

**Record of Proceedings  
City of Lafayette  
Planning Commission  
Tuesday, July 24, 2012**

Those in attendance included: Commissioners Benson, Knuth, Nickell, Patzer, Steinbrecher, Wilgus and Wong

Staff present included: Planning Manager Karen Westover, City Attorney Dave Williamson, Planner Paul Rayl, Lead Code Compliance Specialist Jon Hoffman, and Recording Secretary Michelle Verostko.

**II. Items from the Public Not on the Agenda**

None.

**III. A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Nominations for Chair

*Commissioner Benson nominated Commissioner Patzer for Chair. Commissioner Knuth seconded the nomination. Commissioner Steinbrecher moved they accept the nomination by acclamation, Commissioner Knuth seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

Nomination for Vice Chair

*Commissioner Wilgus nominated Commissioner Wong for Vice Chair. Commissioner Knuth seconded the nomination. Since there were no other nominations, the Planning Commission accepted Commissioner Wong's nomination by acclamation.*

**III. B. Committee Liaison Appointments**

Chairperson Patzer explained that committee liaison appointments to both the Lafayette Open Space Advisory Committee (LOSAC) and the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) are made at the first meeting in July. He asked for either volunteers or whether the Commissioners who are currently serving as a liaison want to continue to serve on that particular Board. Commissioner Knuth stated he currently is the liaison for LOSAC and would like to serve for another year. Commissioner Wilgus stated he was interested in serving as the Historic Preservation Board liaison.

**IV. Minutes for May 22 and 23, 2012**

*Commissioner Knuth moved the Planning Commission approve the meeting minutes for May 22 and 23, 2012, seconded by Commissioner Benson. All voted in favor of the motion.*

**V. Scheduled Items**

**A. Development and Zoning Code Amendments – Recreation Vehicles and Trailers**

Code Compliance Specialist Jon Hoffman entered his staff report into the record. Mr. Hoffman stated this application is an amendment to the Municipal Code Chapter 26-14-14 Recreation Vehicles to add and define trailers and require that trailers be store in the same manner as recreation vehicles. He explained that non-motorized or unattached trailer storage on public property is not currently addressed in the code. He discussed complaints and concerns regarding the current storage of unattached trailers on the public street such as taking up on-street vehicle parking spaces and aesthetically is not pleasing. He used slides to illustrate examples of the current off-street trailer parking situations. He presented the proposed amendment and discussed the anticipated benefits of the amendment.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to Chapter 26-14-14 of the Code of Ordinances finding that the proposal is in the best interest of the City.

Chairperson Patzer opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 7:10 p.m. No one addressed the Commission. Chairperson Patzer closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission questions staff on enforcement of the code including what the fines would be, whether it would be enforced by complaints or would staff be proactive, and what is the process for a violation. The Commission asked whether the person or business could just move the trailer every day, whether 72 hours was a standard time frame for the Denver metro area, and how would the City handle an expired license on a trailer. The Commission asked staff to explain where or how a person would store a trailer and/or recreational vehicles depending upon how many they owned. The Commission also asked about the clause regarding a trailer not project 18" over a public right-of-way or public sidewalk and whether this meant from the lot or the street and also asked what the maximum distance a trailer could project into the street.

The Planning Commission discussed the reference to the 18" distance clause and expressed concern that there are some areas in town where one would not be able to meet this requirement. The Commission discussed changing the distance from 18" to 24". City Attorney Dave Williamson clarified the intent of this clause.

**Motion**

*Commissioner Wilgus moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to Chapter 26-14-14 of the Code of Ordinances with a clarification regarding the reference to the distance a recreational vehicle or trailer can be from the sidewalk relates to the lot side and not the street side. The Planning Commission finds that the proposal is in the best interest of the City. Commissioner Knuth seconded the motion. Commissioner Benson voted against the motion and the remaining Commissioners voted in favor of the motion.*

**B. Development and Zoning Code Amendment – Utility Certificates**

Planning Manager Karen Westover entered the staff report into the record. Ms. Westover stated that this application is a request to amend Section 26-17-6 of the Development and Zoning Code to remove the requirement of utility providers signing final plans. She explained that this is not a state requirement but rather a courtesy that was integrated into the code years ago to ensure utility providers were given a review of final plan documents prior to recording. She noted that the City of Lafayette is one of the few local government entities that require utility certifications.

Ms. Westover explained that recently there have been delays in the processing of final plats so to make the process easier for everyone staff is proposing that developers or the applicant contact the utility services providers prior to an application being submitted to the City to ensure adequate services can be provided and identify what easements and improvements would be required.

Ms. Westover explained that the City Engineer would still keep his signature as a requirement on the plat.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the proposed amendments to Chapter 26 of the Lafayette Code of Ordinances, finding that the proposed amendments are in the best interest of the City of Lafayette.

Chairperson Patzer opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 7:30 p.m. No one addressed the Planning Commission. Chairperson Patzer closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission asked staff why the signature reference is for Public Service Company instead of Excel Energy.

**Motion**

*Commissioner Knuth moved the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the proposed amendments to Chapter 26 of the Lafayette Code of Ordinances, finding that the proposed amendments are in the best interest of the City of Lafayette. Vice Chair Wong seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

**C. Exempla Healthcare Campus PUD Amendment No. 1 and Lafayette Corporate Campus Replat G, and Site Plan/Architectural Review**

Planner Paul Rayl entered the staff report into the record. Mr. Rayl stated that this application includes a Preliminary Plan/PUD Amendment, Minor Subdivision and Site Plan/Architectural Review for a new medical office building at Exempla Healthcare Campus. He reviewed the zoning and prior agreements for the property.

Mr. Rayl presented the PUD Amendments which include an increase in the total square footage of Medical Office Building 3 (MOB 3), a decrease in the total square footage of MOB 2 and MOB 1, and adjustments to the building footprints to accommodate the proposed changes. Mr. Rayl discussed additional modifications needed to accommodate the approved 2<sup>nd</sup> Lafayette Fire Station such as amending the Design Criteria table, amending Note No. 10, and amending the total building square footage for the Healthcare Campus. Other modifications discussed included amending the lot areas for lots 3 and 4 and amending the PUD purpose statement to include all the PUD modifications discussed previously.

Mr. Rayl reviewed the PUD Criteria and discussed how this application met the criteria. He reviewed some of the Comprehensive Plan policies and goals. Staff recommended approval of the PUD modifications.

Mr. Rayl reviewed the minor subdivision of Lafayette Corporate Campus Replat G which is intended to replat the existing lots 3 and 4 to accommodate the increased building footprint for MOB 3. New utility easements are proposed to be dedicated with this minor subdivision to accommodate the adjustment of lot lines. Mr. Rayl noted that there would be future vacation requests of easements that will no longer be needed after the minor subdivision is done.

Mr. Rayl presented the site plan/architectural review and pointed out the scope of work area. He explained that the proposed development includes a 147,110 sq. ft. medical office building to be constructed in two phases. The first phase includes 82,486 sq. ft. of office space and associated landscaping. The second phase will add an additional 64,624 sq. ft. of office space to the building and will include additional landscaping. The development includes parking to be constructed in two phases.

Mr. Rayl presented the architecture and reviewed the building elevations. He presented the exterior materials color board and reviewed the proposed colors, materials, and architectural elements of the building. He explained that the exterior walls of Phase I will have to include materials that will provide a finished appearance to the walls between Phase I and Phase II. This would ensure that the building does not look partially complete if Phase II were never constructed. Phase II elevations will be subject to review and approval of staff. Mr. Rayl reviewed the landscape plan, the trash enclosure, and the lighting plan.

Staff recommended approval of the PUD Amendment, minor subdivision, and site plan/architectural review, subject to the recommended conditions. Staff finds the PUD amendment complies with the criteria of Code Section 26-18-5 and the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan; the minor subdivision complies with the applicable criteria of Code Sections 26-19 and 26-17-7; and the site plan/architectural review complies with Code Section 26-16-7.1. 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.

David Hamm, President and Chief Executive Officer, Exempla Good Samaritan Hospital, 200 Exempla Circle, Lafayette explained that they are ready to move forward with the next phase of the intended medical office building with the creation of a new Comprehensive Cancer Center building which will give them an opportunity to serve Lafayette and other surrounding communities.

Lynn Moore, Davis Partnership, 2301 Blake Street, Denver presented their proposal for a two phase medical office building. Ms. Moore discussed the PUD modifications. She presented an architectural simulation of the building for both Phase I and Phase II. The simulation highlighted the building

elevations, architectural features, the exterior materials and colors as well as the views of the building from various angles including the entry ways, the parking lots, and from Highway 287.

Chairperson Patzer opened this portion of the meeting for public testimony at 8:10 p.m.

Jim Vasbinder, Etkins Johnson Group, 1512 Larimer Street, Denver stated he supports the application but questioned the amendment to allow the fire station to develop where it is proposed and whether there was a variance request to allow for the fire station use at this location.

Ron Spaulding, 597 Casper Drive, Lafayette spoke in support of the proposal.

Chairperson Patzer closed the public hearing at 8:15 p.m.

The Planning Commission asked staff to address Mr. Vasbinder's concerns.

Other Planning Commission questions to staff included whether the difference in building heights was determined by the distance the building is setback from Highway 287, whether the location of the RTD bus stop along Highway 287 could be changed, who owns the property, the timeframe for the project, whether directional signage would be allowed, and whether the handicapped parking is adequate.

The Planning Commission questions to the applicant focused on the Commission's concerns that a wind tunnel effect would be created and how would the applicant address that concern. Other questions focused on their phasing plan, when they anticipate they will get started on the project, when they might complete it, what are the proposed uses anticipated and how the connection of the second phase of the building would work. The Commission asked how many employees they estimate to have and whether they believe the proposed parking for both phases is adequate.

Planning Commission discussed parking being provided on the site.

#### **PUD Amendment Motion**

*Vice Chair Wong moved the Planning Commission approve the PUD Amendment request subject to staff's recommended 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 Wilgus seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

#### **Minor Subdivision Motion**

*Commissioner Nickell moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of the minor subdivision subject to staff's recommended conditions of approval, finding that the plat complies with the applicable requirements of Sections 26-17-7 and 26-19 of the Development and Zoning Code. Vice Chair Wong seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

#### **Site Plan/Architecture Review Motion**

*Commissioner Knuth 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 Nickell seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.*

#### **PUD Amendment Conditions of Approval:**

1. The following PUD modifications are approved:
  - a. Reduce the square footage of MOB 1 from 100,000 square feet to 74,006 square feet;
  - b. Reduce the square footage for MOB 2 from 75,000 square feet to 28,884 square feet;
  - c. Increase the square footage of MOB 3 from 75,000 square feet to 147,110 square feet (Phase 1-82,486 sq. ft; Phase 2-64,624 sq. ft.);
  - d. Amend the building footprints for MOB's 1, 2 and 3 to reflect current and future conditions;

- e. Amend the Design Criteria Table to delete reference to 'Shared Service Facility' and replace with 'City of Lafayette Emergency Services and Public Safety';
  - f. In the Design Criteria Table where it references 'City of Lafayette Emergency Services and Public Safety' amend criteria to increase building square footage from 8,000 square feet to 11,000 square feet, building height from 30 feet to 35 feet, and front setback from 25 feet to 20 feet;
  - g. Increase the total building square footage for the entire campus from 1,354,104 square feet to 1,357,104 square feet to accommodate the increased building area of the fire station;
  - h. Add a new note No. 11 defining emergency services to include fire protection services such as a fire station and other uses generally associated with public safety;
  - i. Revise Note No. 10 to remove reference to the shared service facility on the fire station lot and to identify the existing fenced, outdoor storage yard on Lot 4, Block 1.
  - j. A reduction in the area of Lot 4, Block 1 and subsequent increase in the area of Lot 3 to reflect the new lot configurations proposed with the Minor Subdivision;
  - k. Revision of the purpose statement to include all aforementioned PUD modifications;
2. The applicant shall work with staff and the City Engineer to address the issues and concerns itemized in the City Engineer's memo dated July 1, 2012.
  3. The applicant shall address the following issues prior to submitting the final plan PUD Amendment:
    - a. Delete the City Council Certificate for plats and replace with City Council Certificate for PUD's;
    - b. The Design Criteria table has the incorrect lots listed for many of the uses. The table should be modified to reflect the current Lot and Block # of each use.
    - c. Campus Drive and Pinnacle Drive need to be identified on the PUD;
    - d. Delete the applicant Certificate. This is not a City approved signature block;
    - e. Amend Planning Commission certificate to read "Preliminary PUD Amendment";
    - f. Amend City Council certificate to read "PUD Amendment" and delete references to "dedications".
    - g. In the Design Criteria table the bubble indicating an amendment to the overall lot area square footage and total acres of the PUD needs to be deleted since this number is not changing.

**Minor Subdivision Conditions of Approval:**

1. The applicant shall correct the following errors on the minor subdivision prior to submittal of the plat for City Council acceptance of the new easements:
  - a. The Minor Subdivision is labeled Replat F. Replat F already exists. This minor subdivision should be known as 'Lafayette Corporate Campus Replat G';
  - b. The Fire station lot is mislabeled. It should be labeled as 'Lot 1, Lafayette Corporate Campus Replat F';
  - c. Add the following missing text to the City Administrator Certificate block "appears to be";
  - d. The Planning Commission certificate should be changed to "Preliminary Plat was approved".

**Site Plan/Architectural Review Conditions of Approval:**

1. The applicant shall provide finished elevations for Phase I with the final plan submittal. The phase I elevations shall be subject to review and approval of staff.
2. A table shall be added to the landscape plan indicating the quantity of each plant shown on the plan as well as an analysis of Code requirements vs. what is proposed on the landscape plan.
3. The applicant shall provide data indicating that either 28 additional parking spaces are available adjacent to the site by demonstrating that shared parking is available, or that Phase II be amended to include 28 additional parking spaces.
4. A bike rack detail shall be added to plans specifying the total amount of bicycle parking available.
5. If LED lighting is utilized for this phase of the campus development, the applicant shall provide evidence to the City demonstrating that the style of LED lighting will be compatible with the existing metal halide lighting on the campus.

6. The applicant shall provide a line of sight analysis from Highway 287 to demonstrate that the trash compactor, generator and transformer will not be visible. If this does not show that these items will be adequately screened, temporary landscaping or some other form of screening approved by staff shall be installed until such time as the Phase II building addition is under construction.

**V. Other Business**

**A. Commission Comments / Committee Reports**

Chairperson Patzer thanked everyone for selecting him again as Chair. He thanked staff for their hard work on the Exempla Healthcare PUD Amendment.

Commissioner Knuth gave an update on the recent LOSAC meeting he attended and he explained that the Committee is looking at forming a joint committee to work on a comprehensive bike map. He discussed some of the goals of the committee. He asked staff for some feedback on how the joint committee might get started and involve staff's time. Ms. Westover noted she has had some meetings with Monte Stevenson, Parks Open Space Golf Director and would ask him and get back to the Commission.

**B. Department Comments**

Planning Manager Karen Westover reminded the Planning Commission about the City Council joint workshop with City boards, commissions and committees on August 9. She explained that the meeting will give the Council and the public an opportunity to learn more about what the Commission does, how they work with staff, the City's zoning and development code, the comprehensive plan and so forth. She asked them to email her directly with any questions and to let her know if they will be able to attend.

Ms. Westover noted that there were not any items submitted for review for the Planning Commission in August, so staff plans to hold a workshop with the Commission regarding the Comprehensive Plan on Tuesday, August 28.

**VI. Adjournment**

*Commissioner Steinbrecher moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Nickell. All voted in favor of the motion. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.*

City of Lafayette

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle Verostko, Recording Secretary