

**Record of Proceedings
City of Lafayette
Planning Commission
Tuesday, November 29, 2016**

Chairperson Wong called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Those in attendance included: Chairperson Wong, Vice Chair Kusjanovic and Commissioners Ellis, Fischer, Godfrey, Thomas, and Varley

Staff present included City Attorney Dave Williamson, Planning Manager Paul Rayl, City Engineer Aaron Asquith, Senior Planner Greg Thompson, Planner Jon Hoffman, and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko

II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda

Grant Swift, 608 E. Geneseo St., Lafayette, commented that the October 25, 2016 Planning Commission minutes do not accurately reflect Vice Chair Kusjanovic comments. It should be corrected to indicate that she alluded that City Council had a hidden agenda. He clarified that there is not a hidden agenda and further the Planning Commission does not control surveys for any other groups in the City. He clarified what the role of the Planning Commission is. He also clarified that both City Council and Planning Commission meet twice a month. He pointed out to Chairperson Wong, that other City boards, whether they are televised or not, are required to keep records of the meeting and those minutes are posted to the City's website. He suggested that due diligence is required when speaking about items related to the City.

III. Meeting Minutes for October 25 and October 26, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Godfrey moved to approve the October 25 and October 26, 2016 meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Fischer. All voted in favor of the motion.

IV. Scheduled Items

A. SILO Subdivision Preliminary Plan/PUD, Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and Site Plan/Architectural Review (2nd of two meetings)

Planning Manager Paul Rayl entered the staff report into the record. Mr. Rayl stated that this is the second meeting for the SILO Subdivision Preliminary Plan/PUD. He presented a vicinity map to help orient everyone to the location of the site and the surrounding properties. He explained that the preliminary plan is for an 80-acre subdivision. It includes a mixture of residential land uses and includes a small percentage of commercial within the proposed mixed use and live/work areas of the community. The plan consists of 453 residential dwelling units on approximately 249 lots, and 20,000 sq. ft. of commercial space within the village center and the CSA farm stand. Within the mixture of residential uses the plan proposes single-family detached, duplexes, townhomes, condos, and accessory dwelling units. The commercial use will include small scale office and neighborhood retail such as a farm to table restaurant and area for sale of produce grown on the CSA farm. The plan includes 10.1 acres of public land dedication and 28 acres of private open space which include pocket parks and a central park.

Mr. Rayl explained that at the first meeting held on October 25, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed the preliminary plan and PUD. At that meeting staff presented the City's findings on the proposed project relative to the Municipal Code and Comprehensive Plan. The applicant presented the plan to the Commission. The Planning Commission requested additional information from staff and the applicant to be presented at today's public hearing.

Mr. Rayl presented the additional information requested by the Planning Commission which included a request for examples of projects in Lafayette with similar code modifications to the SILO Subdivision. He reviewed some of the developments that have requested and received multiple modifications from the Code through the required PUD process. These included Anna's Farm PUD, Coal Creek Village PUD, Simpson Old Town, Josephine Commons and Indian Peaks Hedgerow developments.

Mr. Rayl explained that the City has approved multi-family developments with height modifications up to and greater than 45 feet. He noted that the Planning Commission requested information on other buildings in Lafayette that exceed the maximum height allowances that were approved through the PUD process. He reviewed a list of several buildings with the building height that was approved. These included Exempla Good Samaritan Medical Center at 99 feet, Comprehensive Cancer Center at 62 feet, Lafayette City Center at 50 feet, Flatirons Community Church at 50 feet, Lafayette Tech Center at 55 feet, Boulder County Mental Health Partners at 45 feet, Xtreme Altitude Gymnastics at 41 feet and Prasanna Apartments at 38 feet. Mr. Rayl presented an aerial photo to illustrate the location of the above referenced subdivisions and buildings with height modifications to them.

Mr. Rayl reviewed the PUD criteria and discussed how the project complies with the criteria.

Mr. Rayl explained that the Planning Commission also requested additional information on previous land use amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. He reviewed the amendments made to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map that occurred over the past five years. These included the recent changes to the Land Use designation for several parcels that had previously been designated IGA Rural Preservation, the 1.7 acre parcel in Coal Creek Village Subdivision PUD, The Trails at Coal Creek had 30 acres changed, the former church property located at 110 South Roosevelt, Lafayette Corporate Campus and Coal Creek Village North Subdivision. Also the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Technical Update included changes to SILO Subdivision property and the Update created a new land use designation called Opportunity Parcel.

Mr. Rayl also provided information on the phasing schedule, the construction traffic plan, the updated traffic study and public transportation.

Mr. Rayl reviewed the rezoning request and site plan/architectural request. He noted that the applicant has revised their submittal to include approval of a maximum height of 55 feet for the proposed Silo. This is a reduction of 10 feet from the original 65 feet. Mr. Rayl reviewed the zoning criteria and discussed how the application met the criteria. He reviewed some of the Comprehensive Plan Policies and goals that this project fulfills.

Mr. Rayl reviewed the amended conditions which include: under the Preliminary Plan/PUD, a modification to Condition No. 1m for a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces, Condition No. 2 to not approve the proposed 55 foot tall silo, and Condition No. 22 extending the deadline to submit a final plan to 150 days, and under the Site Plan/Architectural Review Condition No. 2 requiring each building permit to show compliance or non-compliance with the solar access provisions of the Architectural Design Guidelines, instead of the PUD.

Staff recommended approval of the preliminary plan/PUD, subject to the recommended conditions, finding that it complies with the criteria of Code sections 26-16-4 & 26-18-5 and the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Furthermore, staff finds that the plan is unique; in the best interest of the City; and the code modifications are in the best interest of the City.

Staff recommended approval of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use designation for the subject property to Agricultural, Open Space, HOA Parks, Low Intensity Commercial and Medium Density Residential subject to the recommended condition, finding that the Comprehensive Plan amendment complies with the criteria of Code section 26-25.1-1.

Staff recommended approval of the rezoning from DR (Developing Resource) to T1/PUD (Transitional Business/Planned Unit Development), R1/PUD (Medium Density Residential/Planned Unit Development), R2/PUD (Single and Two Family Residential/Planned Unit Development), R3/PUD (Multi-family Residential/Planned Unit Development), AG (Agriculture), and P (Public) subject to the recommended conditions, finding that the rezoning complies with the criteria of Code section 26-16-8.

Staff recommended approval of the Site Plan/Architectural Review, subject to the recommended conditions finding that the application complies with Code section 26-16-7.1, promotes a harmonious transition in scale and character of the surrounding land uses, building components are visually attractive and monotony of design has been avoided by providing a variation of detail and form.

Keenan Tompkins, Cornerstone Homes Development Company, 1005 South 120th Street, Lafayette, stated his team was here to present additional information that the Planning Commission requested at the October 25, 2016 meeting.

Abby Kirkbride, Attorney, 410 17th St., Denver, referenced their submittal documents that addresses their responses to the Planning Commission questions and comments from the October 25, 2016 meeting, their request to Amend the Planning Staff's conditions of approval, and their request to extend to the 90-day time period to submit their final plan and plat to 150 days. Ms. Kirkbride outlined the issues they would be addressing this evening.

David Kahn and Michael Tavel, Suns Studios, 3312 Osage St., Denver, gave a presentation in response to questions and comments raised at the October meeting. These included how their development creates harmonious transition to adjacent neighborhoods, how residential mixed use neighborhood is appropriate for this location in a "Medium Density Residential" land use designation, and explain and illustrate in more detail how the requested PUD modifications to the city code is necessary and how it would work.

Mr. Kahn discussed how they designed the development to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods, how the mixed-used development enables the development to meet the goals of the sustainable compact development which are the City's goals. Mr. Tavel reviewed all the PUD modifications being requested and showed examples for each of the housing types and explained why they are needed.

Chris McGranahan, Transportation Engineer, 1889 York St., Denver, reviewed the traffic study process that they did. He discussed the traffic that will be generated from their development and noted the project is close to public transportation and the development has sidewalks and trails to encourage walking and access to the public transportation.

Leslie Ewy, Sanitas, Civil Engineering addressed the drainage concerns regarding drainage from Anna's Farm, sustainable storm water design and ditches. She discussed the Bullhead Gulch drainage basin, the topography of the SILO Subdivision site, and explained how the site currently drains now. She discussed how the development will mitigate some storm water from Anna's farm and stated that no storm drainage from the SILO development would run onto

Anna's farm. She discussed their drainage study, the practices they use for storm water design and detention ponds. She discussed their meeting with Mr. Howland, the adjacent property owner and Davidson Ditch Company director, to understand his concerns regarding laterals and water access. She stated they will respect historic flows to and from the property.

Chairperson Wong opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 8:20 p.m.

Frederick DeWilde, 1541 Spring Creek Drive, Lafayette, expressed concerns about density, emergency response times, water usage, whether the proposed number of students is accurate, and loss of privacy from the proposed silo tower feature.

Timothy Mallon, 10138 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, expressed concern about the overall density of the project.

Seth White, 311 E. Chester Street, Lafayette, expressed concerns about the loss of the rural preservation designation for this property, the compact development being proposed and changes to the standard R1 and R2 dimensional standards.

Bill Howland, Lafayette, questioned what the proposed Planned Unit Development is giving back compared to the open area that will be lost. He expressed concern about drainage and whether the proposed development will have adequate drainage and he discussed current drainage issues in this area.

Edward Michelson, 2427 Targhee Point, Lafayette, expressed concern about traffic.

Jan Cheney, 1549 Spring Creek Drive, Lafayette, expressed concern about traffic, schools, density and parking.

Norbert Klebl, 1240 Lehigh, Boulder, supports the project but did express concerns about traffic.

Suzy Curtin, 1057 W. Century Dr., Louisville, spoke in support of the project and stated there is a need for sustainable housing in the area.

Jillian Weems, 10364 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, discussed the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) that was placed on their property without their consent and their property rights. She added that other neighboring rural areas such as the Bateman property (Anna's Farm) were able to develop while they were not.

Caitlin Moll, 10364 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, spoke in support of the project.

Justin Moll, 10364 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, supports the project.

Donovan Will, Boulder, spoke in support of the project.

Axel Bishop, 513 Wilson Street, Lafayette, spoke in support of the project and noted that we should be looking at walkable and village sustainable projects and that sprawl has created the traffic issues in the area.

Alan Brown, 148 Artesian Drive, Boulder, supports the project and discussed what he liked about the project.

Carol Nickell, 10364 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, spoke in support of the project but does have concerns about traffic in the area.

Nancy Denison, 148 Artesian Drive, Eldorado Springs, spoke in support of the project.

Tracy Sweely, 10364 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, supports the project and asked the Planning

Commission to approve the proposal.

Bruce Vaughn, 531 Canyonside, Boulder, supports the project and believes this is the type of community that we need to embrace and build.

Mackenzie Mallon, 10138 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, expressed concerns about wildlife and traffic.

Mel Haik, 1533 Harvest Drive, Lafayette, opposes the project and expressed concerns about density, lack of apartments proposed, lack of businesses proposed and traffic.

Kathy McMenamin, 1576 Northfield Lane, Lafayette, opposed the project expressing concerns about density, traffic, and lack of affordable housing.

Jessie Olson, 766 Furrow Way, Lafayette, is excited about the project but has concerns with pace of growth in the area, needs a larger buffer between Anna's Farm Subdivision and this subdivision, and drainage.

Joan Prebish, 1512 Harvest Drive, Lafayette, supports the concept but opposes the project. Ms. Prebish expressed concerns about pace of growth in the area, traffic, and infrastructure.

Janelle Hink, 2323 Eagles Nest Drive, Lafayette, supports the sustainable concept but opposes the project. Ms. Hink expressed concerns about density, building height, the commercial component of the project, and traffic.

Diane Sagrillo, 1552 Northfield Lane, Lafayette, expressed concerns about density, traffic and water usage.

Kathy Morey, 515 Vernier Court, Lafayette, expressed concern about water usage.

Ray Sargent, 1278A Milo Circle, Lafayette, expressed concern about the need for affordable housing in the community.

Jeanette Hrubes, 10138 Arapahoe Road, Lafayette, expressed concerns about density, traffic, the height of the proposed silo tower.

Maureen Christopher, 503 Homestead Street, Lafayette, supports the project but expressed concern about traffic and the height of the proposed silo tower.

Chairperson Wong closed the public hearing at 9:25 p.m.

The Planning Commission took a 15 minute recess and reconvened at 9:40 p.m.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to explain why they need setbacks ranging from 1 foot to 4 feet. Other Planning Commission questions to the applicant focused on traffic including how traffic would impact streets like Furrow Way and Arapahoe Road, what would trigger the traffic signal installation, whether Arapahoe Road would be widened in the future, whether they have looked at stacking distances at Arapahoe Road, and what would traffic be at commercial build out.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant to show the regional trail and how the trails would connect. Other questions focused on drainage and how they would address the South Boulder Canyon Ditch Company issues, whether they have a storm water management plan, what about the existing drainage problems that Mr. Howland raised during public comment, whether drainage would be piped under Furrow Way and who would be responsible for maintaining detention ponds and basin areas.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant about the silo tower building height, the distance the silo is from other subdivisions, whether it would be ADA accessible and how it would be used. Other questions focused on water usage and water calculations and how they plan to conserve water. The Planning Commission asked the applicant whether they did a habitat assessment, how would they avoid wetlands and sensitive habitat corridors in their development during construction.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant if they agreed with the conditions of approval except for the PUD Condition No. 2 regarding the height of the silo tower.

Ms. Kirkbride stated they accept the conditions of approval except for PUD condition #2.

The Planning Commission asked additional questions regarding the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and whether they are typically above the garage and whether they consider them a single unit. The Planning Commission asked the applicant to explain their phasing schedule and asked where the construction of the Silo tower fell into the phasing plan.

Ms. Kirkbride addressed the Planning Commission and stated they would like change PUD Condition No. 4 regarding the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) so ADUs would be allowed with the PUD when the code is amended or adopted to allow ADUs in other zoning districts outside of the OTR zoning district.

The Planning Commission questions to staff included what buildings are included under the site plan/architectural review being reviewed this evening and whether it was single-family, duplexes and townhomes. Other questions included the number of units being approved, whether there were concerns about water usage, water availability and whether they will be required to bring water rights to the subdivision.

Other questions to staff included whether the student enrollment numbers were generated by the Boulder Valley School district and not the developer. The PC asked staff to explain growth management and building permit allocations.

The Planning Commission focused on traffic and asked staff whether traffic concerns could be revisited at additional phases of the subdivision, whether CDOT has plans or funding to widen Arapahoe Road, what would be considered a large increase in traffic on Furrow Way and whether Furrow Way could handle the additional traffic.

The Planning Commission asked staff whether the Town of Erie could have annexed this property and whether the applicant could de-annex the property and request the Town of Erie annex them. The Planning Commission also asked what the benefits of the PUD process are to the City when developing a parcel compared to the standard R1 zoning district dimensional standards for setbacks, height, lot coverage, and so forth.

The Planning Commission took a 5 minute break at 11:20 p.m. and reconvened at 11:25 p.m.

Mr. Tavel gave a 3D model presentation outlining the proposed PUD modifications for the duplexes and multi-family buildings.

Mr. Kirkbride addressed the Planning Commission regarding the number of units proposed and which included the future 27 accessory dwelling units. Ms. Kirkbride added that their application meets all the city code requirements, complies with a number of Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, and she asked the Planning Commission to approve the plan with the changes to PUD Conditions No. 2 and No. 4 as discussed earlier.

The Planning Commission discussion focused on the silo tower, the silo tower height, the distance it is between surrounding subdivisions, whether it should be required to be ADA compliant, when it would be built, and whether it meets the intent of being a “way finding piece”.

The Planning Commission consensus was to allow the silo tower to be 50 feet in height.

The Planning Commission discussed other ways this property could have been developed such as single family homes. They discussed density, traffic and drainage. The Planning Commission discussed the merits of the plan and how it meets 40 of the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. The Planning Commission asked if there were design guidelines and noted they did not review a materials board.

Mr. Keenan reviewed the materials they propose and building design.

The Planning Commission discussed PUD Condition No. 4 regarding ADUs, Condition No. 17 about garages, and Condition No. 5 about lighting plan. The Planning Commission amended PUD Condition No. 4 to allow ADUs in the subdivision at such time when the City adopts a code amendment allow ADUs in other zoning districts.

Preliminary Plan/PUD Motion

Commissioner Godfrey moved the Planning Commission approve this request for Preliminary Plan/PUD approval, subject to the amended conditions, finding that the proposal complies with the requirements for preliminary plan submittal; complies with the PUD criteria; and, complies with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies, and land use map. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Motion

Commissioner Godfrey moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, subject to staff’s recommended condition, finding that the amendment is complimentary to the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Varley seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Rezoning Motion

Commissioner Ellis moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of the rezoning request subject to the recommended conditions, finding that the rezoning complies with the Comprehensive Plan, and the rezoning criteria of the Code. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Site Plan/Architectural Review Motion

Commissioner Varley moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of this request for Site Plan/Architectural Review, subject to staff’s recommended conditions, finding that the plan complies with the requirements for site plan/architectural review submittal; complies with the site plan/architectural review criteria; and the design is compatible with the location and proposed use. Commissioner Fischer seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Preliminary Plan/PUD Conditions of Approval:

1. The following PUD modifications are approved for the SILO Subdivision and shall be listed on the plans as approved:

- a. A reduction in minimum lot size to 2,000 square feet for lots zoned R1, and 1,250 square feet for lots zoned R2 & R3;
 - b. A decrease in the front yard setback to 8 feet for a front porch and 3 feet to green space for lots zoned R1; and to 8 feet for a front porch and 3 feet to green space for lots zoned R2 & T1;
 - c. A decrease in the front yard setback to 11 feet to porch and 6 feet to green space for lots zoned R3;
 - d. A decrease in the rear-yard setback to 1 foot for lots with access from a designated 22 foot wide Lane in the R1, R2, R3 & T1 zones;
 - e. A decrease in the side yard setback from 5 feet to 3 feet for lots zoned R1;
 - f. A decrease in the side yard setback for duplex structures in the R2 zone and townhome structures in the R3 zone to 0 feet between common walls;
 - g. A decrease in the side yard setback for mixed use buildings in the T1 zone to 0 feet between common walls;
 - h. A decrease in the minimum separation between structures in the PUD to 6 feet for lots zoned R1, R2, and R3, and 10 feet for lots zoned T1;
 - i. 60% lot coverage for single-family dwellings in all zones, 75% lot coverage for duplex and townhome dwellings in the R2 & R3 zones, and 80% lot coverage for mixed use and multi-family buildings in the T1 zone;
 - j. An increase in building height to 35 feet to top of the roof for principal structure and 20 feet for accessory structures in the R1, R2 and R3 zones, and 40 feet for principal structures in the T1 zone as measured from the overlot grade.
 - k. A reduction from 25 feet to 0 feet for frontage on a public street for those lots with access from the SILO Metro District maintained private driveways;
 - l. A reduction from 25 feet to 20 feet for frontage on a public street for those lots as indicated on the plan in the R1 & R2 zones and 15 feet in the R3 zone.
 - m. Each single-family, duplex and townhome unit may include 2 off-street parking spaces, on average except for those lots that front onto private green space with no adjacent on-street parking available must have 2 off-street parking spaces.
 - n. The one required off-street parking space for accessory dwelling units may be waived if the lot has already provided 1 off-street visitor space and has on-street parking available adjacent to the lot.
 - o. A reduction in the amount of required parking spaces for the multi-family units located in the mixed use building of: 1 off-street space per 1 bedroom unit; 1.5 spaces per 2 bedroom unit; and 2 spaces per 3 bedroom unit subject to site plan/architectural review approval.
 - p. A reduction in the minimum parking required for the commercial component of the mixed use of 1 space per 300 square feet of gross floor area subject to site plan/architectural review approval.
 - q. An increase in density for the T1 zoned property to 25 dwelling units per acre.
2. The Silo shall not exceed a maximum height of 50 feet to the top of the structure.
 3. The zoning overlay of the PUD shall be amended to indicate the uses as listed are permitted with approval of a Special Use Review in the T1 and AG zones.
 4. At such time that a Code amendment is adopted to allow accessory dwelling units in other zoning districts outside of OTR, accessory dwelling units will be allowed within the PUD.

5. The subdivision developer shall clearly mark the Driveway access easements as no parking zones with signs and also verify the Metro District will be responsible for removal or towing of any vehicle parked within a driveway access easement.
6. The proposed street names shall be added to the final plat and PUD prior to submittal for City Council consideration.
7. The plat shall be amended to include access easement along all streets where sidewalks are proposed outside of the right-of-way.
8. Prior to submittal of the final plan for City Council consideration, the developer shall work with CDOT and RTD to ensure appropriate placement of the shelter improvements and apply for the necessary permits from CDOT for improvements within the right-of-way.
9. The applicant shall work with Xcel to ensure the appropriate easement widths are provided to accommodate the development.
10. The applicant shall address the issues identified by the City Engineer in the memo dated October 14, 2016 prior to the submittal of the final plan.
11. The applicant shall provide written verification from the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District approving the location of the proposed trail within their easement prior to submittal of the final plan for City Council consideration.
12. All tracts proposed to be dedicated to satisfy public land dedication requirements shall be included as part of the Phase 1 final plat.
13. The landscape plan shall be amended to show the quantity of each street tree proposed in order to ensure that no one species will be planted to exceed the 25% requirement.
14. A hydrozone map, water budget and irrigation plan shall be submitted for the street tree and tree lawn area for staff review and approval prior to submittal of the final plan for City Council consideration.
15. Construction activities shall be timed to ensure they occur away from areas where birds may be nesting during migratory patterns per the conclusions of the Biological Resource Assessment.
16. A copy of the final State approval of the remediation work done to finish capping the well on the property shall be submitted with any future final plan submittal.
17. The CC&R's shall be amended to ensure that the garages are utilized only for the parking of the occupants regular vehicle so as not to overburden the proposed on-street parking areas with vehicles because the garage is being used for storage.
18. All typographical, clerical and technical errors shall be corrected on the plat document prior to submittal of a final plat for City Council consideration.
19. The applicant shall be responsible for 50% of the costs of the future traffic signal at Arapahoe Road and Aspen Ridge Drive at the time it is installed.
20. The building permit allocation for the Silo Subdivision is approved as follows:

Year	Annual Allocation
2017	60
2018	60
2019	60
2020	60
2021	60
2022	60

2023	60
2024	60
Any unused permits thereafter until build out	

21. The deadline to submit a final plan for the subdivision is extended to 150 days after approval of the preliminary plan/PUD.
22. The applicant shall obtain all necessary ditch crossing agreements for any location where a public street or trail crosses a ditch on the property.
23. Prior to submittal of a final plan for city council consideration a storm water management plan shall be prepared by the applicant for review and approval by the City Engineer.
24. The Final Plat shall depict existing ditch easements.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment

1. Approval of Comprehensive Plan Land Use designation for the subject property to Agricultural, Open Space, HOA Parks, Low Intensity Commercial and Medium Density Residential shall be subject to approval of the preliminary plan/PUD.

Rezoning

1. Approval of the rezoning from DR (Developing Resource) to T1/PUD (Transitional Business/Planned Unit Development), R1/PUD (Medium Density Residential/Planned Unit Development), R2/PUD (Single and Two Family Residential/Planned Unit Development), R3/PUD (Multi-family Residential/Planned Unit Development), AG (Agriculture), and P (Public) shall be subject to approval of the preliminary plan/PUD and comprehensive plan amendments.

Site Plan/Architectural Review

1. No one housing model shall be located next to or across the public street from the same model.
2. Each building permit application shall include information on its compliance or non-compliance with the Site and Architecture Review Design Guidelines for solar access.
3. The landscape plan shall be amended to include the required information including:
 - a) A hydrozone map;
 - b) Water budget worksheet;
 - c) Detailed irrigation plan which should closely align with the proposed water budget;
 - d) A weather sensor in appropriate locations.
4. A detailed fencing plan shall be submitted for staff review and approval which pays particular attention to the interface between the lots and private and public green space and open areas.
5. The applicant shall submit a lighting plan including details for the subdivision as a whole and for the residential units for staff review and approval prior to submitting the final plan for City Council consideration.

V. Other Business

A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports

Commissioner Ellis thanked staff for doing a thorough job in reviewing the plan. Chairperson Wong agreed and also thanked the Planning Commissioners for a good job as well. He thanked the Public for their input and comments and noted that the Commission addressed what issues they could.

B. Department Comments

None.

VI. Adjournment

Commissioner Ellis moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Vice Chair Kusjanovic. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 12:20 am.

City of Lafayette

Brian Wong, Chairperson

Attest:

Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary