



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments & Design Review Board**  
**Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda**  
**Tuesday, September 27, 2016 at 5:30p.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 August 23, 2016 & September 13, 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. Design Review Application for 1921 Eagle Drive, Car Quest Auto Parts Store
- VI. **Planning Commission**

NONE
- 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
- IX. **Adjournment**

---

James Dickhoff, Planning Director



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments & Design Review Board  
Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda  
Tuesday, August 23, 2016 at 5:30p.m.**

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

---

- I. **Call to order / Roll Call:** Commission Chair Maez calls the meeting to order at 5:30PM. Present were Commissioners Adams, and Giles. Also present were Planning Director James Dickhoff and Associate Planner Rachel Novak. Commissioner Parker arrived at 6:05PM.
- II. **Announcements:** NONE
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
  - A. *Approval of the August 9, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes:* Commissioner Adams moves to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Giles 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
- V. **Design Review Board**

NONE
- VI. **Planning Commission**
  - A. *Conditional Use Permit for Placement and Operation of Ice Skating Rink in South Park:* Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses the project for placing an ice skating rink in the winter months at 550 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street. The rink would go over top of the existing courts in the park and a building will be installed to house the ice maintenance equipment and there will also be a skate rental station installed as well. Currently, this will be a temporary installment until a time when the applicants can afford an over roof structure and this location may or may not be considered as a permanent location. The skate rental shack will be either on the north end of the courts (opposite the rink) or on the western side, outside of the fenced area. The proposed equipment shed will be placed on a concrete pad and will need to be heated/insulated. The parks staff supports bringing this building into compliance to match the style of the other buildings within the parks. There aren't any buildings within the parks that are metal, but a deferred compliance has been discussed after a successful skate season. There will be a 20ft shade cloth applied around/over the rink and the support post will be within concrete, which will also be removable. Staff will need to monitor the noise from the lights and general use, but overall this could fall under the Town's construction elements, which allows construction up to 10:00PM at night. The applicant says that this is a trial year at this location, but there is a potential to have this as a permanent installment with an overhead roof. If this location does work, the applicant hopes to do away with the generator for the lights and a quieter option would be installed. The equipment shed could potentially be the bottom third metal and the rest of the siding matches the other materials on the site. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that both Parks and Recreation and the Town Council support this idea. The applicant went door-to-door and placed a door hanger on all properties within 300feet of

the project site, in addition to staff administratively notifying the public as well. There are 6 criteria items that the proposed project must meet and after an analysis, the Planning Director feels that this project meets all 6 criteria items. The Planning Director would like the planning commission to discuss the exterior of the proposed metal shed structure. He also suggests deferring this until next season as this is a trial year and in the long term staff would want to ensure the design criteria is being met. Planning Director James Dickhoff would like to ensure the applicant will keep the area clean as this is within a neighborhood. Any noise or light complaints will be addressed by staff and it is expected the applicant will work with staff on any issues that will arise. Commissioner Maez asks if the restrooms will be in use during the winter months. Planning Director James Dickhoff says no. There will be two portable restrooms on site that will be removed after the season. The floor is opened to public comment. Steven Chaney of the public is concerned about the pickle ball players in the area. He says that they are in support of the ice rink, but he wants to ensure that any permanent structures will not impede their use in the summer months. Commissioner Adams asks which other applicant the commission gave a year to try different items to see if they would work. Planning Director James Dickhoff says the paintball park was given a year to see if their parking arrangement would be sufficient. Commissioner Adams asks how large of a building does the applicant need. The applicant says that it would need to be large enough to house ice maintenance equipment, foam boards, the generators, general storage, etc. All of the labor will be donated for this project. Commissioner Maez feels that the biggest issue is the metal siding on the shed. The applicant agrees that he would like to do it right the first time. Commissioner Maez also would like to see the skate shed on the outside of the courts, but on a trial basis this year he feels that having it be on the courts is appropriate. The applicant also says that if by chance the skate rink does not work well at this location, the shed building could be purchased by the Town and the Parks and Recreation Department could utilize the space. The applicant is anticipating the rink to run from November to February and the ice should be melted by mid April with the court skate shed removed. Planning Director James Dickhoff suggests including the following two items within the motion: D) Remove the skate rental shed from the courts which would be approximately mid April. E) Work with staff on the metal building design to be consistent with the existing metal structure. Commissioner Adams moves to approve a Conditional Use Permit for 550 South 8th Street for the placement and use of South Park for the proposed Ice Skating Rink, with the following conditions: A) The Applicant shall provide daily maintenance of the site to ensure an acceptable visual appearance. B) This Conditional Use Permit is valid for one year. Additional years require an additional Conditional Use Permit. C) The Applicant shall ensure all exterior lighting sources are compliant with the Town's Exterior Lighting Regulations. D) Remove the skate rental shed from the courts which would be approximately mid April. E) Work with staff on the metal building design to be consistent with the existing park structure. Commissioner Giles seconds. Unanimously approved.

## **VII. Public Comment**

A. *Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda:* Commission Chair Maez left the meeting at 6:30PM. He selects Commissioner Adams to act as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

## **VIII. Reports and Comments**

A. *Staff Report\_ Projects, Updates and Upcoming Development Applications:* Planning Director James Dickhoff discusses updates with the Commission. The Town was awarded an SHF grant for restoring

the Waterworks site tanks for approximately \$167,000. The award will be presented to Town Council soon to officially approve the funds. There are plans to extend the Riverwalk through this site, including a new pedestrian bridge to the River Center. Commissioner Parker asks about what other funds are available if the Town accepts the grant. Planning Director James Dickhoff says these funds are solely for restoring the site. It may be best to pursue a public-private partnership for future development. Both the Rumbaugh Creek Bridge restoration and the Waterworks tanks will be bid together for a better price over the winter for construction in the spring. The east phase of the Town to Lakes Trail and the 8<sup>th</sup> Street construction will be starting soon. The west phase of the Town to Lakes Trail is waiting for CDOT approval. The Comprehensive Plan Update is moving forward. The review committee has selected four consultants to interview next week. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that Town Council would like to fill all of their vacant seats before they have discussions on smaller lot sizes with the Planning Commission. He also recommends a mobile work session to really see the Town's boundaries, infrastructure deficiencies, and zoning issues. Commissioner Adams suggests a Tuesday from 2:00PM-5:00PM, possibly on the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Planning Director is finalizing his 2017 budget and ideas for projects to pursue in 2017 should be submitted soon.

- B. Planning Commission – Comments, Ideas and Discussion: Commissioner Giles feels that a light at HWY 160 and HWY 84 could potentially help break up traffic downtown. He also feels that walking on the bridge in front of the museum is dangerous and it's too bad that the proposed pedestrian bridge in that area is so far off. He asks if there is a way to speed up this process. The Planning Director says that the earliest a pedestrian bridge could be installed would be in 2018. Commissioner Giles is also concerned about the general safety at crosswalks. The Planning Director says that the next step would be an expensive "Hawk System" which is basically a stoplight at the crosswalks. He recommends a flag program and better interpretive signage for crossers before that option is considered. Commissioner Adams is concerned about the vacant buildings that will be taken with the McCabe Creek project. He suggests a few signs that tell people what the project is and that these buildings will be demolished. Commissioner Adams also suggests a "Pride in Pagosa" program to address the Town's gateways and roadways in terms of maintenance and weeds.
- C. Upcoming Town Meetings Schedule.

**IX. Adjournment:** Commissioner Parker moves to adjourn. Commissioner Giles seconds. Unanimously approved. he meeting adjourns at 7:15PM.

---

Commission Chair, Ron Maez



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments &  
Design Review Board**

**Regular Scheduled Meeting Agenda**

**Tuesday, September 13, 2016 at 5:30p.m.**

Town Hall, Council Chambers, 551 Hot Springs Boulevard,

Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

---

- I. **Call to order / Roll Call:** Commission Chair Maez calls the meeting to order at 5:30PM. Present were Commissioners Adams, Parker, and Giles. Also present were Planning Director James Dickhoff and Associate Planner Rachel Novak.
- II. **Announcements:** NONE
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
  - A. *Approval of the August 23, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes:* The minutes were not included the meeting packets and will be presented at the next regularly scheduled meeting. This has been tabled.
- IV. **Public Comment**
  - A. *Opportunity for the public to provide comments and to address the Planning Commission on items not on the Agenda:* NONE
- V. **Design Review Board**

NONE
- VI. **Planning Commission**
  - A. *Election of Planning Commission Vice Chair:* Commissioner Adams motions to nominate Commissioner Parker as the Vice Chair. Commissioner Giles seconds. Commissioner Parker declines as he cannot commit to this position. Commissioner Giles motions to nominate Commissioner Adams as the Vice Chair. Commissioner Parker seconds. Unanimously approved.
  - B. *Recommendations on Filling Vacant Planning Commission Regular and Alternate Member Seats:* All initial letters of interest have been withdrawn.
  - C. *Recommendation Regarding Awarding Comprehensive Plan Update:* Staff advertised for updating the Town's Comprehensive Plan and received six proposals. The review committee interviewed four teams and staff called all of the references provided. It came down to two teams: SE Group and Sites Southwest. Overall, the committee selected SE Group as the consultant for this project. SE Group had the strongest public involvement outline and included many updates to the planning commission and Town Council. Their references came back great and they specialize in small, mountain Town's. Commissioner Adams is looking forward to working with them. Commissioner Parker is happy to see that the consultant team selected is also the team staff originally was leaning towards. Commissioner Parker motions to approve and/or concur with the selection committee's selection to hire SE Group for the Comprehensive Plan Update. Commissioner Adams seconds. Unanimously approved.

**VII. Public Comment**

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

**VIII. Reports and Comments**

A. *Staff Report\_ Projects, Updates and Upcoming Development Applications:* Planning Director James Dickhoff provides a brief update. The South 8<sup>th</sup> Street construction is underway and the goal this year is to get asphalt down on the ground before winter. Commissioner Adams asks if they are going to be replacing the concrete near the library. Planning Director James Dickhoff says no, that concrete will not be replaced. The east phase of the Town to Lakes Trail is also underway and there will be some overlap of construction. Commissioner Parker asks when CDOT will be done striping. Planning Director James Dickhoff says hopefully next week. He also says that the removal asphalt was not conveyed to Town staff. CDOT will keep the parking on Main Street and will also incorporate a center turn lane, one travel lane each direction, and a bike lane for the 100 and 200 blocks. This should help calm traffic through the downtown area. Staff has also advertised for construction of the west phase of the Town to Lakes Trail. It is unlikely to have extensive construction done on this phase due to the timeframe and winter. This project has taken a very long time, but it will be a great day for the Town when this is completed. Planning Director James Dickhoff is going to be presenting to a subcommittee tomorrow on smaller lot sizes. This should give them a better understanding as to why the Town is pursuing this and ultimately they can formulate a recommendation to Town Council. Town Council does have a full members list and they can now schedule a work session with the Planning Commission on smaller lot issue. Staff is continuing their efforts with the Waterworks Committee and visualizing the future of this site. The Rumbaugh Creek bridge project has been met with delays this summer, but staff hopes to have at least a support structure in place to prevent damage in the spring runoff. Commissioner Adams asks if this committee will be involved in the Comprehensive Plan Update. Planning Director James Dickhoff says he hopes to coordinate all of these efforts into the Comprehensive Plan Update. Commissioner Adams wants to ensure that smaller lot sizes are incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan Update. He is concerned that if the Town does not act soon, the prices of land and construction will only go up. If the Town wants higher density, then multifamily is the way to go. Commissioner Adams wants to ultimately get to affordability and make Pagosa Springs a desirable and attractive area for everyone. He is concerned that waiting for the Comprehensive Plan Update isn't going to be as effective as exploring this issue now and presenting the Town Council with a recommendation. There is a real silent crisis for housing. Commissioner Parker asks if going from R-18 to R-20 would solve the Town's housing problem. He also says that increasing density would cause more people using less resource and would in-turn increase open space. Commissioner Adams says that once the R-18 or R-20 zone comes to the South Side of Main Street, the Town can fit many more units per lot. He would like to create more opportunities to create higher density. Commissioner Maez asks if having R-20 move to the South Side of Main Street should be on a future agenda. Commissioner Adams agrees that this should be on an agenda. Planning Director James Dickhoff says that the Comprehensive Plan process will help provide a professional recommendation could help shorten the process to achieving smaller lots. He supports higher density in the R-12 and R-18, but having the recommendation through the Comprehensive Plan Update will help achieve this through an LUDC amendment. Commissioner Parker asks if a variance can be issued for density. Planning Director James Dickhoff says no, that could not fall under a variance.

B. *Planning Commission – Comments, Ideas and Discussion*: NONE

C. *Upcoming Town Meetings Schedule*: There is a public hearing on 09/27/16 for 1921 Eagle Drive. Planning Director James Dickhoff is compiling his 2017 budget and an update will be presented to the Planning Commission prior to submitting this. He encourages the Commission to email ideas to him.

**IX. Adjournment**

Commissioner Parker motions to adjourn at 6:20PM. Commissioner Adams seconds. Unanimously approved.

---

Commission Chair, Ron Maez

DRAFT



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments,  
& Design Review Board**  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

I. Call to Order / Roll Call:

---

II. Announcements:

---

III. Approval of Minutes:

---

A. August 23 and September 13, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Approval of Minutes: | Staff recommends approving Minutes from the August 23 and September 13, 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.

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>a.</b> | 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**  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

V. Design Review Board:

- A. Major Design Review Application for Retail Store at 1921 Eagle Drive.  
(Public Hearing / Quasi-Judicial Matter).

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Project Location:</b>             | 1921 Eagle Drive, a 1.39-acre parcel.   |
| <b>Property Zoning:</b>              | Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C).  |
| <b>Nearby Land Use/Zoning:</b>       | Zoning to the South: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C).<br>Zoning to the East: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C).<br>Zoning to the West: Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C).<br>Zoning to the North: Agricultural Residential (RA).  |
| <b>Property Owner #1:</b>            | Cody Ross   |
| <b>Applicant:</b>                    | Cody Ross   |
| <b>Pre-Application Conference:</b>   | The applicant has met with the Town Planning Department a number of times in their preparation of submitting an application for Major Design Review.  |
| <b>Application Received:</b>         | The applicant submitted an application on August 26, 2016.<br>with drainage report and plan provided on September 16, 2016.   |
| <b>Public Hearing Notifications:</b> | Published public notice in the Sun Newspaper occurred on September 8, 2016.<br>Town Hall posted public notice was posted on September 8, 2016.<br>Neighborhood public notifications were mailed on September 8, 2016.<br>Property posted public notice was posted on-site on September 8, 2016. |
| <b>Additional Permits:</b>           | None.   |
| <b>DRB Action:</b>                   | The DRB’s review of the Major Design Review application and determination shall be in compliance with the Town’s Land Use Development Code.   |



**The LUDC section 2.4.6 reviews Major Design Review applications:**

**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.



**LUDC Article 3, Zoning:**

Mixed Use Corridor (MU-C) district definition:

*“The MU-C district is intended to allow for the vertical or horizontal mixing of uses, including some high-density residential, along major highways. Commercial uses are appropriate, including retail, offices, hotels, and tourism-related businesses. The district is intended to promote gradual development and redevelopment of existing commercial corridors to become more vibrant and attractive mixed-use areas that also contain some housing, offices, and light trade.”*

**LUDC Article 4, Allowable Uses:**

Retail establishments are an allowed use by right in the MU-C District. The building proposed is 7,950 sqft.

**LUDC Article 5, Dimensional Requirements:**

***Building Height:***

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

The proposed project includes two structures.

~ The structure is proposed to be 22’-0” to the highest portion of the building, complying with LUDC.

***Yard Setbacks:***

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

*The proposed structure location complies with the LUDC setback requirements.*

**The parking lot encroaches into the front 20-foot setback. The typical condition along Eagle Drive indicates this is a regular occurrence at most properties.**

**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. This project appears to affect over 1 acre. The issuance of such permit is required prior to issuance of a building permit and prior to commencement of site construction activities. This permit and SWM plan identifies 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 from storm waters flowing from construction sites, during project construction activities.*



Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments,  
& Design Review Board  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

**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 applicant's engineer has provided a detention pond on site, to handle the subject property storm water detention requirements. The engineer's analysis is included in the applicant's application packet.

**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".*

The parking area and sidewalks to be cleared of snow equate to 15,960 sqft of surface area.

A snow storage areas have been designated and equate to 6,600 sqft, sufficiently accommodating snow storage on site.

**Sanitary Sewer:**

The applicant has initiated conversations with the Pagosa Springs Sanitation General Improvement District (PSSGID) for sewer service.

**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:**

Fire Hydrant review will be conducted by the Fire Code Official (TOPS, Building Official) as part of the building permit application review. The building will not 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 does have a steep slope on the northern side of the proposed structure. The applicant has proposed a retaining wall to help stabilize the slope.

**Natural Features:**



Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments,  
& Design Review Board  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

There are no existing trees on the property. There are no natural features identified on the property.

***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 at this time.

***Riparian Setbacks:***

There are no Riparian features on the subject property.

**Access and Circulation:**

***Connectivity:***

The subject property is currently accessed from Eagle Drive. As part of this application, the applicant will be required to ensure a 60-foot-wide ROW dedication is formalized with the Town to ensure future connectivity of Eagle Drive with Pike Drive can be accommodated.

***Traffic Generation:***

Anticipated traffic generation created by the proposed project will not dictate improvements to existing roadways or intersections.

***Roadways:***

CDOT/County/Town adopted Access Control Plan (ACP) compliance:

It is important to note, the eastern access to Eagle Drive from Hwy 160 is contemplated to be removed in our adopted access control plan, possibly when the connection to Pike Drive is accomplished. Eagle Drive is identified as a Secondary Road in the ACP. Eagle drive is a 60-foot-wide ROW, currently with one 12’ wide drive lane each direction. No on street parking o, bike lanes or sidewalks currently exist.

***Roadway Classification:***

- 1) The classification of Eagle Drive is a minor collector road (400 – 2499 ADT’s) which could convert into a major collector (2500 + ADT’s) once this secondary roadway has full connectivity to Downtown.

**Parking and Vehicular Access:**

***Private Driveway:***

The Private driveway design includes two 24-foot-wide accesses from Eagle Drive. Both are spaced as best as possible from the current Hwy 160 access to Eagle Drive.

**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 18 feet long in compliance with LUDC table 6.9-4.
- Parking lot isle is designed for two-way traffic and dimensioned in compliance with the LUDC.

***2) Number of Parking Spaces:***

- Table 6.9-1: Retail establishments require a minimum of one parking space for each 300 sqft of retail building space and 1 space for each 750 sqft of storage space. The retail space is 2,400 sqft requiring 8 spaces and storage space is 5,550 sqft requiring 8 spaces, for a total of 16 minimum required spaces. The applicant has provided 27 spaces total, two of which are ADA spaces (minimum 1 per 25 spaces is required).

***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.

***4) Parking Lot Landscaping:***

- LUDC requires one tree for each 5 parking spaces.  
A minimum of 6 trees are required within the parking lot. The applicant has provided 6 trees immediately adjacent to the parking lot.
- LUDC 6.9.4.C requires 10 percent of the parking lot shall be used for landscaping.  
The parking lot is 15,960 sqft requiring 1,596 sqft of parking lot landscaping.  
The Landscape strip between the building and the parking lot, strip along the Eagle Drive Frontage and along the east and west sides of the parking lot, provide ample landscaping complying with the required 10% of parking area minimum.

***5) Circulation Area Design:***

Two 24'-0" wide accesses from Eagle Drive are proposed providing a drive thru flow within the parking lot. Pedestrian connectivity from the public sidewalk is provided. The eastern portion of the lot is designed to accept backed in semi-truck deliveries.

***6) Exterior Lighting:***

Exterior parking lot lighting is not proposed. If any exterior lights are installed, they shall be inspected after installation for compliance. All light sources shall be completely concealed so as not to be visible from off site. Staff highly recommend the applicant meet with staff on all proposed exterior lighting fixtures prior to installation.

7) *Parking Lot Drainage:*

Parking lot drainage is conveyed on the surface via curb and gutter to the detention pond.

8) *Loading/Unloading Areas:*

The loading area is a back in loading area along the east side of the building. There is not an exposed loading dock/area.

***Sidewalks, Multi-Use Paths and Trails:***

1) Sidewalks along Eagle Drive do not exist, however, the LUDC requires the installation at time of development. The applicant will provide a public sidewalk improvement along their portion of Eagle Drive for future connectivity. **The eastern end of the sidewalk should connect with the eastern driveway surface.**

2) Internally, pedestrian paths are provided from the parking lot to the building along the south and east side of the building.

3) *Commercial and Mixed-Use Design Standards:*

1) *Site Layout:*

The proposed development is a new development on a vacant 1.39-acre lot. The applicant proposes a phased project, with the first phase being reviewed at this DRB stage. A future expansion has been contemplated on the west side of the proposed building.

2) *Building Orientation:*

Orientation has the main entrance facing south, providing good solar exposure for the sidewalks and parking lot.

3) *Pedestrian Environment:*

The applicant has provided pedestrian access and connectivity, consistent with the intent of the LUDC and Comprehensive plan.

4) *Building Design:*

The proposed one story 7,950 square foot building design has provided:

- a. The walls contain no more than 30% metal siding (29.73%)
- b. Wall modulation is proposed on the north and south side.
- c. The roof line has been broken with a center raised portion

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:

South Building wall facing Hwy 160:

- a. Stone veneer wainscoting
- b. CMU Split Face block
- c. Stucco
- d. Glass windows at the main customer entrance
- e. Rusted metal architectural detail
- f. Stucco
- g. Stone veneer columns
- h. CMU split faces columns
- i. Rusted metal on sign wall

East Building wall:

- a. Stone veneer wainscoting
- b. CMU Split Face block
- c. Stucco
- d. Glass windows at the main customer entrance
- e. Rusted metal architectural detail
- f. Stucco

West Building wall: This wall is designed to accommodate a future building expansion.

- a. CMU Split Face block wainscoting
- b. Stucco
- c. Stone veneer column
- d. Rusted metal architectural detail
- e. Stucco

North Building wall:

- a. Stone veneer wainscoting
- b. CMU Split Face wainscoting

6) *Architectural Style:*

The DRB should consider if the architectural style compliments the character of the adjacent existing buildings (LUDC 6.7.B.3).

7) *Four-Sided Design:*

Four sided design appears to have been achieved, with similar level of design detail on all four Sides of each building.

**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 indicates 19,800 sqft of the 60,548 sqft lot is landscaped, providing approximately 15% landscaping and 18% areas being revegetated with native reclamation mix. The landscaping plan identifies locations and plant species as well as mulched areas and re-vegetation after construction.

1) *Design Standards:*

The landscape plan indicates areas of plantings with specifies specified and revegetated areas indicated.

2) *Protection of Existing vegetation:*

No existing trees exist.

3) *Maintenance:*

The property owner is required to maintain all plantings associated with the plan submitted and approved by the DRB.

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.

**Buffering and Screening:**

1) *Loading and Service Areas:*

Service and loading areas are not exposed.

2) *Mechanical Equipment:*

Exposed and visible exterior Mechanical Equipment has been indicated on the plans. visible exterior. **Mechanical Equipment is required to be screened.**

3) *Dumpsters and Trash Storage Areas:*

The applicant has indicated a dumpster enclosure at the NE corner of the lot.

**Exterior Lighting Plan:**

1) *Light Sources Shielded from View:*

The applicant has not indicated any exterior lighting in the submitted plans. The applicant shall submit an illumination plan with fixture specification sheets if any exterior lighting is to be installed, confirming that all exterior light sources will be shielded/concealed from off-site view. Staff highly recommends a meeting with the Planning Department to review proposed fixtures prior to installation.

2) *Foot Candle calculations:*



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments,  
& Design Review Board**  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

The referenced illumination plan may be required to include foot candle levels along the property lines if necessary. Planning Director shall make that determination once presented with an exterior lighting plan/proposal.

**Sign Code:**

The applicant has submitted a plans indicating locations of proposed signs, indicating a wall sign and monument style sign. Staff can administratively approve a sign permit if directed by the DRB.

- 1) *Freestanding Signs: Monument style sign required, up to 100 sq. ft. per side and 20' tall maximum.*
- 2) *Wall signage: No more than 100 sq. ft. per side.*

**Building Code and Building Permit:**

- 1) The applicant has indicated the submission of a building permit following a determination on the development's Major Design Review application at the DRB public hearing.

**Impact Fees:**

- 1) The proposed development is subject to Impact fees pursuant to LUDC article 10. 54,818 sqft new retail 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 | \$4,336.00  | \$159.00          | \$741.00      | \$2,594.00  |
| 7,950 sf=    | \$34,471.20 | \$1,264.05        | \$5,890.95    | \$41,626.20 |



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments,  
& Design Review Board**  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

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.

Approve the Car Quest Retail Store 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. Parking lot encroaches into the front 20’ setback. Applicant shall provide additional Landscaping elements along the planting strip to include....
- b. All exposed Mechanical equipment shall be screened from view.
- c. The eastern end of the sidewalk shall connect with the eastern driveway surface.
- d. Formalize the 60-foot-wide ROW along the entire eastern edge of the property.
- e. Exterior lighting plan or proposed fixtures were not included in the application submittal. If Exterior lighting is to be incorporated, the Applicant shall provide an illumination plan and LUDC Compliance will be determined after installation of fixtures.
- f. Provide proof of State Storm Water Management Plan Permit prior to Building Permit Issuance.
- g. Each Additional project phase requires the submission of a Major Design Review application.
- h. PLUS, ADDITIONAL CONTINGIUENCIES AS DETERMINED BY THE DRB.....
- i. DENY the Car Quest Retail Store Major Design Review Application submitted, finding the application is not in substantial compliance with the Town’s adopted Land Use Development Code.



**Planning Commission, Board of Adjustments,  
& Design Review Board**  
Staff Report – Tuesday, September 27, 2016 Regular Scheduled Meeting

**IX. Reports and Comments:**

- A. Planning Director Report –  
Full report will be provided on October 11.

**IX. Reports and Comments:**

- B. Planning Commission –

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | Time for Planning Commission Open Discussion, Ideas and Comments. |
|--|---|

**IX. Reports and Comments:**

- C. Upcoming Scheduled Town Meetings.

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>a.</b> | Next Scheduled PC Meetings:<br>~ Tuesday, October 11, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting<br>~ Tuesday, October 25, 2016 @ 5:30pm in Town Hall, Regular Meeting        |
| <b>b.</b> | Next Regular Scheduled Historic Preservation Board meetings:<br>~ Wednesday, September 28, 2016 at 5:45pm in Town Hall<br>~ Wednesday, October 10, 2016 at 5:45pm in Town Hall |
| <b>c.</b> | Next Regular Town Council Meetings:<br>~ Tuesday, October 4, 2016 at 5:30pm in Town Hall<br>~ Thursday October 20, 2016 at 5pm in Town Hall                                    |
| <b>d.</b> | Next Regular Parks and Recreation Board Meeting:<br>~ Tuesday, October 11, 2016 @ 5:30pm in the Ross Aragon Community Center   |