, The Planning Commission again further considered the matter and revised their previous recommendation, unanimously approving:

"A recommendation for the Town Council to approve amending the LUDC to change the minimum lot size, including town homes, in the R-18 district to 2,100 sqft and increase the allowable density to 20 allowable dwelling units per acre, changing the R-18 district to an R-20 district."

On May 19, 2016, Town Council considered two ordinances, one reducing the allowable lot size in the R-12 to 3630 and one reducing the R-18lot size to 2100. "*Council Member Bunning suggested the Town Council be involved in a work session with the planning commission and workforce housing group. Council Member Egan moved to table item Ordinance 846 and 847, Council Member Patel seconded, unanimously approved."*

On June 27, 2016, a worksession is scheduled with the area public utility providers for additional considerations regarding smaller lot sizes, The results of that work session will be presented at the June 28th PC meeting.

RSIDENTIAL USE DEFINITIONS

Definitions:

12.3.1. RESIDENTIAL USES

A. **Household living.** This use category is characterized by residential occupancy of a dwelling unit by a household. Tenancy is arranged on a month-to-month or longer basis (lodging where tenancy may be arranged for a period of less than thirty (30) days is classified under the "Lodging Facilities" category). Common accessory uses include recreational activities, raising of pets, gardens, personal storage buildings, hobbies, and parking of the occupants' vehicles. Specific use types include, but are not limited to:

Dwelling, Duplex

1. **Dwelling, duplex.** A detached house on a single lot designed for and occupied exclusively as the residence of not more than two (2) families, each living as an independent housekeeping unit.

2. **Dwelling, Live/work.** A structure or portion of a structure: (1) that combines a commercial or manufacturing activity that is allowed in the zone with a residential living space for the owner of the commercial or manufacturing business, or the owner's employee, and that person's household; (2) where the resident owner or employee of the business is responsible for the commercial or manufacturing activity performed; and (3) where the commercial or manufacturing activity conducted takes place subject to a valid business license associated with the premises.

3. **Dwelling, single-family detached.** A detached dwelling unit designed to be occupied by not more than one (1) family. This use type includes modular homes, but excludes manufactured (HUD) and mobile factory built homes.

4. **Dwelling, factory built.** Factory built homes shall include the following:

   a. Manufactured (HUD) - b. Mobile Homes – c. Modular Homes –

5. **Dwelling, multi-family.** A dwelling or group of dwellings on one (1) lot containing separate living units for three (3) or more families, but which may have joint services or facilities. Each dwelling unit is designed for occupancy by one (1) family within each unit and is attached by a common wall. The use includes condominiums and apartments.

6. **Dwelling, timeshare.** A residential unit or property containing multiple residential units, in which more than one (1) person has a fractional or interval ownership interest.

7. **Dwelling, townhouse.** A building that has two (2) or more single-family dwelling units erected in a row as a single building on adjoining lots, each unit being separated from the adjoining unit(s) by a fire wall (to be constructed in accordance with Code) along the dividing lot line, and each such building being separated from any other building by space on all sides. Each individual townhouse unit has individual front and rear access to the outside. Townhouse units are typically surrounded by common areas owned and maintained by a property owners association. Each unit is identified by specific title and ownership that includes the ground immediately below the unit. The use includes patio homes and row homes.

RSIDENTIAL DISTRICT DEFINITIONS

3.2. - RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

3.2.1. GENERAL PURPOSES OF ALL RESIDENTIAL ZONE DISTRICTS

The residential zoning districts are intended to:

A. Provide appropriately located areas for residential development that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with standards for public health, safety, and general welfare;

B. Ensure adequate light, air, and privacy for all dwelling units with respect to density;

C. Minimize traffic congestion and overloading of public services and utilities;

D. Protect residential neighborhoods from incompatible uses that create excessive noise, illumination, unsightliness, odor, and smoke; and

E. Create a mixture of residential uses and preserve edges and transitions between districts.

3.2.2. AGRICULTURAL/RESIDENTIAL (R-A)

The R-A zone district is intended for agricultural uses and detached single-family residences. The district is intended to provide a transition between Town neighborhoods and surrounding county agricultural/rural residential areas on large parcels of land at a low rate of population density. Land owners may develop large lot single-family residential, or cluster residential units on smaller lots to conserve space, views, agriculture or equestrian land, and other natural features. Clustering should occur near the edges of property close to existing or planned development. Density can range from one (1) unit per five (5) acres, to up to one (1) unit per acre, with more density being allowed proportionately with increased dedication of land for conservation purposes.

3.2.3. RURAL TRANSITION (R-T)

The R-T district is intended primarily for detached single-family residences (and duplexes and patio homes if clustered). The district is intended to provide a transition between Town neighborhoods and the R-A district on large parcels of land with population densities higher than the R-A district, but lower than the R-1 district. Land owners may develop large lot single-family residential, or cluster residential units on smaller lots to conserve space, views, agriculture or equestrian land, and other natural features. Clustering should occur near the edges of property close to existing or planned development. Density can range from one (1) unit per two (2) acres, to up to two (2) units per acre, with more density being allowed proportionately with increased dedication of land for conservation purposes.

3.2.4. TOWN RESIDENTIAL - LOW DENSITY (R-6)

The R-6 district is intended primarily for single-family residences and duplexes. The district should have pedestrian-oriented, connected local streets and sidewalks, as well as accessibility to parks, open space, schools, and other civic activities. The maximum density is six (6) units per acre.

3.2.5. TOWN RESIDENTIAL - MEDIUM DENSITY (R-12)

The R-12 district is intended primarily for single-family residences, duplexes, and patio homes. The district is intended for locations closer to commercial centers and near downtown, and may serve as a transition between higher-density residential areas and lower-density, single-family neighborhoods. The district should have pedestrian-oriented, connected local streets and sidewalks, as well as accessibility to parks, open space, schools, and other civic activities. The maximum density is twelve (12) units per acre.

3.2.6. TOWN RESIDENTIAL - HIGH DENSITY (R-18)

The R-18 district allows the broadest range of residential types, including single-family residences, duplexes, patio homes, and apartments. The district is intended for locations closer to commercial centers and near downtown, and may serve as a transition between commercial centers and lower-density residential neighborhoods. The district should have pedestrian-oriented, connected local streets and sidewalks, as well as accessibility to parks, open space, schools, and other civic activities. Additional private recreational amenities, such as tot lots or garden/courtyards, should be provided in apartment or townhome complexes. The maximum density is eighteen (18) units per acre.

3.3. - MIXED-USE DISTRICTS

3.3.1. GENERAL PURPOSES OF ALL MIXED-USE DISTRICTS

The mixed-use districts are established to:

A. Promote higher-density residential development near and within downtown and commercial centers, and other areas as appropriate;

B. Concentrate higher-intensity commercial and office employment growth efficiently in and around the downtown and other centers of community activity;

C. Encourage mixed-use redevelopment, conversion, and reuse of aging and underutilized structures and areas, and increase the efficient use of available commercial land in the Town;

D. Create pedestrian-oriented environments that encourage transit use and pedestrian access;

E. Ensure that the appearance of residential and nonresidential uses are of high and unique aesthetic character and quality; and

F. Ensure that residential and nonresidential uses are integrated with one another and the character of the area in which they are located.

3.3.2. MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL (MU-R)

The MU-R district is intended to allow for the vertical or horizontal mixing of uses, including some high-density residential. Mixed-use residential is appropriate near activity centers and near major arterial and collector streets. The district should promote self-supporting neighborhoods that contain housing predominantly, but could also include some retail, offices, and light trade. A range of residential housing types, including single-family residences, duplexes, patio homes, apartments, and live-work units, are allowed. A lesser portion of the site area shall be allocated to non-residential uses that are related to the neighborhood.

ANALYSIS

In Preparation for an upcoming work session, staff would like to present additional information for the Planning Commissions consideration. This is for discussion purposes only.
Some examples of current smaller lot sizes for comparisons include the following properties:

1) Koch cottage rental single homes: 318 South 8th Street, Equivalent of 3000 sqft per dwelling unit.
2) CHI Overlook Homes: South 7th Street, Equivalent of 2600 - 3900 sqft per dwelling unit.
3) 4-Plex Rental Apartments: 311 South 7th Street, Equivalent of 1875 sqft per dwelling unit
4) Shelton 4-plex: South 8th Street, Equivalent of 1875 sqft per dwelling unit.

R-12 District:

In essence, 12 units per acre equates to 3630 sqft lot per dwelling unit.

Single family home dwelling units:

~ The current allowable minimum lot size of 7500 sqft , equates to 6 dwelling units per acre, 6 dwelling units less per acre than the current 12 units per acre allowable density.

~ At 3630 sqft minimum lot / dwelling unit (12 dwelling units per acre).

- Two dwelling units could be built on a split 50' x 150' lot, with one accessed from alley and one from street. This configuration may not be available or work for all lots.

Multi-Family (Townhomes/Condominiums/Apartments):

~ The current allowable minimum lot size of 3000 sqft , equates to 15 dwelling units per acre, 3 dwelling units more per acre than the current 12 units per acre allowable density.

~ Staff recommends considering allowing smaller lot and slightly higher density.

~ 2800 sqft minimum lot size (16 units per acre) would be a slight reduction from the existing LUDC allowance of 3000 sqft minimum lot / dwelling unit and would accommodate a 5 unit townhome/condo/apartment complex on two combined 50'x150' lots.

~ 2500 sqft minimum lot size (17 units per acre) would accommodate a three unit townhome/condo/apartment complex on a 50'x150' lot.

R-18 District:

In essence, 18 units per acre equates to 2420 sqft lot per dwelling unit.

Single family home dwelling units:

~ The current allowable minimum lot size of 7500 sqft , equates to 6 dwelling units per acre, 6 dwelling units less per acre than the current 12 units per acre allowable density.

~ 2420 sqft minimum lot / dwelling unit (18 units per acre), would accommodate 3 single family units on the equivalent of a single 50'x150' lot.

~ 2100 sqft lot / dwelling unit (20 units per acre), would accommodate 4 single family units on a single 50'x150' lot. This could be difficult to do on the equivalent of a single 50'x150' lot, however, for unplatted parcels, flexibility with a new lot configuration that could accommodate small homes.

Multi-Family (Townhomes/Condominiums/Apartments):

~ The current allowable minimum lot size of 3000 sqft , equates to 15 dwelling units per acre, 3 dwelling units les per acre than the current 16 units per acre allowable density.

~ 1875 sqft minimum lot / dwelling unit (23 dwelling units per acre).

During the PC discussions, staff presented a number of examples including 311 S. 7th Street, a four-plex on one 50' x 150' lot, equating to 1875 sqft per dwelling unit.
This would provide a rental or townhome/condo ownership scenario.

Mixed Use-Residential District:
~ The MU-R district does not have minimum lot sizes and allows up to 16 dwelling units per acre.

VI. Planning Commission:

B. Vacation Rental Zoning Discussions.

BACKGROUND

PLEASE NOTE: This item is for information and brief discussions in preparation for a Town Council and Planning Commission work session.

In general, Town Council has requested a work session to consider the impacts of the smaller lots proposed for the R-12 and R-18 Districts, as well as discuss how short term vacation rentals could affect the availability of work force housing if the smaller lots are approved.

Here is a link to a recent webinar that may provide some relative information for our future considerations. YouTube Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0DqfSJz5ag4
Ohio APA Chapter Webcast Series: http://www.ohioplanning.org/aws/APAOH/pt/sp/development_webcast

Staff encourages the PC members to conduct some research of their own to present at a future work session with Town Council.

Some possible Vaca rental restrictions / allowances may include:

Work Force Housing Overlay District in some residentially zoned districts that would not allow or limit Vacation Rentals.

Restrictions: limit # per block/area/other in certain zone districts.

Prohibition in certain zone districts: Due to nature of a business.

Market driven demand: Let the market dictate the need for vacation and long term rentals.

Staff will provide more information at the meeting.

VI. Planning Commission:

C. Zoning Map Discussions.

BACKGROUND	The PC recently decided that PC Members would spend some time to drive around and review our current zoning map designations, and bring back comments and observations to share with the PC, regarding current property and area zoning designations. Staff will present a number of properties that seem out of place as far as zoning, at the PC meeting. Some areas discussed at the previous meeting include: Pinecrest Subdivision: PC determined staff will present revisions for consideration. South 7th Street: PC agreed to proceed with rezone the western side of eth southern end of S. 7th to R-12. Village Drive: PC discussed Commercial zoning seemed inconsistent with MU-TC zoning that is adjacent. Hermosa Street: Discussion regarding increasing density, maybe change zoning to R-12, R-18 or MU-R. Goldmine Drive: PC discussed Commercial versus Mu-C district. Trinity Lane: PC discussed Metal Buildings and current Uses South Pagosa Neighborhoods: Maybe consider higher density R-18 district ? Staff will provide more information at the meeting.

VII. 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.

VIII. Reports and Comments:

A. Planning Director Report –

PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD (HPB) UPDATE

1) The HPB has been working with the Archuleta County Fair to incorporate 125th anniversary celebrations, which may include a booth, sponsored music, information and demonstrations.
2) The HPB completed a Historic District Sandwich Board Sign survey, and has reviewed the results in preparation for bringing a recommendation to Town Council.
3) The Movie Series "Into the West" began showing on Thursday, May 19th at the liberty Theater. This is a 6-part series with each part showing on consecutive Thursday's. The shows were free and attendance has been excellent with 40 + in attendance at each showing.
4) The HPB has expressed that the Town needs to be a larger part of the Courthouse Discussions. The Town Council had recently expressed interest in a BoCC work session to discuss the future Courthouse considerations, however, this work session has not yet been scheduled.
5) On May 25 the HPB approved a revised Alteration Certificate for 434 Pagosa Street. The applicant was previously approved to install a privacy wall, however, came back requesting a change from a wall to a fence.
6) The HPB has formed a committee to conduct a public input work session regarding future repurposing considerations for the Water Works Facility property.

The next regular HPB meetings will be held on June 22, 2016 and July 13, 2016 at 5:45 pm in Town Hall.

TWO RIVERS GRAVEL PIT

Archuleta County Planning Commission approved a recommendation for the BoCC to DENY the Two Rivers Gravel Pit application. The BoCC will consider the matter on Tuesday, June 28th at 1:30pm at the County Extension building located at the fair-grounds.

The Town 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, and has generally requested that If the Gravel Pit application is approved, an equitable truck delivery route be approved identifying delivery zones and routes for those zones, as a means to ensure all the traffic does not go through Town Streets only.

WALL MART APPEALS HEARING

The Town Council Appeals Hearing for the Wal-Mart parking lot lighting has been postponed until a later date, TBD, as a resolution appears to be in the works. Staff is working with Wal-Mart to formalize such agreement.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL GRANT

Our Safe Routes to School Infrastructure grant application was fully funded at $346,500. The state received 21 applications with our application scored #4 out of the 7 projects awarded funding.

The Town Project Manager, Scott Lewandowski is currently preparing an RFP for design services to be completed in 2016.

Construction is planned to occur in early 2017.

Following are the financial contributions the Planning Director was able to negotiate and secure for the project: SRTS approved $346,500, The Town Council approved $80,000, the BOCC $10,000 and the School district $3,500, Totaling $440,000.

WATER WORKS FACILITY FUTURE REPURPOSING

The HPB has designated a committee to work on a public input work session regarding the future potential of the Water Works Facility site, including the stone arch bridge. This is being initiated to ensure a full understanding of the site for potential future repurposing and use of the Town owned site. The next committee meeting will be conducted on Friday July 8th at noon in Town Hal.

RUMBAUGH CREEK BRIDGE UPDATE

The Collaborative is running behind in completing our design plans for the bridge restoration project. Staff has provided a deadline of June 22, 2016 for the plans, otherwise we will seek another consultant for restoration plans. The restoration plans require State Historic Fund staff review and approval prior to RFP's being advertised. Once we have the approval from the SHF, we will solicit an RFP for construction services.

TOWN TO PAGOSA LAKES TRAIL, EAST PHASE UPDATE:

This trail segment project has been advertised for construction bids !! Staff will bring the bid abstract to Town Council on July 21st for consideration of awarding the project to a contractor for construction this summer.

TOWN TO PAGOSA LAKES TRAIL, WEST PHASE UPDATE:

After finalizing the Federal Uni-Form Act easement acquisition donations, we have received CDOT Right-of-Way approval and will be submitting final plans for CDOT approval to advertise for construction bids in the coming weeks. As soon as final plan approval is received, we will advertise for construction bids for construction in 2016.

MILL CREEK ROAD ANNEXATION

As part of the Mountain Crossing development approval, 1800 lineal feet of Mill Creek Road will be considered for Annexation to accommodate road improvements required for the development. The item will come before the planning commission in July 2016.

VIII. Reports and Comments:

B. Planning Commission –

Time for Planning Commission Open Discussion, Ideas and Comments.

VII. Reports and Comments:

C. Upcoming Scheduled Town Meetings.

a.	Next Scheduled PC Meetings: ~ Tuesday, July 12, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting ~ Tuesday, July 26, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting
b.	Next Regular Scheduled Historic Preservation Board meetings: ~ Wednesday, July 13, 2016 at 5:45pm in Town Hall ~ Wednesday, July 27, 2016 at 5:45pm in Town Hall
c.	Next Regular Town Council Meetings: ~ Thursday, July 3, 2016 at 5pm in Town Hall (8th Street Bid Award special meeting) ~ Tuesday, July 21, 2016 at 5pm in Town Hall
d.	Next Regular Parks and Recreation Board Meeting: ~ Tuesday, July 12, 2016 @ 5:30pm in the Ross Aragon Community Center ~ Tuesday, July 26, 2016 @ 5:30pm in the Ross Aragon Community Center