

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

448 E. 1st Street, Room 190 Salida, Colorado 81201

November 23, 2020 - 6:00 PM

MINUTES

Email public comments to: publiccomment@cityofsalida.com

Please register for the Planning Commission meeting: <https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/rt/1909092342220683277>

CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN – 6:00 PM

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Vice-Chair Francie Bomer

Commissioner Dori Denning

Commissioner Judith Dockery

Commissioner Giff Kriebel

Commissioner Michelle Walker

Commissioner-Alternate Suzanne Copping

Commissioner-Alternate Dave Haynes

Planner – Bill Almquist

Planner – Kristi Jefferson

City Attorney – Nina Williams

ABSENT

Chairman Greg Follet (recused)

Commissioner Doug Mendelson

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. Planning Commission draft minutes - 10/23/2020

Motion made by Commissioner Kriebel, Seconded by Commissioner Dockery.

Voting Yea: Vice-Chair Bomer, Commissioner Denning, Commissioner Dockery, Commissioner Kriebel, Commissioner

Walker, Commissioner-Alternate Copping, Commissioner-Alternate Haynes

UNSCHEDULED CITIZENS – None

AMENDMENT(S) TO AGENDA – None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearings will follow the following procedure:

- | | |
|---|--|
| A. Open Public Hearing | E. Public Input |
| B. Proof of Publication | F. Close Public Hearing |
| C. Staff Review of Application/Proposal | G. Commission Discussion |
| D. Applicant's Presentation (if applicable) | H. Commission Decision or Recommendation |

2. **Chaffee Housing Trust Limited Impact Review** - The request is for limited impact review and approval of a new 6-unit (inc. one ADU) residential development. The development is proposed to consist of 4 separate buildings, including a duplex, a primary residence with attached ADU, and two single-family dwellings—all of which are proposed for sale or rental at or below 80% AMI. The property is located within the Medium-Density (R-2) zone district.

Almquist gave an overview of the application and stated that staff supports the request with the three (3) recommended conditions.

Haynes asked about the potential impact to the adjacent development to the southeast, per the written comment and concerns submitted by the neighbor, Joe Martindale. **Almquist** explained that some views to the north/northwest might be obscured, but that the proposal met setback and height requirements.

Walker asked for clarification about the approval process and **Bomer** explained that Planning Commission was the ultimate decision-maker for the LIR, but there will be additional building permit review. **Almquist** explained that Council would also be considering the ultimate review of the transfer of the property to the applicant, and that there would be a lot line adjustment to be reviewed by staff.

Kriebel asked for clarification regarding who will pay for the street improvements to M Street and relocation of the sewer. **Almquist** explained that the applicant would pay for the sewer line relocation and (eventually) the sidewalks along M Street, and the City would be paying for the street reconfiguration and water line relocation. The overall estimated cost to the City for such improvements were approximately \$100K - \$120K. **Kriebel** asked if the

soils analysis was required of the adjacent property to the southeast, and **Almquist** confirmed that it was not, but that other nearby properties had performed such an analysis, hence how the sandy soils are known.

Denning asked if the M Street reconfiguration had been reviewed and approved by experts—**Almquist** confirmed that the design had been reviewed and approved by the City of Salida Public Works Director.

Kriebel asked about required parking within the development, which is a minimum of 6 spaces. **Almquist** confirmed that the proposal meets the minimum and that additional on-street parking would be possible along E. Crestone Ave, M Street, and out in front of the development along W. Third St. **Walker** asked about the M Street design status and engineering, and **Almquist** explained that the grade of M Street would be between approximately 4% (towards the bottom of M) to 8% (around the corner of M).

The applicant, **Read McCullough**, gave an overview of Chaffee Housing Trust and the proposed development.

Denning asked clarification about grading, height of the buildings, the opportunity for outdoor storage, and landscaping. **Almquist** said the two-story height would be in the vicinity of 22 feet. **McCullough** said that code would be followed for landscaping and stormwater drainage, but no outdoor storage was intended at this point.

Haynes asked a little more about the impact to the neighbor and **McCullough** explained that the development was constrained by setbacks, grade and other aspects that required the location of the building furthest to the southeast. **Walker** asked if the City is obligated in any way to preserve the views of adjacent neighbors to which **Almquist** confirmed there was no such obligation. **Kriebel** pointed out that the neighboring property was purchased after the proposed development was already made public.

Denning asked about rent levels and for sale costs, which **McCullough** explained they were also based off HUD numbers for Chaffee County according to number of bedrooms and household size. He said they try to hit ~70% AMI or approximately \$1175 for a 3-person, 2BD rental unit; \$190K - \$215K for the for sale units. **Bomer** asked about if there was opportunity for storage units on site, and for additional parking on-site or around the site. **McCullough** answered that they will see if they can feasibly get an additional space on-site, but that additional on-street parking would be an option. He said that the site is limited insofar as outdoor storage because of site constraints, but that they will look at the possibility if space and finances permitted. **Denning** suggested an attached storage area on each building for bikes and other items.

Public Comment—Karen Karnuta, owner of 750 W. Third Ave spoke in support of the project. Merrill Bergin, 126 ½ F Street, asked about design of one of the units and encouraged storage for bicycles and offered support of the project.

Commissioner Discussion – **Dockery** talked about the previous approvals by the Commission and the importance of affordable housing for both sale and rental. **Haynes** said he likes the project but has concerns about parking spaces and hopes that the surrounding on-street parking will absorb additional vehicle needs. **Copping**

said she likes the change in the facades from/to the existing neighboring buildings but also has concerns about parking area and landscaping in the back. She also thinks it's a great adaptation of the existing area/asphalt into useable residential space. **Walker** wanted to confirm that M Street reconfiguration was already finalized.

Denning likes the project but has concerns about storage and recommends condition to encourage provision of outdoor storage. **Kriebel's** only concern was regarding parking, esp. along the serpentine section of M Street, but that parking along W. Third Street would be good. There was additional discussion that parking should be provided along W. Third Street and that staff could forward recommendations along to Public Works about that.

Attorney Williams mentioned that some of the recommendations can also be built into the deed transfer or development agreement.

Motion to approve with the recommended conditions (plus an additional recommendation to make a good-faith effort to provide outdoor storage) made by Commissioner Kriebel, Seconded by Commissioner Denning.

Voting Yea: Vice-Chair Bomer, Commissioner Denning, Commissioner Dockery, Commissioner Kriebel, Commissioner Walker, Commissioner-Alternate Copping, Commissioner-Alternate Haynes

Voting Nay: None.

NEW BUSINESS – None

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS – Kriebel brought up the changes to the Land Use Code update and when PC might see the latest installment. **Almquist** mentioned that staff has needed to pause that project due to staff shortage and other demands. **Bomer** asked for update to the search for a new Community Development Director. **Almquist** reminded about the upcoming joint work session with City Council. **Walker** expressed additional concerns about giving away/vacating right-of-ways without doing more in-depth traffic analyses in the future. **Almquist** mentioned the basic analysis that was provided during the vacation review, but that this was also a very rare example of a right-of-way vacation to remove a street, esp. for development—a “one-off”. New Commissioners, **Copping** and **Haynes** were welcomed to the group.

ADJOURN – 7:41PM