

1  
2  
3 **MINUTES**  
4 **PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
5 **AUGUST 21, 2024**  
6

7 1. Called To Order

8  
9 Chair Michael Polan called the August 21, 2024, meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission  
10 to order at 7:00 p.m., in City Council Chambers.  
11

12 2. Roll Call

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

19 3. Communications

20  
21 No communications.  
22

23 4. Public Invited to Be Heard

24  
25 Chair Polan opened the public invited to be heard.  
26

27 No one wished to speak.  
28

29 Chair Polan closed the public invited to be heard.  
30

31 5. Approval of the minutes

32  
33 July 17, 2024, Meeting Minutes  
34

35 Motion

36 **COMMISSIONER BOONE MOVED APPROVAL OF THE JULY 17, 2024, MEETING**  
37 **MINUTES AS PRESENTED. CHAIR POLAN SECONDED THE MOTION.**  
38

39 Vote

40 **MOTION CARRIED 5-0-2, Commissioners Hite and Koler abstaining.**  
41

42 6. Public Hearing

43  
44 A. Westview Acres Concept Plan Amendment, Senior Planner Kristin Cote  
45

46 Staff Presentation

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

Property Location/Info

- 8757 N 87th Street, west of Airport Road, south of Glenneyre Drive
- 6.83 +/- acres
- Originally platted in Boulder County in 1980 as Westview Acres Subdivision
- Annexed in 2022 – Westview Annexation
- Original Concept Plan and Zoning approved in 2022 with conditions (see Attachment 9)
- Zoned R-SF (residential single-family)
- Envision Longmont designated as Single-Family Neighborhood

Development Info

- Zoned R-SF with Single Family Neighborhood Land Use Designation (Envision Longmont)
- Uses proposed on site include single family detached dwelling units
- Original Concept Plan allows for 22 single-family dwelling units, with the existing two homes remaining on the site
- Original concept Plan was approved with conditions
- Applicant proposes to demolish the two existing single-family dwellings on this property, which had originally been planned to be maintained and included in this development

Proposed Amendment to Westview Annexation Plan

Amendment Overview:

- The applicant is seeking approval to increase the maximum number of allowed single-family detached units on the property known as Westview Acres, which is zoned Residential Single-Family (R-SF). The concept plan, originally approved in 2022 for 22 single-family dwelling units, is now requesting an increase to allow for 24 units.

Public Outreach

- Neighborhood meeting May 11, 2023, via Zoom
- Notice of Application Mailing December 23, 2023
  - Comments Received
- Notice of Public Hearing Mailing August 7, 2024

Development Considerations

- Proposed amendment aligns with Envision Longmont and Residential Single-Family (R-SF) zoning
- Complies with minimum lot standards for area and width
- Amended concept plan complies with all applicable Codes and regulations
- Adequate services exist or will be provided for the Westview development
- Applicant proposes to demolish the two existing single-family dwellings on this property, which had originally been planned to be maintained and included in this development
- Surrounding area contains compatible zoning and uses

Recommendations

1 Staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission consider recommending conditional  
2 approval of the Westview Acres Concept Plan Amendment to the City Council with the following  
3 conditions of approval:

- 4 • A robust landscape buffer and privacy fencing must be installed along the north, west, and  
5 south sides of the property. The fencing must be installed prior to construction.
- 6 • A drainage report must be submitted in accordance with the City of Longmont Design  
7 Standards and Construction Specifications

8  
9 Applicant Presentation

10 Jack Bestall, Bestall Collaborative, Ltd.

11  
12 Requested Actions

- 13 • Approve Concept Plan Amendment.
  - 14 ○ R-SF density range: 1-5du/ac.
    - 15 ▪ Addition of two single family homes: 22 to 24 lots.
    - 16 ▪ Density increase: 3.22du/ac to 3.5du/ac (8%).
- 17 • Approve Preliminary Plat.
  - 18 ○ Conforms to Planning Commission Conditions.
    - 19 ▪ Provides robust landscape buffer & privacy fencing to be installed prior to  
20 construction.
    - 21 ▪ Drainage report must be submitted compliant with City Standards and  
22 Construction Specifications.
- 23 • Concept plan amendment removes the two existing homes on the property.

24  
25 Concept Plan Amendment Approval Criteria

- 26 • Will not limit ability to integrate surrounding land into the city or cause variances if  
27 adjacent land is annexed or developed.
  - 28 ○ Amendment will not limit integration with surround land – no change from  
29 annexation.
- 30 • Will not create undevelopable lots burdened with costs that preclude development from  
31 occurring on other property.
  - 32 ○ Amendment provides more efficiency and less cost and limitations on  
33 development.
- 34 • Development phasing is rational – relative to infrastructure capacity and public facility  
35 standards.
  - 36 ○ Continuous build – sufficient capacity at standard.

37  
38 Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 1

- 39 • Consistent with comprehensive plan; code and zoning; conforms to prior concept plan;  
40 complied with applicable statutes, codes, and regulations.
  - 41 ○ Conforms with comprehensive plan, zoning (R-SF), code, and regulations.
  - 42 ○ Comply with Envision Longmont goals and polices.
    - 43 ▪ Contribute to a diverse housing mix.
    - 44 ▪ Sustainable cost/benefit – higher density infill.
    - 45 ▪ Contribute to affordable housing – providing fee-in-lieu

- Adaptive reuse of underutilized properties on major corridor

Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 2

- Complies with city standards; street-utility design and adequate utilities are available for appropriate urban level services.
  - Adequate utilities available, compliant design of utilities, and streets to standard.

Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 3

- Development is compatible with surrounding properties land use, site, and building layout and access.
  - Compatible with adjacent properties: zoned R-SF.
  - Consistent with Annexation Concept Plan conditions of approval:
    - Drainage report must be submitted compliant with City Standards and Construction Specifications.
    - Robust landscape buffer and privacy fencing (installed prior to construction) along north, west, and south sides of property.

Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 4

- Will not adversely affect surrounding properties, city transportation, utilities, facilities, and natural environment.
  - No adverse impact – same R-SF zone, 3.5du/ac.
  - No access to adjacent neighborhood.
  - No adverse impact to natural resources – NRHP.
  - Existing utilities planned to serve property.
  - Drainage design complies with city/regional standards.
  - Public Safety and SVVSD have sufficient capacity.

Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 5

- Transportation plan is appropriate – multi-modal access connected where appropriate with adjacent development.
  - Accessed from Airport Road – Principle arterial planned for 4-thru lanes with bike lanes/trails and sidewalks. Signalized or round-about full-movement in the future.
    - Airport Road transit service planned to increase service.
    - No direct access to adjacent neighborhoods.
    - Street loop conforms to Longmont local street standards.
    - Streets scaled with sidewalks connecting to Airport Road sidewalk and extending north the Glenneyre Drive.

Public Hearing

Chair Polan opened the public hearing.

No one wished to speak.

Chair Polan closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion

1 Commissioner Koler asked about a variance on this project. Kristin states there is no request for  
2 a variance but there is exception request for Public Works. Josh Sherman, PWRN, explained the  
3 project has a reduced street cross section, an attached sidewalk instead of a detached sidewalk, and  
4 the applicant has requested a design exception that was reviewed under the preliminary plat. Josh  
5 said staff is supportive of the request in concept, but it typically does not get approved until final  
6 plat.

7  
8 Commissioner Hite asked for confirmation that the number of lots has been reduced and Jack  
9 confirmed that is correct. Commissioner Hite commented that the original concept plan shows two  
10 points of ingress/egress. Jack states there are not two points, one access is a gated emergency  
11 access only. Josh states the northern access was always intended to be an emergency access only  
12 and added that from the beginning Public Works was only intending to approve one full movement  
13 access onto Airport Road.

14  
15 Commissioner Hite noticed in the overall planning criteria that enclave subdivisions that do not  
16 connect to other subdivisions are not favorable and asked how it happened that this subdivision  
17 does not connect to other subdivisions. Kristin said the Somerset plat was approved around 1980  
18 and it was not typical practice at that time to plan for those connections and explained that  
19 Somerset property is in the county and there isn't a potential access point on the west side to any  
20 existing roadways. Commissioner Hite asked about the easement to the north and Kristin states  
21 that is a utility and drainage easement. Commissioner Hite asked if the easement should be  
22 explored as another point of access. Josh said from a utility standpoint that is how they are going  
23 to get their redundancy for the waterline loop, as well as the service for sewer, but from a  
24 transportation perspective this project will generate a low volume of traffic contributing to Airport  
25 Road so the secondary access will be for emergency use only. Commissioner Hite asked why the  
26 city doesn't want to ask whether it could connect to the subdivision next to it. Josh feels at times  
27 it may be asked for or required, but believes from a transportation and volume standpoint, one  
28 access is sufficient. Josh added that an access through the utility easement may also be gated.

29  
30 Commissioner Hite asked about 226 trips from this subdivision and is wondering where the 200  
31 trips outside of the peak hours are coming from. Caroline explained trip generation is determined  
32 by the ITE Trip Generation Manual which provides different criteria based on the information you  
33 are looking for. The manual is based on studies done nationwide around different types of land  
34 uses, monitoring traffic, and developing equations based on the studies. Commissioner Hite asked  
35 if staff is satisfied with the report and Caroline replied based on the standards that is how trip  
36 generation is determined.

37  
38 Commissioner Popkin asked about utilities and about the notice from Xcel regarding the natural  
39 gas and electric distribution lines within the easement. Kristin advised that is a standard letter  
40 noticing the property owner of those services adjacent to this site and is a way of making the  
41 applicator aware they exist in the event they are intending to move them or vacate easements.  
42 Commissioner Popkin wanted more clarity on the letter and Kristin explained the letter is putting  
43 the applicant on notice that there are facilities adjacent to this site or on site and they should get  
44 proper permits for any work. Commissioner Popkin wanted to confirm that the notice does not  
45 adversely impact the utility services and Kristin said no.

1 Commissioner Popkin said it sounds like the designs have gone through a number of iterations as  
2 it relates to density and is curious how the applicant’s team thought about appropriate density for  
3 the project and if they considered accessory dwelling units to complement the single-family  
4 housing. Jack said at this point in the process they have not determined if an accessory dwelling  
5 unit would be built-in or a buyer’s option to add it. As for the density, the number has been  
6 fluctuating but is has been over a long period of time. During the referral process there were some  
7 council members who felt it might not be sustainable at 24 units but after they modeled it and  
8 removed the two existing homes, they found that 24 was sustainable and that they could even go  
9 down to 22 units and remain sustainable.

10  
11 Commissioner Popkin asked how this project advances sustainability or creates a more sustainable  
12 future for the city. Jack suggests that even though these are not small lots, this is project is  
13 diversifying the area being next to the one acre lots in Summerlin and the smaller lots in Somerset  
14 Meadows. He thinks increasing to 24 units is important and is an economic driver and he said  
15 while it is a little premature in the process to talk about, this project will be all electric.

16  
17 Commissioner Popkin asked if the only way to get to the neighborhood behind this property would  
18 be to exit onto Airport Road and go around. Jack said that is correct. Commissioner Popkin asked  
19 about potential conflicts with bikes and pedestrians with one entry point. Jack said the project has  
20 a looping sidewalk system internally so by staying on the north side of the access onto Airport  
21 Road, that would take the conflict out in terms of getting to the sidewalk to head north. Jack added  
22 that pedestrians and bikes can also get in and out of the development using the gated emergency  
23 access. Commissioner Popkin asked Jack to consider creative markings to indicate that pedestrian  
24 and bicycles can use the gated emergency access.

25  
26 Chair Polan asked how robust landscaping mentioned in the conditions is defined. Kristin said that  
27 is open to interpretation, that is the verbiage that was placed on the original approval of the  
28 annexation. Chair Polan understands there is a six-foot privacy fence on the north, west, and south  
29 side and a three-foot split rail fence. Kristin said that is correct and believes the split rail fence  
30 separates the easement area from the lots.

31  
32 Commissioner Teta asked what the number is for the fee-in-lieu the applicant is providing for  
33 affordable housing. Kristin said that is calculated by the affordable housing staff and she does not  
34 have that number. Jack believes it is a dollar amount per square foot of the structures being built.

35  
36 Commissioner Boone thought the fee-in-lieu multiplier was increasing July 1. Jeremy Tyrrell,  
37 Assistant City Attorney said the fee-in-lieu on applications that do not receive final approval before  
38 December 31, will increase from \$7.90 to \$13.50.

39  
40 Commissioner Boone said it appears that this version of the plan has changed since the original  
41 approval that shows the fence and robust landscaping and said since the fence and landscaping are  
42 on the current plan, why is a condition needed on this approval. Kristin said it is important to carry  
43 forward this condition because buffering would normally not be required on this site since it is  
44 surrounded by single-family residential. Carrying it forward from original concept plan makes it  
45 very clear.

1 Chair Polan feels like this is a good plan and fit for the area. He likes that plan to remove the two  
2 older homes as well as moving some homes from exterior of the site to the interior. He will be in  
3 favor of the project.

4  
5 Commissioner Popkin asked how “robust” in the conditions of approval is quantified. Kristin  
6 states that is conversation that staff has had and there is not really a way in code to quantify robust.  
7 Jack states he argued that condition when the commission placed it on the original plan. He said  
8 they spoke with staff and after looking at code they took the buffer plant guide that is used between  
9 single-family and multi-family and used that for this project. Commissioner Popkin asked if any  
10 of the existing landscaping is being retained and Jack said yes, the plan is to retain as much of the  
11 current landscaping as possible and add that the project will have an additional buffer 20 feet  
12 beyond the property lines.

13  
14 Commissioner Popkin asked the applicant if they would have any concerns with adding a condition  
15 that signage will be placed marking the emergency access as pedestrian and bicycle access. Jack  
16 states they would not have an issue with it. Commissioner Popkin believes the access enhances the  
17 multimodal aspects of the site and does enhance some of the regional connectivity.

18  
19 Commissioner Koler commended the applicant on the preservation of the trees on the site and  
20 agrees with the language Commissioner Popkin is proposing as an additional condition.

21  
22 Jack recalls the north entrance Commissioner Hite spoke about and believes the plan may have  
23 been looking at a right in/right out, but that idea went away and it became a gated emergency  
24 access only which has the fire departments approval.

25  
26 Commissioner Popkin feels that the applicant is willing to accept the condition and it makes sense  
27 for the property. The condition is intended to offer flexibility and he will leave it to the applicant’s  
28 discretion to figure out how they want to incorporate it to make it clear for pedestrians and  
29 bicyclists.

30  
31 Motion

32 **COMMISSIONER POPKIN MOVED APPROVAL OF PZR 2024-6B, A RESOLUTION**  
33 **OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING**  
34 **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE WESTVIEW ACRES CONCEPT PLAN**  
35 **AMENDMENT ADDING A THIRD CONDITION TO READ: “APPLICANT WILL**  
36 **PROVIDE SPECIFIC MARKINGS, SIGNAGE, AND/OR OTHER DESIGN ELEMENTS**  
37 **TO ENCOURAGE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ACCESS AND USE ALONGSIDE THE**  
38 **EMERGENCY ACCESS ROAD.” COMMISSIONER BOONE SECONDED BOONE THE**  
39 **MOTION.**

40  
41 Additional Discussion of the Motion

42 Commissioner Hite asked for clarification, is the access alongside or on the road. Commissioner  
43 Popkin will amend the motion to read “on or alongside...”

44  
45 Amended Motion

1 **COMMISSIONER POPKIN MOVED APPROVAL OF PZR 2024-6B, A RESOLUTION**  
2 **OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING**  
3 **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE WESTVIEW ACRES CONCEPT PLAN**  
4 **AMENDMENT ADDING A THIRD CONDITION TO READ: “APPLICANT WILL**  
5 **PROVIDE SPECIFIC MARKINGS, SIGNAGE, AND/OR OTHER DESIGN ELEMENTS**  
6 **TO ENCOURAGE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ACCESS AND USE ON OR**  
7 **ALONGSIDE THE EMERGENCY ACCESS ROAD.” COMMISSIONER BOONE**  
8 **SECONDED BOONE THE MOTION.**

9  
10 Vote

11 **MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

12  
13 Chair Polan read the process notice into the record.

14  
15 B. Westview Acres Preliminary Subdivision Plat, Senior Planner Kristin Cote

16  
17 Staff Presentation

18  
19 Property Location/Information

- 20
- 21 • 8757 N 87th Street, west of Airport Road, south of Glenneyre Drive
  - 22 • 6.83 +/- acres
  - 23 • Annexed in 2022 – Westview Annexation
  - 24 • Originally platted in Boulder County in 1980 as Westview Acres Subdivision
  - 25 • Zoned R-SF (residential single family)
  - 26 • Envision Longmont designated as Single-Family Neighborhood
- 27

28 Land Use Info

- 29
- 30 • Zoned R-SF with Single Family Neighborhood Land Use Designation (Envision Longmont)
  - 31 • Uses proposed on site include single family detached dwelling units
  - 32 • Water will be supplied by an upsized main on Airport Road, in partnership with the City, to support future development in that area. Sanitary and stormwater will connect to existing infrastructure on the North side.
  - 33 • Right-of-way improvements on Airport Road include extending the sidewalk north
  - 34 • Traffic impact is within acceptable limits, with future planning for a potential traffic signal and southbound right turn lane in consideration of development in this area
  - 35 • Preliminary Plat includes existing/future rights-of-way, access points, and multimodal connections including an extension of the sidewalk to the north; further refinement of access and circulation to occur in future development applications
- 36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Request

43 Preliminary Plat Specifics

- 44
- 45 • 24 Single-Family Lots
    - o Lot sizes: 6,000 - 17,465 sq. ft.

- 1           ○ Total lot area: 4.30 ± acres
- 2       • ROW Dedications: Interior Street Loop
- 3           ○ 1.592 acres / 69,347.52 ± sq. ft.
- 4       • Buffers
- 5           ○ North (20'), south (12'), and westerly (20') buffers are proposed to be provided in
- 6           an easement for this development which will be located on the lots.
- 7           ○ The Airport Road buffer (Type B – 20') is to be provided within an Outlot.

#### 8 Outlot Use and Sizes

- 9       • Outlot A: Access & Utility - 0.098 ± acres
- 10      • Outlot B: Access & Utility - 0.104 ± acres
- 11      • Outlot C: Drainage, Utility & Easement - 0.535 ± acres
- 12      • Outlot D: Landscape Buffer - 0.188 ± acres

#### 13 Public Outreach

- 14      • Neighborhood meeting May 22, 2023, via Zoom
- 15      • Notice of Application Mailing December 23, 2023
- 16          ○ Comments Received – See Attachment 8
- 17      • Notice of Public Hearing Mailing August 7, 2024

#### 18 Development Considerations

- 19      • Meets criteria for preliminary subdivision plat review
- 20      • Complies with minimum lot standards for area and width
- 21      • Aligns with the comprehensive plan
- 22      • Airport Road buffer to be within an Outlot, additional buffers to be provided in an easement
- 23      and located on the developable lots
- 24      • Provides connectivity within the site, with direct access to Airport Road
- 25      • Include an extension of the sidewalk within the right of way to the north
- 26      • Installs an oversized water main for future development within this area
- 27      • No federal or state protected species on site
- 28      • No prairie dog colonies observed
- 29      • Landscaping proposal meets City standards
- 30      • School District confirms capacity to serve this subdivision

#### 31 Recommendation

32 Staff recommends that the Planning and Zoning Commission conditionally approve the Westview  
33 Acres Preliminary Plat with the condition of approval of the concept plan amendment.

#### 34 Applicant Presentation

35 Jack Bestall, Bestall Collaborative, Ltd.

#### 36 Requested Actions

- 37      • Approve Concept Plan Amendment.
- 38          ○ R-SF density range: 1-5du/ac.
- 39              ▪ Addition of two single family homes: 22 to 24 lots.
- 40              ▪ Density increase: 3.22du/ac to 3.5du/ac (8%).
- 41      • Approve Preliminary Plat.

- 1           ○ Conforms to Planning Commission Conditions.
- 2                     ▪ Provides robust landscape buffer & privacy fencing to be installed prior to
- 3                     construction.
- 4                     ▪ Drainage report must be submitted compliant with City Standards and
- 5                     Construction Specifications.
- 6         • Concept plan amendment removes the two existing homes on the property.
- 7

8 Concept Plan Amendment Approval Criteria

- 9         • Will not limit ability to integrate surrounding land into the city or cause variances if
- 10         adjacent land is annexed or developed.
- 11             ○ Amendment will not limit integration with surround land – no change from
- 12             annexation.
- 13         • Will not create undevelopable lots burdened with costs that preclude development from
- 14         occurring on other property.
- 15             ○ Amendment provides more efficiency and less cost and limitations on
- 16             development.
- 17         • Development phasing is rational – relative to infrastructure capacity and public facility
- 18         standards.
- 19             ○ Continuous build – sufficient capacity at standard.
- 20

21 Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 1

- 22         • Consistent with comprehensive plan; code and zoning; conforms to prior concept plan;
- 23         complied with applicable statutes, codes, and regulations.
- 24             ○ Conforms with comprehensive plan, zoning (R-SF), code, and regulations.
- 25             ○ Comply with Envision Longmont goals and polices.
- 26                     ▪ Contribute to a diverse housing mix.
- 27                     ▪ Sustainable cost/benefit – higher density infill.
- 28                     ▪ Contribute to affordable housing – providing fee-in-lieu
- 29                     ▪ Adaptive reuse of underutilized properties on major corridor
- 30

31 Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 2

- 32         • Complies with city standards; street-utility design and adequate utilities are available for
- 33         appropriate urban level services.
- 34             ○ Adequate utilities available, compliant design of utilities, and streets to standard.
- 35

36 Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 3

- 37         • Development is compatible with surrounding properties land use, site, and building layout
- 38         and access.
- 39             ○ Compatible with adjacent properties: zoned R-SF.
- 40             ○ Consistent with Annexation Concept Plan conditions of approval:
- 41                     ▪ Drainage report must be submitted compliant with City Standards and
- 42                     Construction Specifications.
- 43                     ▪ Robust landscape buffer and privacy fencing (installed prior to
- 44                     construction) along north, west, and south sides of property.
- 45

1 Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 4

- 2 • Will not adversely affect surrounding properties, city transportation, utilities, facilities, and  
3 natural environment.  
4 ○ No adverse impact – same R-SF zone, 3.5du/ac.  
5 ○ No access to adjacent neighborhood.  
6 ○ No adverse impact to natural resources – NRHP.  
7 ○ Existing utilities planned to serve property.  
8 ○ Drainage design complies with city/regional standards.  
9 ○ Public Safety and SVVSD have sufficient capacity.

10  
11 Preliminary Plat & Amendment Approval Criterion 5

- 12 • Transportation plan is appropriate – multi-modal access connected where appropriate with  
13 adjacent development.  
14 ○ Accessed from Airport Road – Principle arterial planned for 4-thru lanes with bike  
15 lanes/trails and sidewalks. Signalized or round-about full-movement in the future.  
16 ■ Airport Road transit service planned to increase service.  
17 ■ No direct access to adjacent neighborhoods.  
18 ■ Street loop conforms to Longmont local street standards.  
19 ■ Streets scaled with sidewalks connecting to Airport Road sidewalk and  
20 extending north the Glenneyre Drive.

21  
22 Public Hearing

23 Chair Polan opened the public hearing.

24  
25 No one wished to speak.

26  
27 Chair Polan closed the public hearing.

28  
29 Commission Discussion

30 Commissioner Boone noted the lot sizes are 6,000-17,000sf and was thinking the 17,000-sf lot  
31 was the two homes on the previous plan. Kristin pointed out the most westerly lots on the plan are  
32 larger in size.

33  
34 Commissioner Popkin asked if the commission should carry forward conditions from the concept  
35 plan amendment. Kristin explained the conditions will follow the concept plan if approved by City  
36 Council and Grant felt it would be redundant if added to this PZR.

37  
38 Commissioner Lange asked about the extension of the sidewalk to the north. Kristin said the  
39 proposal is to construct the sidewalk up to Somerset existing sidewalk to provide the connection.  
40 Commissioner Lange asked how far south the sidewalk will go. Kristin said the sidewalk will  
41 extend to the very south point of Westview Acres project, further south of that is Boulder County  
42 property.

43  
44 Commissioner Popkin realized there isn't a connection to Highway 119 and asked what the future  
45 plan is for a sidewalk to Highway 119. Kristin said the development of sidewalks in areas where  
46 sidewalks do not exist typically comes with infill or future development and the properties to the

1 south are in Boulder County. Commissioner Popkin said the real advantage is the connection to  
2 the north on the west side of Airport Road. Kristin states that is correct.

3  
4 Commissioner Hite said there is a reference at some point in time there is going to need to be a  
5 traffic light at this intersection and asked if this intersection will line up with the proposed  
6 Kanemoto development on the east side of Airport Road. Josh said yes, the property to the east is  
7 still in the annexation process and any access will line up with this project.

8  
9 Motion

10 **COMMISSIONER BOONE MOVED APPROVAL OF PZR 2024-7B, A RESOLUTION OF**  
11 **THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE**  
12 **WESTVIEW ACRES PRELIMINARY PLAT. COMMISSIONER POPKIN SECONDED**  
13 **THE MOTION.**

14  
15 Vote

16 **MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

17  
18 Chair Polan read the appeal notice into the record.

19  
20 7. Final call – public invited to be heard

21  
22 Chair Polan opened the final call public invited to be heard.

23  
24 No one wished to speak.

25  
26 Chair Polan closed the final call public invited to be heard.

27  
28 8. Items from the Commission

29  
30 Commissioner Popkin advised the commission that at a future meeting he will be bring forward a  
31 request for a study session in early 2025 and asked the commissioners to think about topics they  
32 would like to add to an agenda.

33  
34 9. Items from the Council Representative

35  
36 Council Member Rodriguez thanked the commission for their thorough review and discussion of  
37 the projects before them.

38  
39 Commissioner Member Rodriguez also advised the commission that two items on the August 27  
40 City Council agenda are projects that were recently heard by the commission and encouraged the  
41 commissioners to watch the meeting if they are interested.

42  
43 10. Items from the Planning Director

44  
45 Grant advised the commission that no projects have been submitted for the September meeting,  
46 but the deadline is still a week out.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

11. Adjournment

**CHAIR POLAN MOVED ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING. NO ONE WAS OPPOSED.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chair/Vice Chair  
Planning and Zoning Commission

/Jm 08/21/24

