

**MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APRIL 24, 2024**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 1. Called To Order  
7

8 Chair Michael Polan called the April 24, 2024, meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission  
9 to order at 7:00 p.m., in City Council Chambers.  
10

11 2. Roll Call  
12

13 Recording Assistant Jane Madrid called the roll. Present on the Commission were  
14 Commissioners Judson Hite, Chris Teta, Geri Boone, Michael Polan, Amy Saunders, Ana  
15 Lucaci, and Tom Lange. Commissioners Janell Flaig and Matthew Popkin, and Council  
16 Representative Aren Rodriguez were absent. In attendance also was Interim Planning Director  
17 Grant Penland, Senior Planner Kristin Cote, and Assistant City Attorney Jeremy Tyrell.  
18

19 Other staff in attendance: Don Burchett, Phil Greenwald, Michele Goldman, Josh Sherman,  
20 Caroline Michael, Sam Lanternier, and City of Longmont affordable housing staff.  
21

22 3. Communications  
23

24 No communications.  
25

26 4. Public Invited to Be Heard  
27

28 Chair Polan opened the public invited to be heard.  
29

30 No one wished to speak.  
31

32 Chair Polan closed the public invited to be heard.  
33

34 5. Approval of the minutes & 2024 Bylaws  
35

36 February 21, 2024, Meeting Minutes  
37

38 Motion

39 **COMMISSIONER HITE MOVED APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 21, 2024,**  
40 **MEETING MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. COMMISSIONER BOONE SECONDED THE**  
41 **MOTION.**  
42

43 Vote

44 **MOTION CARRIED 6-0-1, Commissioner Saunders abstaining.**  
45  
46

February 28, 2024

Motion

**COMMISSIONER HITE MOVED APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2024, MEETING MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. COMMISSIONER BOONE SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vote

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0-1, Commissioner Saunders abstaining.**

2024 Bylaws

Motion

**COMMISSIONER HITE MOVED TABLING THE APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED 2024 BYLAWS UNTIL THE COMMISSION HAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE RECENTLY ADOPTED CODE OF ETHICS AND DETERMINE ANY INCLUSION INTO THE COMMISSION BYLAWS. COMMISSIONER SAUNDERS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Vote

**MOTION CARRIED 4-3, Commissioners Polan, Lucaci, and Lange dissenting.**

6. Public Hearing

- A. HousePAD Envision Longmont Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendment, Rezoning, Concept Plan Amendment, Overall Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, Senior Planner Kristin Cote

Staff Presentation

Property Location/Info

- 200 Bountiful Avenue - south of Costco, north of Bountiful Avenue, and west of Harvest Moon Drive
- 16.4 +/- acres
- Annexed in 2017 – Irwin Thomas #1 Annexation
- Zoned R-MF (residential multi-family)
- Envision Longmont designated as Multi-family Neighborhood

Proposed Project

The proposed development for this property entails a 16.4-acre, low- and middle-income, for-sale all-electric neighborhood. Important notes regarding this development include:

- Proposed maximum of 185 units.
- Approximately 55 units are earmarked for permanent deed restrictions.
- Approximately 130 units will be deed-restricted attainable units.

- The neighborhood design includes a mix of attached townhomes and detached single-family homes.
- Overall density averaging approximately 11.6 units per acre.

#### Application Summary

##### Amendment to Envision Longmont Comprehensive Land Use Plan

This application seeks to amend the land use designation for the portion of Irwin Thomas Annexation No.1 lying south of Costco, specifically Lots 5 and 6 of Irwin Thomas First Filing, from multi-family neighborhood to mixed neighborhood.

- Change is necessary to accommodate the proposed affordable and attainable for-sale housing.
- This amendment is necessary, as the neighborhood plan includes a mix of single-family detached homes, attached homes, and townhomes. Single-family detached homes are not permitted under the current zoning (R-MF).
- Additionally, the proposed density of 11.6 units per acre falls outside the density range specified in the R-MF zone (18 to 35 units per acre).

##### Rezoning Application

The rezoning application seeks to change the zoning from R-MF (residential multifamily) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) with an R-MN (residential mixed neighborhood) use allowance.

- Change is necessary to facilitate the construction of the neighborhood, including a mix of single-family detached homes, attached homes, and townhomes at a density of 11.6 units per acre.
- This zoning change aligns with the comprehensive plan amendment and allows for the proposed mix of units.

##### Concept Plan Amendment

The Concept Plan Amendment proposes to change the land use designation on Lots 5 and 6 of Irwin Thomas First Filing from Multifamily Neighborhood to Mixed Neighborhood to accommodate the aforementioned.

- Change is necessary to facilitate the construction of the neighborhood, including a mix of single-family detached homes, attached homes, and townhomes at a density of 11.6 units per acre.
- The remainder of the property is unchanged.

##### PUD Overall Development Plan (ODP)

The proposed ODP application sets tailored regulations to allow for a unique development.

- These regulations enable the developer to customize development standards and codes specific to the proposed development, allowing for some flexibility to our standards and the requirements outlined in the Longmont Municipal Code.
- These project specific codes and standards are designed to support the applicants in creating an affordable and attainable project while upholding high standards and ensuring quality construction.

- These project-specific codes and standards are designed to support the creation of an affordable and attainable project while upholding high standards and ensuring quality construction.
- This application aligns with the city's objective of having 10% of the total housing stock designated as permanently affordable units and is crucial for advancing the applicant's vision of a well-designed, sustainable, and inclusive community.

#### Preliminary Plat

The Preliminary Plat lays out the proposed lots, blocks, easements, grading, drainage, and utilities required to serve the new homes.

- This 185-lot preliminary plat reflects the proposed regulations and standards outlined in the Overall Development Plan (ODP).
- These regulations enable the developer to customize development standards and codes specific to the proposed development, allowing for some flexibility to our standards and the requirements outlined in the Longmont Municipal Code.

#### Public Outreach

- Neighborhood meeting January 24, 2024, via Zoom
- Notice of Application Mailing February 20, 2024
  - Comments received - included in attachments
- Notice of Public Hearing Mailing April 10, 2024
  - Comments received - included in attachments

#### Summary of Comments

- Two letters were received from Xcel Energy. The first letter addressed easement concerns, while the second amended the original letter to state no objection to the proposal, contingent upon PSCO's ability to retain all existing rights regarding natural gas and electric transmission.
  - In response, staff assured that all existing rights pertaining to natural gas and electric transmission would indeed be maintained.
- An email expressing concerns about truck traffic during construction and the traffic generated from the development was received.
  - In response, staff noted that a traffic study would be necessary if the development progresses to the final plat and site plan review stage. Any issues identified in that report would be addressed in accordance with review requirements. Furthermore, construction traffic would be mandated to adhere to Longmont standards by utilizing designated truck haul routes.
- An email expressing concerns about the rezoning and the subsequent decrease in density was received.
  - In response, staff clarified that the HousePAD project's layout was intentionally designed to accommodate a mix of housing types, in line with the objectives outlined in Envision Longmont. The placement of single-family detached properties along South Martin Street serves to create a buffer zone between the existing single-family residences and the attached units.

- Two documents were received from a property owner expressing concerns regarding the proposed tree lawns, citing difficulties in maintenance, associated costs, and a preference for more xeric plantings in the tree lawn area.
  - In response, staff emphasizes adherence to City Standards, specifically referencing sections 606.02.1 and 606.02.5. These standards prioritize the design and installation of plant materials for ease of maintenance and safety, as well as the incorporation of xeriscaping principles in all city-owned landscape areas. Furthermore, landscaping within this development will comply with city standards, considering water conservation needs and maintenance considerations. Final decisions on landscaping will be made as the development progresses through the required processes.

#### Development Considerations

- The proposed development of this property encompasses a 16.4-acre neighborhood designed for low- and middle-income residents. It will feature approximately 185 units for sale. Among these, about 55 units will be subject to permanent deed restrictions, ensuring affordability for households earning below 80% of the area median income. Additionally, around 130 units will be designated as attainable units, subject to deed restrictions for households earning below 120% of the area median income. These attainable units will maintain their affordability status for at least 10 years.
- The proposal entails creating a fully electric neighborhood.
- The proposed development aligns with several key policies of the Envision Longmont Comprehensive Plan: Policy 1.2, which advocates for a sustainable blend of land uses; Policy 3.1.A, which aims to provide affordable and accessible housing options catering to residents of diverse ages, abilities, and income levels; and Policy 3.1.B, which endeavors to achieve a ten percent quota of permanently affordable housing units within the overall housing stock.

#### Questions

Questions have arisen regarding pivotal project elements, including the rationale behind downsizing property density, potential construction implications of soil conditions, minimum 2-car garages in architectural elevations, plans for burying power lines, details of deed restriction verbiage, and the proposal for a 6' tree lawn.

In summary:

- Progress and decisions made regarding density can be attributed to two main factors: acquiring land below market value and employing innovative design. These, combined with the site configuration and flexibility offered by the PUD/ODP application, enable the developer to reduce costs. This directly affects the feasibility of creating an affordable and achievable development.
- On-site soil treatment or importing offsite soils will be required before building construction
- LMC Section 15.05.080 requires 2 parking spaces per single-family unit. Garages are added to comply, but some lots (SFD types C1/C2) may lack space for both driveway and garage parking. Units without garages (SFD types A/B) offer more flexibility with larger sizes for driveway parking

- Some lines will be buried. LPC will make a final determination regarding that requirement at public improvement plan (PIP) review.
- PUD zoning requires an Overall Development Plan (ODP). The consideration of a 6' tree lawn instead of a standard 8' is part of ODP application. The City Environmental Planner recommends canyon maple, golden raintree, Ussurian pear for appropriate plantings within a reduced-size tree lawn.

### Recommendations

Based on the record and preceding information staff recommends approval of the HousePAD Envision Longmont Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendment, Rezoning, Concept Plan Amendment, Overall Development Plan and recommends conditional approval of the Preliminary Plat subject to final approval of the rezoning.

### Applicant Presentation

- LOCATION: Irwin Thomas Annexation No. 1 – north of Quail Road, South of Saint Vrain Creek, west of N119th Street and east of Martin Street, Lots 5 and 6 Irwin Thomas First Filing
- LANDOWNER: City of Longmont
- APPLICANT: Vertikal, LLC Walker Thrash
- PROJECT TEAM:
  - Vertikal LLC - Walker Thrash, Managing Partner and Sarah Newton, AIA Partner/Design
  - TST Consulting Engineers, Inc. - Brian Williamson, Landscape Architect and James Bruntz, Professional Engineer
  - SM Rocha, LLC Traffic and Transportation Consultants – Mike Rocha, Transportation Engineer
  - Resource Conservations Partners, LLC-Barb Brunk – Landscape Architect
- APPLICATIONS: Envision Longmont Land Use Map Amendment
  - Irwin Thomas Annexation No. 1 Concept Plan Amendment
  - Rezoning
  - Preliminary Plat
  - Overall Development Plan
- HousePAD Affordable and Attainable Neighborhood Project is a cooperative effort between the City of Longmont, Vertikal, LLC and the original landowner to establish a beautiful, walkable, sustainable neighborhood of approximately 185 affordable and attainable, for sale homes. The public private partnership was established through agreements as approved by City Council at the beginning of this year.
- Vision – To establish a beautiful, walkable community of affordable and attainable homes with an integrated open space and pedestrian network.
- Existing Zoning: Residential Multi-Family
  - Density allowed 18 to 35 units per acre. Up to 3 stories tall with an allowance for additional height for Affordable Housing. Up to 560 units on 16 acres
- Proposed Zoning: Planned Unit Development
  - Density established by the PUD as allowed by the underlying land use designation - allowed 6 to 18 per acre.

- HousePAD – 185 units (11.6 units per acre), 1 and 2 story homes,
- Maximum Building height 30 feet
- Vehicle Trip Generation Comparison & Development Impacts (based on 185 units)
  - The proposed development does not exceed traffic volumes approved for the area in comparison to previously projected volumes of the overall development area. These volumes are not likely to negatively impact operations of Harvest Moon Drive, Bountiful Avenue, nor other adjacent roadways or intersections.
- Overall Development Plan
  - Target density is 185 Affordable and Attainable units.
- Overall Development Plan – Standards & Regulations
  - As contemplated with planned unit development zoning, this Overall Development Plan establishes the framework for development of this affordable and attainable neighborhood. Regulations and standards as shown on the tables in the ODP are substitutions from the noted existing regulations and standards found in the Longmont Development Code, Design Standards, and Construction Specifications. The plans as presented reflect these regulations and standards.
- Overall Development Plan – Access
  - 15.05.050.G. 3. Two means of access required.
  - a. General rule. To ensure public safety and to provide an efficient transportation system, each new development or subdivision shall provide a minimum of two principal means of access to the development or subdivision from public streets. The two means of access shall separately connect to the public street system. Direct access is provided to Bountiful Avenue and Harvest Moon Drive as required and allowed by Code.
  - The location and number of access points to serve the neighborhood were reviewed through the DRC process and approved by Public Safety and Public Works.
- Overall Development Plan – Parking
  - No on-street parking is allowed on Martin Street, Bountiful Avenue or Harvest Moon Drive adjacent to the site. Internal on-street parking provided as shown on the ODP.
- Parks and Recreation Connectivity
  - Planned community park (Sisters Community Park), Left Hand greenway/connectivity to St. Vrain Greenway are within the 1/2 mile from combined parcels.
  - Nino Gallo neighborhood park, Quail Campus/Rec Center, and Dickens Farm Nature Area approximately 1 mile away.
- These applications represent an opportunity to facilitate a unique public private partnership to provide affordable and attainable, for sale homes in Longmont. The applications presented meet the purpose and intent of the City's stated goals for providing more housing opportunities in Longmont and the specific Review Criteria as set forth in the Longmont Municipal Code including:
  - Section 15.02.055 - Review Criteria for all Application Types;

- Section 15.02.060 – Review Standards and Procedures For Specific Major Development Applications; Section 15.02.060.B.3 – Comprehensive Plan Amendments;
- Section 15.02.060.E – Preliminary Subdivision Plats;
- Section 15.02.060.F.5 – Rezoning (Amendment to the Official Zoning Map and Concept Plan Amendments.
- Section 15.02.060.G – Planned Unit Development Overall Development Plan; and
- Section 15.03.060 – Planned Unit Development.
- Specific details of how the applications as presented meet the applicable review criteria are outlined in the letter from Resource Conservation Partners, LLC to the Commission dated April 12, 2024, as included with the Planning Commission Packet.

#### Public Hearing

Chair Polan opened the public hearing.

Mark Pabst, 46 Sugar Beet Circle. Mark spoke about the current zoning of the property and the existing apartments to the north creating three blocks of apartments and supports the proposal of single-family housing with lower density instead of more apartments. Mark spoke about the preliminary landscape design and feels the small lots should have an appropriate landscape design. He has provided comments to the staff but did show some photos where he feels the trees are too large for the planting space, leading to infrastructure damage and the trees having to be cut back away from homes or removed if the tree dies. Mark is proposing the use of smaller scale columnar trees and shrubs, removal of turf areas, and moving to a beneficial turf concept.

Jordan Hill, 11531 Quail Rd. Jordan represents the agricultural Quail community, and the group has been coming to these types of meetings for about a decade as the Irwin Thomas projects continue to approach their neighborhood. He said the notice spoke to the expansion and change of an area of this project and states no one in the agricultural Quail neighborhood has a problem with lots 5 and 6 but did ask about the boundaries of the rezoning. Jordan said the projects are approaching their older agricultural community and they have submitted the quail community greenway proposal each time a project comes in to keep the information on record. They know they will eventually be annexed into Longmont but by the time they are Longmont residents they might not have a voice. The goal when it gets to them, is to have some kind of agricultural buffer and they hope their community is taken into consideration. He is in support of this project but will continue to give voice to the existence of their community.

Lawrence Beshear, 2 Western Sky Cir. Lawrence has reservations about the design and the pocket parks. The interior park is bounded on three sides by driveways and the other outer pocket parks are near high traffic areas. His proposal would take out all units in the middle and make the park larger. The current street is narrow with parallel parking, but parking could be included if the park is made bigger and added that there is almost no connection to the trail system. He said there is already affordable homes in the area and does not feel that \$400k is affordable. He also does not see the use of electric vehicles by the homeowners in this project. The project has good green space for trees, but not parks.



1 Jacob Arment, 110 Main St. Jacob like this development, Longmont needs more attainable  
2 housing. This project reminds him of Prospect and feels likes the layout adds to the walkability  
3 of the community, but he does have concerns about only two connections. He thinks this could  
4 create a problem like Prospect where the community is very walkable but no one outside the  
5 community will walk into it. He said adding more pedestrian connections outside of this  
6 development would greatly benefit the ability to add future developments to this area. Other  
7 than those concerns he likes this project and excited to see the city pursuing a project like this.

8  
9 No one else wished to speak.

10  
11 Chair Polan closed the public hearing.

12  
13 Commission Discussion

14 Commissioner Hite asked for clarification on the five proposals they are reviewing and how the  
15 approvals will work. Jeremy said if City Council denies any of the three recommendations made  
16 by the Planning & Zoning Commission, the ODP (Original Development Plan) is moot,  
17 assuming the commission approves the ODP and preliminary plat. He explained that you cannot  
18 have an ODP without the PUD zoning from City Council, which requires both the  
19 comprehensive plan amendment and concept plan amendment to accommodate the density. He  
20 added that the ODP and preliminary plat are appealable.

21  
22 Commissioner Boone appreciates the nice presentations and liked Mr. Pabst's presentation on  
23 the tree lawn. She said the Prospect tree lawns are 4-5 feet wide and when trees are too big it is a  
24 problem and feels that the recommendations of Mr. Pabst should be considered by the applicant.  
25 Speaking from someone who lives in Prospect, there are two larger community parks and many  
26 smaller parks, and she feels that the pocket parks work well in the neighborhood. There were  
27 concerns about pedestrian access raised by Mr. Arment but states a lot of people do walk into  
28 Prospect from the neighborhoods to the north and west. Commissioner Boone is excited about  
29 the proposal and will be in support.

30  
31 Commissioner Saunders commented that this is a huge project, and a large amount of work has  
32 gone into it. She feels it is a well done, balanced project but her vote does not yet support the  
33 ODP and the landscaping. She asked if there is a matrix to support the sustainability claim on  
34 their plans. Brian Williamson said they will incorporate some of Mr. Pabst's ideas of columnar  
35 trees in the landscaping plan to make the smaller spaces more functional. Brian said the intent is  
36 to use the columnar trees in the smaller tree lawns adjacent to the parking and use larger canopy  
37 trees where they have a 12-foot tree lawn. He said they were thoughtful when putting the turf  
38 areas in, especially in the corners adjacent to the roundabout where they have included some  
39 evergreen trees to protect the turf areas from the traffic. The smaller spaces at end of the houses  
40 are functional for small children playing and in a development with this many units they want  
41 accessible open space near the units.

42  
43 Commissioner Saunders asked if the applicant used any of the sustainability calculators when  
44 doing their assessments. Brian said they did not, but they did include a seed mix that requires  
45 low water use in the perimeter areas and the dog park, and in other areas they are using a native  
46 prairie sod. Commissioner Saunders pointed out that one of the guiding principles of the

1 sustainability plan is measuring for sustainability and a target she mentioned is the 18% tree  
2 canopy increase for 2025 and said that she is not seeing that in this plan. She states that the tree  
3 lawn is being decreased 25 percent, from 8-feet down to 6-feet, but the parking and the bump  
4 outs is increasing the parking load. She said the overall parking increased almost 37 percent over  
5 the site and it reads to her like it is swapping out trees and vegetation for parking. That doesn't  
6 track towards sustainability goals and her idea would be to reduce the parking and increase  
7 vegetation. Brian said that has been a discussion item on the project, trying to balance the need  
8 for the parkways and the larger green areas with making sure it is a functional development. He  
9 pointed out that the units do not have driveways so there is a need for visitor parking on the  
10 street. Barb added that the streets are significantly narrower creating less pavement with less  
11 runoff and heat sink and the parking spaces are strategically placed. She pointed out that  
12 Longmont Power & Communications (LPC) will put the power lines under the sidewalk rather  
13 than in the tree lawn to make it the best tree lined street. She understands the reservations about  
14 parking, and is all about having the green space, but if it doesn't function as a neighborhood, it  
15 does not do any good to have it there. Commissioner Saunders said if the project is not meeting  
16 sustainability targets from the sustainability plan, it cannot be marketed as sustainable.  
17 Decreasing the tree canopy by using columnar trees is cutting the shade in half and the trees are  
18 susceptible to snow load and breakage, and added having the power lines under the sidewalk is  
19 fairly standard. She feels the tree canopy and vegetation are being shortchanged for more parking  
20 and will be voting no for this project.

21  
22 Chair Polan asked about the multimodal transportation plan. Barb spoke to the plan in the  
23 packet. There are interior paths, sidewalks along the streets, and connections to Martin Street. All  
24 adjacent streets have sidewalks and provisions for bicycles, and they have a place for a crossing  
25 over to Costco. She added that all the bike lanes and sidewalks connect to the larger greenway  
26 system in the area and the overall system in Longmont and bus transit is located on Main Street.  
27 Barb explained that connectivity was seriously contemplated at the time of platting this property.

28  
29 Chair Polan asked if city staff is okay with the smaller street and alley widths. Josh Sherman,  
30 PWNR Civil Engineer, said the request was made to reduce the street width from 10 feet down to  
31 nine feet, for a total of 18 feet which is adequate for standard cars but not fire apparatus. He  
32 added that the provision being added in lieu of that is that all homes will have fire suppression  
33 for alternative means of protection. Alleys are 20 feet wide with a 9 feet drive width in each  
34 direction that will allow for waste services and emergency access. Michele Goldman, Assistant  
35 Fire Chief, concurred that the concession was all units are fire suppressed in this development.  
36 Code only requires anything above a single-family residence be sprinkled, but all products in this  
37 development are being suppressed. She pointed out these building will be 30 feet and below in  
38 height, if they do go over 30 feet the fire code requires aerial apparatus access in addition to  
39 ordinary fire emergency access to perform rescue and fire attack in the buildings. She said even  
40 giving up the two feet in width, the emergency equipment still can move through the  
41 development and make the turns.

42  
43 Commissioner Lucaci asked what how the electric works if the sprinklers go off. Michele  
44 explained when looking at an electrical fire the sprinklers are there to protect the routes of egress  
45 until the fire department can get there. As far as water and electric, the only thing you can do is

1 prevent the runaway which is what happens with EV lithium, and providing water, sand, and  
2 blankets to compress or suppress it.

3 Commissioner Lucaci asked for additional clarification on the multimodal plan. Barb explained  
4 the green lines are sidewalks along the street and the purple lines are the internal sidewalks along  
5 the front of homes in the development. Commissioner Lucaci commented that she does not see a  
6 good connection to Costco. Barb said on the northeastern edge of the subdivision there is a  
7 sidewalk that goes north up to the property line and then turns north again into the Costco  
8 property. She said they talked to staff about this because Costco is developed and there is not a  
9 pedestrian connection on that site, but the site between Costco and Harvest Moon is under  
10 development and it is their understanding that a pedestrian connection will be included in that  
11 development. She mentioned another way to get to Costco is to walk up Harvest Moon Drive and  
12 the first and second exit is the Costco entrance with pedestrian connections.

13  
14 Commissioner Lucaci knows that residents in the area use the path along the ditch on the west  
15 side. Barb advised that is the Bonus ditch and the property is an outlot on the Costco property  
16 that was dedicated to the city. There is a ditch access and maintenance road, but it not meant to  
17 be a formal connection. Commissioner Lucaci asked if a bridge could be installed to make it a  
18 formal connection. Barb said it was discussed but city staff asked that pedestrian traffic be  
19 directed to Martin Street instead of the ditch right-of-way. Barb explained some items will be  
20 more refined at final development and final plat, but there are designated connections  
21 established. Kristin explained to the commission that the plans are conceptual in nature at this  
22 point, so landscaping and connectivity will go through additional review and are subject to  
23 change. Josh said something to consider is the Costco multimodal plan and the orientation of the  
24 building with the entrances on the north and east side. There was a sidewalk planned through  
25 their parking to the east, but when thinking about where to put those pedestrians safely, it is not  
26 in the middle of parking lot where there are not adequate crossing facilities. There is also the  
27 issue of trucks coming from the west and south for the loading and unloading on the west side of  
28 the facility and recognizing there may be some informal paths in the area, promoting those or  
29 facilitating those would not be something the city would want to consider if it is not the safest  
30 route. Commissioner Lucaci asked if it will ever be a safe route. Josh said with the proposed  
31 development to the north of this project, there is a planned access without having to go out to the  
32 street.

33  
34 Commissioner Hite likes this project, it is affordable and ownable. He commented that the  
35 project is horizontally dense, dwelling units are lower than multifamily but multifamily stacks  
36 the density. He does understand the concerns with the tree canopies and small tree lawns but  
37 wasn't exactly sure how the green space and pocket parks requirements mapped out in the ODP.  
38 Brian said there is no code requirement for micro parks, it is a concept they are introducing in the  
39 ODP. Commissioner Hite asked for the definition of a pocket park and Kristin read the definition  
40 from code. She said a pocket park is provided in one area, but the applicant is asking to provide  
41 one larger centralized pocket park and make up the remaining required acreage with smaller  
42 micro pocket parks. Commissioner Hite asked if there is a minimum size for a pocket park.  
43 Kristin said the requirement for a pocket park is one centralized continuous area, but the  
44 applicant is asking for the layout in the ODP. Brian explained that the layout does not allow for a  
45 1.85-acre contiguous space, but they are trying to meet the intent of the standard by providing the  
46 same amount of space adjacent to as many units as possible in the development. He explained

1 the different areas of green space throughout the plan and advised that as part of the original  
2 Irwin Thomas improvements the ditch along the west side is open in some areas and piped in  
3 other. They need to leave the easement open, however they are allowed to surface treat with  
4 grass and trees if a certain separation is maintained from the pipe and the utilities.

5  
6 Commissioner Hite asked how many parking spaces are in the bump outs. Brian said 81 are  
7 included in the loop around the development. He added the only units that could have a driveway  
8 are the units along the west.

9  
10 Commissioner Hite asked if the number of units could be reduced. Walker Thrash explained  
11 there are many goals they are trying to meet and one of them was the maximum number of  
12 affordable (80% and under AMI) units utilizing the funding sources from the city. The 185 units  
13 they need is based on a perma total to make the math work financially. He explained that the  
14 affordable units are being subsidized with attainable units (80-120% AMI), so the more  
15 attainable units the better the perma will operate and less public incentives would be  
16 necessary. The plan is to get to 55 affordable units, meaning they need to add two attainable  
17 units to make the math work. The current pricing is set at 90%, 100%, and 110%, they have not  
18 maxed at the 120% and that is to account for any kind of inflationary pressure that might happen.

19  
20 Commissioner Lange asked about rendering the packet of one of the buildings. Walker  
21 explained the single-family homes will have a 7–8-foot separation between the units with one  
22 side of every residence without windows. The units will have a sliding glass door to a private  
23 patio, which is opposite of the home next door. Commissioner Lange asked about the square  
24 footage of the homes. Walker said the first phase will be between 900-1,500 square feet, with  
25 small 1,700-1,800 square foot lots. Commissioner Lange likes the plan.

26  
27 Chair Polan understands the tension with the lot size and landscaping and trying to get to a  
28 density number for the affordable housing. He knows they would be giving up some canopy and  
29 street size to get to the affordable number, but he is leaning towards support of this project.

30  
31 Commissioner Saunders asked what part parking plays in the penciling out of the units. Walker  
32 explained for the individual units as a stand-alone, they are trying to create two parking spaces,  
33 there is no driveway to park a vehicle, so on street parking is the only option for the visitors. He  
34 is not sure it plays directly into the perma but not having street parking becomes functionally  
35 problematic because you cannot park traffic in a driveway. Commissioner Saunders commented  
36 that the parking is over the minimum standards and asked if there is a way to decrease on-street  
37 parking to allow for an increase in tree lawns. She feels the detriment is to the tree lawn, canopy  
38 and the sustainability markers that have been worked on and put into place. She would like to do  
39 percentages or exact numbers for an ODP, but she doesn't want to prohibit the design process.  
40 Walker said they are at the concept level, adjustments can be made to the formal ODP, and they  
41 can take it into consideration, but the total mix of homes is really where their perma is  
42 dependent, it is not the number of parking spaces. Commissioner Saunders agrees and said it  
43 does matter down the line. Barb said those considerations would come at the final development  
44 plan, this is the outline and the basic standards. She said the streets are narrower and some areas  
45 of the tree lawn are more than eight feet, it has been dispersed throughout the project, and it  
46 could be at final they make some more bump outs and lose some parking to make room for more

1 canopies along the street, but if they wholesale take away the opportunity to have a 6-foot tree  
2 lawn, it will impact the design. Don Burchett pointed out that the site currently has no trees and  
3 when it is developed, tree canopy will be added, and added that the city standards allow for on-  
4 street parking on every street. He said as part of the discussion with Public Safety and Public  
5 Works, they agreed to reduce the street size to a narrower cross-section, knowing that some of  
6 the parking spaces may not be used all the time so that there are additional places for the vehicles  
7 to get through for trash pickup and other services. It is important to understand that there has  
8 been some compromise to meet the goal of this development which is to provide affordable  
9 housing. He also pointed out that if this was an urban section where everything was concrete  
10 from the property line to the street, the design standards allow for tree lawns to be 6-feet wide by  
11 8-feet deep with no restriction on the type of trees that are planted. Currently this is at 6-feet  
12 wide tree lawns with sections longer than 8-foot in length for the absorption of water and the  
13 provision for them to grow into, so an urban development would have less than what this  
14 development has now in terms of tree islands, with no restrictions on the type of landscaping. He  
15 added that if this were a different design, this wouldn't be a discussion and said there has to be a lot  
16 of discussion and thought that has gone into this design. He also advised the commission that  
17 there are no review criteria for the commission to consider regarding the sustainability plan.

18  
19 Commissioner Saunders is disappointed to hear that while there was time and energy put into  
20 sustainability targets, there is not more requirements for them. What is the point of having a  
21 sustainability plan if we are going to put in parking and not put in trees and tree lawns. It is  
22 saying let's just green it up as little as possible so we can have as many cars come in as possible.  
23 She said there will come a time for everyone to decide where we're uncomfortable walking  
24 around and not having an extra spot for guests to come over and visit, and there is going to be a  
25 point when we say climate change is important and it is a piece that needs to pencil out and be  
26 important in a project. She was hoping to put a condition on the project to decrease the on-street  
27 parking while increasing the width of the tree lawn.

28  
29 Motion

30 **COMMISSIONER SAUNDERS MOVED APPROVAL OF PZR 2024-2B, WITH AN**  
31 **ADDED CONDITION DECREASING THE AMOUNT OF ON-STREET PARKING AND**  
32 **INCREASING THE WIDTH OF THE TREE LAWN. COMMISSIONER HITE**  
33 **SECONDED THE MOTION.**

34  
35 Discussion of the Motion

36 Chair Polan commented that with affordable housing it comes down to density. It was pointed  
37 out that it would not be a 6-foot barrier everywhere, it may go up to 8-feet, the applicant is just  
38 asking for the ability to go down to 6-feet in some areas. He said given the small lot sizes it does  
39 make sense to have smaller trees, that is something that must be given up to get the affordable  
40 housing and added that the applicant has done electrification which is sustainable and not  
41 required. Chair Polan is comfortable with the balance that they are trying to reach to bring in the  
42 affordable and attainable housing on this project.

43  
44 Commissioner Hite reviewed the five applications the commission is working through and feels  
45 that they all meet the standards, except the lack of greenspace, and he would like to encourage

1 the applicant to include more greenspace. He will be in support of the project with the condition  
2 proposed by Commission Saunders.

3  
4 Commissioner Lange pointed out that on the parking table it states 311 parking spots are  
5 required, which is 1.7 cars per unit, and he feels that is a small number. He can appreciate  
6 wanting more canopy and not diminishing that in lieu of adding more parking, but 2.33 spots per  
7 units seems more reasonable than 1.7. He also reviewed Google maps and in terms of  
8 accessibility to mass transit, the residents will have to walk a mile to access mass transit so he  
9 feels there will be a lot of cars in this development. His preference is to keep the plan the way it  
10 is, he believes it is reasonable as proposed.

11  
12 Kristin reviewed a slide with the city approved tree detail for this project. She also clarified that  
13 one half acre is to be contiguous for each pocket park and that would be the reason for the ODP  
14 request.

15  
16 Jeremy Tyrrell suggested that the commission break up their motion and consider each  
17 application individually, and the reason for that would be because the condition added by  
18 Commissioner Saunders would appear to apply to all the applications versus a separate motion  
19 for the ODP. He also suggested that if conditions are going to be imposed on the ODP, the  
20 commission recommend specific conditions as opposed to a nebulous idea.

21  
22 Chair Polan asked for clarification about the resolutions needed. Jeremy said staff will redraft a  
23 resolution to identify the condition on the ODP.

24  
25 Commissioner Saunders clarified that the condition to decrease parking and increase the tree  
26 lawn would only apply to the ODP.

27  
28 Commissioner Boone asked for clarification on the condition regarding additional tree lawn.  
29 Commissioner Saunders replied that she is purposefully not putting numbers on it, she does not  
30 want to tie the hands of the design team. She clarified that the decrease in parking should go to  
31 the increase in tree lawn.

32  
33 Chair Polan does not like the idea of having something nebulous without a number, it is hard to  
34 keep track of and achieve. He said there should be some numbers that the applicant can be held  
35 to.

36  
37 Commissioner Boone asked if this project would come back to the commission. Staff advised it  
38 would not come back to the commission for any additional review, staff will complete the final  
39 review.

40  
41 Chair Polan's concern is with the project design after making the changes being suggested.

42  
43 Jeremy commented that there is not an on-street parking requirement, the only time a  
44 requirement would come in is if the applicant is using on-street parking to satisfy an off-street  
45 parking minimum, which is not being done on this project. He explained that making the  
46 condition concerning the tree lawn width increasing beyond the 6-foot width, they would have to

1 take it away from the parking to achieve that goal, as opposed to having a separate condition  
2 regarding parking. The alternative is the applicant would have to change the design of the homes.

3  
4 Walker suggested a decrease in parking by a percentage or number of spaces. Jeremy feels like  
5 that would be a condition on the preliminary plat because the ODP does not address on-street  
6 parking. Walker added that if they decrease the parking, they will need to increase the green  
7 space. After further discussion regarding specific numbers, the commission was coming up with  
8 25% decrease, or approximately a 20-space decrease.

9  
10 Brian is concerned about losing that many spaces, that will leave around 60 spaces or 1 visitor  
11 space for every three units. He would like to propose putting a cap on the number of on-street  
12 parking spaces throughout the development. Commissioner Saunders prefers a swap, 20 percent  
13 for 20 percent, versus putting a number on it. Brian explained that they cannot make the 6-foot  
14 lawn areas bigger because there is physically not enough space in the street section without  
15 making the right-of-way larger.

16  
17 Amended Motion

18 **COMMISSIONER SAUNDERS MOVED APPROVAL OF PZR 2024-2B, WITH AN**  
19 **ADDED CONDITION OF DECREASING THE AMOUNT OF ON-STREET PARKING**  
20 **BY 16 SPACES TO BE REPLACED BY GREEN SPACE.**

21  
22 After further discussion, Commissioner Saunders withdrew her motion. The commission will  
23 vote on items individually.

24  
25 Motion

26 **COMMISSIONER HITE MOVED RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF THE**  
27 **HOUSEPAD ENVISION LONGMONT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE**  
28 **AMENDMENT, REZONING, AND CONCEPT PLAN AMENDMENT.**  
29 **COMMISSIONER TETA SECONDED THE MOTION.**

30  
31 Vote

32 **MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

33  
34 Motion

35 **CHAIR POLAN MOVED APPROVAL OF THE HOUSEPAD PRELIMINARY PLAT AS**  
36 **PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER SAUDERS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

37  
38 Vote

39 **MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

40  
41 Motion

42 **COMMISSIONER SAUDERS MOVED CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE**  
43 **HOUSEPAD OVERALL DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH THE CONDITION OF**  
44 **DECREASING THE AMOUNT OF ON-STREET PARKING BY 16 SPACES TO BE**  
45 **REPLACED BY GREEN SPACE, AS REFLECTED ON PAGE 2 OF 18 OF THE**

1 **OVERALL DEVELOPMENT PLAN. COMMISSIONER TETA SECONDED THE**  
2 **MOTION.**

3  
4 Vote

5 **MOTION CARRIES 5-2, COMMISSIONERS HITE AND LANGE DISSENTING.**

6  
7 Motion

8 **COMMISSIONER HITE MOVED TO DIRECT STAFF TO DRAFT THE RESOLUTION**  
9 **CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMISSION’S FINDINGS AND GRANTING CHAIR**  
10 **POLAN AUTHORITY TO SIGN THE RESOLUTION. CHAIR POLAN SECONDED**  
11 **THE MOTION.**

12  
13 Vote

14 **MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

15  
16 Chair Polan read the appeal and process notices into record.

17  
18 7. Final call – public invited to be heard

19  
20 Chair Polan opened the final call public invited to be heard.

21  
22 No one wished to speak.

23  
24 Chair Polan closed the final call public invited to be heard.

25  
26 8. Items from the Commission

27  
28 Commissioner Hite advised he will be rethinking his interpretation of “special circumstances”  
29 after the variance discussion at the February 28 meeting.

30  
31 9. Items from the Council Representative

32  
33 Council Member Rodrigues was absent.

34  
35 10. Items from the Planning Director

36  
37 Grant advised the commission if there is a meeting in May, it would be held on May 15. At this  
38 time, he does not believe there will be any projects ready for this date. He also mentioned that  
39 the June 19 meeting was cancelled for the Juneteenth holiday and the commission should plan to  
40 meet on June 26.

41  
42 11. Adjournment

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN MOVED ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING. NO ONE WAS**  
45 **OPPOSED.**



1 The meeting was adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

2  
3 Respectfully submitted,

4  
5  
6  
7 Chairman/Vice Chairman  
8 Planning and Zoning Commission

9  
10 /Jm 04/25/24

DRAFT