

The Berthoud Planning Commission met in a regular session at the Berthoud Town Hall on February 22, 2007 with Vice Chairman Scott Banzhaf presiding. The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

Members Present: Scott Banzhaf, Vice Chairman

John Bauer
Stelios Androulidakis
Jeff Hindman
Brian Anderson
Ben Zink

Members Absent: Chris Thorne, Chairman

Staff/Town consultants Robert Anderson, Planning Director
Sue Bowles, Planning Technician

CONSENT AGENDA

Bauer moved to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of the minutes of the meeting of January 25, 2007 as presented. Second by Androulidakis. All members voted YES.

BERTHOUD COMMON COMMERCIAL CENTER – FDP & FINAL PLAT

Barkeen introduced this agenda item noting that the property is located at the southeast corner of LCR 17 and Mountain Ave. The applicant is requesting approval of a PDP/FDP and Preliminary/Final Plat. Barkeen pointed out that only two (2) of the lots are seeking approval of an FDP, and the remaining five (5) lots will come before the Commission and the Town Board in the future. The PDP covers only the layout of the development.

Barkeen reminded the Commission that a PDP for this property had been approved 2002, however the time limit has expired, so this is a new application. The overall layout has not changed considerably, except that it now has seven (7) lots rather than the eight (8) lots in the previous plan since the lot in the southeast corner had to be utilized for retention/detention.

Barkeen reported that in the neighborhood meeting in 2001, the main consensus was that the neighbors wanted the uses to be neighborhood commercial. That is what is proposed. Barkeen discussed the FDP for the two (2) 11,700 sq ft. buildings, as well as the proposed accesses and the improvements that will be made by the developer. The plan meets the Town's criteria for FDP, and staff has reviewed the plan for compliance with the Development Code, the Land Use Plan and the Comp. Plan and recommends approval with the conditions noted in the staff report.

Carl Cross from Design One, speaking on behalf of the applicant, Clarkson Land, gave a Power Point presentation of the landscaping, architecture and layout of the building, including historical landmarks they had used for inspiration.

Vice Chairman Banzhaf opened the public meeting.

There being no one wishing to speak, the matter was brought back to the Commission for discussion.

Bauer noted that the plan is consistent with neighborhood commercial, but noted his concern with the use of Kentucky Bluegrass.

There was significant discussion that crosswalks should be placed on the Welch side since there are so many connections.

Brad Curtis with Pickett Engineering pointed out that multiple crosswalks are more hazardous. There need to be primary stops and stop signs, and the crosswalks need to be placed where handicapped ramps are located.

Staff will discuss this further with the applicant and the transportation engineer.

Banzhaf noted that somewhere along the way, it was discussed that the vision for this center was that it have a downtown block layout more like Harmony and College in Fort Collins with shared and collective parking and defer away from the strip center design. While some of the aspects are more like downtown, the site design is more like a strip center. If the parking goes in more collectively, there may be some economies of scale rather than each site being looked at for parking and so on.

Carl Cross from Design One noted that the developer is proposing giving an additional set of guidelines to potential pad site developers that propose pedestrian friendly nodes throughout the site. Future developers are encouraged to have garden areas, sculptures, and those types of things throughout the site.

There was some discussion regarding varying the tree spacing along Mountain Avenue to show off the commercial center rather than shielding it.

Planning Director Anderson noted that staff could discuss that with the Town Arborist and the landscape consultants.

It was further noted that the developer is working with the adjacent owners – McKee and Main Street Car Care for cross access, along with possibly adding McKee to the overall signage plan.

There was significant discussion of the proposed parking which is very similar to what is in front of Hays Market, and has been an issue. The applicant will discuss this with staff.

The trash enclosures would likely be located in the back corners of the lots and will match the architecture of the buildings.

When asked about architectural enhancements to the back of the building, the applicant noted that they do have the pitched roofs, canopies over doorways, columns, etc.

There was some discussion about the proposed drainage pans in the outlot. The Commission would prefer to see those go away since they are unsightly, and would instead like to see

landscaping in that area.

The applicant responded that the Town engineer's recommendation calls for drainage plan due to the grading, but if planning and engineering agree to it, the applicant would be amenable to it.

Discussion was held that the proposed signage needs to be shorter and to grade. In regards to the proposed clock tower, since there's already one at Hays Market, the applicant should consider doing something different to make a distinction between this development and the one to the east.

Anderson moved to recommend approval of the Berthoud Commons Commercial PDP/FDP application finding that the request is consistent with the criteria for preliminary development plan and final development plan with the following conditions:

- 1. That the applicant address any remaining technical engineering comments to the Town Engineer's satisfaction.**
- 2. Successful negotiation to the east with Quick Lube and McKee for access to 10th Street.**
- 3. Review pedestrian connections with the streets to the south, including at least one crosswalk.**
- 4. Evaluate landscaping options to eliminate concrete drainage trickle channels.**
- 5. Evaluate the tree spacing along Mountain Avenue to show off the businesses rather than hiding them.**
- 6. That the applicant and the Town enter into a development agreement prior to recordation of the final plat.**

Second by Bauer. All members voted YES.

Bauer moved to recommend approval of the Berthoud Commons Commercial Preliminary/Final Plat application, finding that the request is consistent with the criteria for final plat. Second by Androulidakis. All members voted YES.

MASTER STREET PLAN AMENDMENT

Planning Director Anderson addressed this agenda item noting that this is an item the Commission discussed and approved at the public meeting for the Overlook at Dry Creek, however, it needed to go through a formal process to amend the plan as follows:

1. Elimination of the proposed arterial along the extension of the LCR 6 alignment to the east of LCR 17
2. Construction of an east-west collector from the 5th Street alignment, along the east side of the development, to LCR 17
3. Extension of 10th Street to terminate at the proposed east-west collector (as described within the attached summary)

The Town's transportation engineer, in cooperation with the Public Works Department, has reviewed the requests and found that the amendments would benefit the Town's Plan.

Androulidakis moved to adopt the Town's Master Street Plan Amendment, finding that the request is consistent with Town's Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, Land Use Plan and Best Transportation Practices and with HDR's recommendation. Second by Bauer. All members voted YES.

DOWNING, THORPE AND JAMES – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

Rick Volpe from DTJ addressed the commission regarding its role in the Comp Plan Amendment process. Volpe noted that he has been the principal in charge for the past 2 years, and was involved with the I-25 Sub-area Master Plan as well as the master plan for Wilson Ranch.

Volpe summarized the letter that had been provided to the Commission and noted he was here to clear up some misunderstandings. There has obviously been some miscommunication, and once he knew there was an issue he immediately contacted Planning Director Anderson and Town Administrator White. The issues are related to the cost of the project, the cost of the meetings, and why we used the format we used. It was never our intention to produce something you couldn't use. This is a software we use, and we didn't change our scope. The previous Planning Director, Wayne Reed gave us the impression that the Town was going to publish this, and was intending to purchase this software. He then had a phone call with Anderson and it was agreed that we needed to put this in a package the Town could work with. We're researching a way to do that conversion. We have been producing maps all along. We produced PDF files that you can print and that have been on the Town's website. We agree that producing color graphics is not cheap, and we need to be able to do this in a black and white format. We plan to be successful at this. We are use to using Indesign, but we understand that you can't.

Regarding the cost and the budget – we anticipated one year, and didn't have any idea it would go into 2 years. We realize the budget constraints, and we have taken it upon ourselves to continue at our cost. The scope was for 12 meetings, and it has turned into 25 meetings. We underpriced some meetings, but the average cost has been \$1,000, not \$5,000 per meeting. I would have done it differently and said \$1,000 per meeting for 12 meetings. Over and above the 12 were 10 additional meetings that were not in our scope of services. We had \$20,000 incorporated into our fee for maps and so on. We spent more time with meetings and less on product. The contract amount was \$110,000 and we've only gone over by \$20,000. Maps will be done at no cost. The additional meetings were important, but in hindsight, and where you have a grant, we moved forward as best we could and ate some of the expenses. We want to initiate communication. Part of the problem is that we have been out of the loop. We want to be helpful to the Town to get this comp plan update completed.

Also, there was a changing of the guard with changes in staff, and also changes in views. Plus the down time between planning director's when we were trying to continue without Town leadership. There was lost time, restarts, and trying to regroup when there was lag time. We were not to be the leaders, but to provide support to the planning director. One final thing is

reimbursable cost which is generally 10% - like reproduces, maps, etc. We're about 8% right now, but it was not factored in. I think the other is expenses that are in addition to our contract, and we have reminded staff of that. Since we didn't know how much we were going to author, we didn't know how much to budget for that. We have itemized everything out. There is a good track record for that, and we're glad we provided that. I would like to offer my services and if there's any questions, I'd like to respond.

This is more about DTJ's reputation, and I felt it was important that I respond. We probably didn't do our best job. We were trying to be part of guiding the process rather than driving it. We were basing this on what the CAC wanted. Toward the end, we only went to meetings that we were asked to attend. I was behind the scenes.

Banzhaf asked where the product is currently. Is there some type of a wrap up report where you have taken a look at sustainable commercial, or the pro and con or strengths and weaknesses of the plan and some pitfalls we may be creating from a professional planning perspective since you have worked with other communities.

Volpe said he would be more than willing to follow up with Robert on that.

Hindman said he thought it was amazing that the additional meetings were included in that \$112,000 cost, and noted his appreciation of Volpe's offer of getting this finished at no additional cost.

Bauer echoed those sentiments, and his appreciation to Volpe in giving some details, and noted he also would like to see some insight since DTJ has worked in other communities.

Volpe said he would need to see where the map is today and compare it to the CAC plan to see what the benefits and downfalls to those maps are.

Androulidakis – thanked Volpe for coming to the meeting and was glad to see the new number of \$1,000 per meeting, and further noted his appreciation for the offer to finish up the maps and so on.

Volpe explained that the reason it took as long as it did was that the "Chip Game" took several months to initiate and then a lot of time to evaluate. There were starts and stops. August and September we were dragging our feet because they didn't want to move forward without a planning director in place. 20 meetings in 2 years seems like a lot, but it really isn't. The previous director had a vision of the goals and objectives. We had originally scheduled 1 meeting and it took 8.

Goreski pointed out that the commission needs to understand that the CAC took on two (2) large projects, the Land Use Plan and the Comp Plan. It took us almost 2 years to do a comp plan back in 1991. We have devoted most of the time to goals and objectives, and only spend two (2) months on the Land Use Plan. I have made comments that DTJ didn't really understand the character of Berthoud, and I still feel that way.

Volpe replied that there wasn't really a chance to follow up on the images that had been provided. They really were from Colorado. A lot of that was to give you an idea of what you

might like to see in Berthoud such as density, and so on. This was not in our scope and we did it anyway. We put it out there to show what density looks like. Some of those images may have been unpopular with some.

Planning Director Anderson thanked Rick Volpe for attending the meeting noting that it shows the character of DTJ.

STAFF REPORTS

Planning Director Anderson reported on the developer's forums that have been held over the past several months. The first one was without staff, and was facilitated by DOLA. The second one was done with staff and DOLA.

One of the things the developer's asked for was a development code and comp plan that gives them guidance, and streamlining the process. Right now it takes about 4 ½ years to go through the process in Berthoud. One of the main ideas that staff garnered is that we have to get a document that both the commission and board agree on and will follow. They need to work together. The comp plan is a vision, and the development code puts that vision into the black and white. Our hands are tied as a staff. We can only make recommendations to the board and commission. We're going to work to change the reputation that Berthoud is a "no growth" community. A lot of that reputation is a hold over from years ago.

Hindman responded that to say the Town takes that long is wrong. We have approved a lot of stuff. Be careful where you say the average project takes 4 ½ years. A lot of the reason the projects are not going forward is that the growth cap or the economy stopped them, or whatever.

Commissioner Anderson disagreed that the growth cap is responsible.

After some discussion, it was decided that the Commission would meet every Thursday, with the exception of March 12th since spring break is that week.

Goreski suggested that when we start the comp plan update process we should go section by section so we'll have time to thoroughly address each section.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Brian Anderson, Secretary

Sue Bowles, Planning Technician