



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Meeting of the Planning Commission for the Town of Frisco

Virtual Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/91407739558?pwd=bVNlVWhzbnZkKzF3Vm0xREl5WnJxdz09>

Meeting ID: 914 0773 9558

Passcode: 77934

Thursday, January 7, 2021 at 5:00 P.M.

Call to Order:

Kelsey Withrow, Chair, opened the meeting.

Roll Call:

Robert Franken, Patrick Gleason, Lina Lesmes, Donna Skupien, Andy Stabile, Ira Tane, Kelsey Withrow

Minutes:

The November 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment (non-agenda items):

There were no public comments.

Agenda Items:

1. **Adoption of the Planning Commission Resolution 21-01:** A Resolution Naming the Public Place for Posting Notices of Planning Commission Meetings for the Town of Frisco, Colorado in Compliance with the Colorado Sunshine Act of 1972

Assistant Community Development Director, Bill Gibson, stated that section 24-6-402 CRS requires a public body to annually designate the public place for posting timely notice of public meetings at the Planning Commission's first regular meeting each calendar year. The Planning Commission confirmed the location is the same as last year (bulletin board outside the east vestibule at Frisco Town Hall and the Frisco Post Office).

MOTION: PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER FRANKEN MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE RESOLUTION NO. 21-01. SECONDED, PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER SKUPIEN.

VOTE:

YEAS: SKUPIEN – **YEA**, GLEASON – **YEA**, LESMES – **YEA**, FRANKEN – **YEA**, TANE – **YEA**, WITHROW – **YEA**, STABILE – **YEA**
NOES: NONE

MOTION: PASS

2. **Planning File No. 116-20-MAJ:** A public hearing on a Major Site Plan Application for a proposed multi-family townhome project, located at 116 Galena Street / Lots 20-21, Block 2, King Solomon Subdivision 1. Applicant: Abby Ploen, PloenHaus representing MACATR, LLC

Planner Katie Kent reviewed the staff report noting that the proposed three units comply with the Frisco Community Plan, Central Core District requirements and development standards including drainage, snow storage, parking, access, landscaping, and lighting. staff recommends approval of the project with the suggested findings and conditions in the Staff Report.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS FOR STAFF INCLUDED:

- Commissions asked Staff if there was a past code requirement for outdoor parking. Staff responded there was no such requirement in the code previously or currently.
- Commissioners requested further information regarding the Town’s priority to affordable housing as referenced in 1.1.C of the Community Plan. Staff responded that this project does not require affordable housing but there may be future discussions with the Planning Commission regarding updates to the UDC to support more affordable housing.
- Commissioners questioned section 1.4.B of the Community Plan and Staff acknowledged it should not have been bolded in the Staff Report.

Applicant, Abby Ploen described the proposed exterior materials and noted changes made since sketch plan review to address the Commissions prior questions and concerns.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT INCLUDED:

- Commissioners questions for the Applicant included requesting more information on heat taping of gutters, building location related to setback, snow load risk factors for decks. Ploen responded accordingly noting that heat taping would go through the gutter and downspouts, describing the specific location of the buildings on the lot, and that snow load had been designed for.

- Commissioners noted that “bonus unit” was noted on the submitted plans. Ploen responded that was an error and it would be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Kent noted that one public comment has been received by Nancy Kinney, dated December 30, 2020 and was included as an attachment to the Staff Report.
- Laurie Steuri, 190 Galena Street, Unit 6. Ms. Steuri noted how important dumpsters are and that the adjacent property has had problems with totes stored in garages creating rodent problems. Steuri noted that the Applicant could speak to her townhome project about sharing a dumpster if they were interested.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSIONS:

- Commissioners were complimentary of the project and expressed their appreciation to the Applicant for listening to their comments at sketch plan and addressing concerns raised at that time.

MOTION: PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER STABILE MOVED TO APPROVE PLANNING FILE NO. 116-20-MAJ: A PUBLIC HEARING ON A MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED MULTI-FAMILY TOWNHOME PROJECT, LOCATED AT 116 GALENA STREET / LOTS 20-21, BLOCK 2, KING SOLOMON SUBDIVISION 1. SECONDED, PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER GLEASON.

VOTE:

YEAS: SKUPIEN – **YEA**, GLEASON – **YEA**, LESMES – **YEA**, FRANKEN – **YEA**, TANE – **YEA**, WITHROW – **YEA**, STABILE – **YEA**
NOES: NONE

MOTION: PASS

3. **Planning File No. RZ-20-0182**: A preliminary public hearing on a Rezoning Application to change the zoning classification for the property located at 18 & 68 School Road / Lot 1, Saint Anthony Summit Medical Campus from Light Industrial (LI) District to Mixed Use (MU) District. Applicant: Traditional Neighborhood Developers, LLC, representing Centura Health

Assistant Community Development Director Bill Gibson reviewed the Staff Report noting that the Applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from Light Industrial (LI) District to Mixed-Use (MC) District. Mr. Gibson noted that pursuant to Frisco Town Code, Section 180-2.3.4.F, a Major Site Plan application may not be accepted or processed while a rezoning application is pending for the same property and so the Applicant’s future residential project cannot be reviewed by the Planning Commission at this time. Mr.

Gibson noted the proposed rezoning complies with the Frisco Community Plan with the exception of Policy 2.2B, protect the LI District from dilution and intrusion by other uses. Rezoning criteria were reviewed noting that the applicant shall establish that at least one of the criteria is met. Staff recommended two alternative motions in the Staff Report dependent on if the Planning Commission chooses to request further information.

Note: Criteria 1 and 4 – Staff does not believe these are applicable.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS FOR STAFF INCLUDED:

- Commissioners questioned whether they had combined all three lots into one and if the Commission were to approve this, could Centura re-divide the property at a later date and sell off. Staff responded that it's likely they would maintain a singular property for development. Mr. Gibson further discussed the reasons behind this.
- Commission referenced the letter in the packet, first and second paragraph. If we are only considering Light Industrial to Mixed Use but the letter suggests it could be a rental apartment complex of some sort. How can it be addressed that we ensure it will be rental apartments? Mr. Gibson responded that with zoning, you never have a guarantee of what will actually be developed in the future. From a staff perspective the re-zoning stands on its own merits. If future redevelopment, it would demonstrate compliance under Town Code.
- Commission questioned the percentage of use between residential and commercial in the Mixed Use District. Staff responded explaining the percentages noting that the planning commission could change that percentage through the Conditional Use process.
- Commission expressed a concern that this is a rezoning to establish something different. Seems like Staff is tying the rezoning to the need for workforce housing in Criteria 2. Who picked Mixed Use for this rezoning and why. Staff responded that the conversation between Staff and Centura began a couple of years ago and was based on a variety of reasons to which Mr. Gibson further explained.
- Commission questioned whether there was any concern over "spot zoning"? Staff responded there was no concern due to the minimum threshold in the Code being one acre and this is four times that size plus other nearby properties are also zoned Mixed Use.
- Commission questioned whether there was a workforce housing incentive. Staff responded yes there is a workforce housing incentive to this property if it is rezoned to Mixed Use.
- Commissioners wanted confirmation that the current facility pre-dated current sustainability codes. Staff responded yes.
- Commission questioned whether the Applicant could operate under the previous Sustainability Code if we grant this rezoning change? Staff responded that this is

not possible, the Sustainability Code is part of the adopted building codes and would be a separate issue from zoning and there is no grandfathering.

- Commission asked if someone subdivided lots in the future – and built two buildings, 100% residential and the other 100% commercial would they then be non-conforming without Conditional Use permits. Staff responded that this would not be allowed, unless the applicant comes before the Commission for a Conditional Use permit.
- Commission asked if we were to assume for now this would be 100% residential, how many units could there be and is traffic a major concern? Also, could a traffic study be required? Staff responded that approximately 53 units would be allowed under Mixed Use zoning. Any future redevelopment of this property will require a traffic study.
- Commission asked if the Applicant pulled a permit for the demo of the current building? Planner Susan Lee responded that no permit has been issued for the demo.
- Commission stated that so much of the property is already used, are they entitled to this area to determine zoning calculation. Mr. Gibson responded yes.

Applicant, Melissa Sherburne representing Traditional Neighborhood LLC addressed the Commission giving a brief review of the development. Also with Ms. Sherburne was Ronnie Pelusio with Pel-Ona Architects & Urbanists.

The Centura St. Anthony's Summit Medical Center Leadership Team, consisting of Lee Boyles – CEO and Cindy Farnsworth – HR Director, addressed the Commission expressing their goal and the importance to have workforce housing for the hospital and other community businesses.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANT INCLUDED:

- Commissioners asked about the timeframe for the project. Mr. Boyles responded that the Centura enterprise would like to move the project along as quickly as possible.
- Commission asked if it was considered a desirable neighborhood for residential being next to Highway 9. Ms. Sherburne responded that they would take that under consideration.
- Commission questioned what type of housing their employees need? Ms. Sherburne responded that they are doing outreach to make that determination for their development proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- There were no public comments.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSIONS:

- The Commission stated support for rezoning to Mixed Use with residential/workforce housing at this property.
- Commissioners expressed concern over traffic impacts from future redevelopment.

MOTION: PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER FRANKEN MOVED WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. RZ-20-0182, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPT THE RECOMMENDED PRELIMINARY FINDINGS SET FORTH IN THE PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT DATED JANUARY 7, 2021 AND THAT, BASED ON THOSE PRELIMINARY FINDINGS, THE PLANNING COMMISSION PRELIMINARILY RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE REZONING APPLICATION TO CHANGE THE ZONING CLASSIFICATION OF 18 & 68 SCHOOL ROAD / LOT 1, SAINT ANTHONY SUMMIT MEDICAL CAMPUS FROM LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI) DISTRICT TO MIXED-USE (MU) DISTRICT. **SECONDED, PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER SKUPIEN.**

VOTE:

YEAS: SKUPIEN – **YEA**, GLEASON – **YEA**, LESMES – **YEA**, FRANKEN – **YEA**, TANE – **YEA**, WITHROW – **YEA**, STABILE – **YEA**
NOES: NONE

MOTION: PASS

Staff and Commissioner Updates:

- Community Development Director Don Reimer gave the Commissioners an update on the status and upcoming expiration of Library Lofts.
- The Commissioners expressed concern if businesses with Main Street parklets are using them enough.
- Mr. Reimer gave the Commissioners an update that the Town is reviewing proposals submitted in response to the RFP for the 619 Granite Street Project in conjunction with CDOT.

Adjournment:

There being no further business, Commissioner Lesmes moved to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Gleason. It was unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 7:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cheryl Mattka
Community Development Department