

1
2 New Castle Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
3 Wednesday, June 8, 2016, 7:00p.m., Town Hall

4
5 Call to Order

6 Commission Chair Chuck Apostolik called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m.

7
8 Roll Call

9 Present Chair Apostolik
10 Commissioner Borgard
11 Commissioner Gates
12 Commissioner Metzger
13 Commissioner Ruggles
14 Commissioner Urnise

15
16 Absent Commissioner Slack
17
18
19

20 Also present at the meeting were Town Planner Tim Cain, Assistant Town Attorney
21 Haley Carmer, Deputy Town Clerk Mindy Andis and members of the public.

22 Meeting Notice

23 Deputy Town Clerk Mindy Andis verified that her office gave notice of the meeting
24 in accordance with Resolution TC-2016-1.
25

26 Conflicts of Interest

27 Commissioner Urnise said the civil engineering company that was working on the
28 Lakota Ridge Senior Apartments employed him. He asked to be recused from the
29 public hearing regarding their application. The Commission agreed. Commissioner
30 Urnise left the council chambers at 7:00 pm.
31

32 Commissioner Gates said the soils laboratory company that was working on the
33 Lakota Ridge Senior Apartments employed him and he was the one who processed
34 all the soils samples. He asked to be recused from the public hearing regarding
35 their application. The Commission agreed. Commissioner Gates left the council
36 chambers at 7:01 pm.
37

38 Citizen Comments on Items NOT on the Agenda

39 There were no citizen comments.
40

41 Public Hearing

42 Final Planned Unit Development

43
44 Purpose: Application for Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)
45

46 Legal description: Lot 2A, Amended Final Plat, Lot 2, Lakota Canyon Ranch, Phase
47 7, According to the Plat thereof Recorded July 30, 2010
48 Under Reception No.789213

1 Common Address: T.B.D. Castle Valley Blvd., New Castle

2
3 Applicant: Lakota Ridge Senior Apartments, LLC

4
5 Landowner: Town of New Castle

6 Resolution PZ 2016-4 A Resolution of the New Castle Planning and Zoning
7 Commission Recommending Approval of Lakota Ridge Senior Apartments, LLC's
8 Final PUD Development Plan Application.

9
10 Chair Apostolik opened the Public Hearing at 7:02p.m.

11
12 Town Planner Tim Cain reported there had been no public opposition to the
13 development, however; the Lakota Canyon Ranch Design Review Board felt that the
14 subject property should comply with their concerns regarding the exterior of the
15 proposed structures. Technically, the Lakota Senior Apartments were not subject to
16 the Design Board requirements because the development will not be subject to
17 **annexation in to the Master Lakota Canyon Ranch Homeowner's Association.**

18
19 Planner Cain said that Community Resources and Housing Development Corporation
20 (CRHDC) was requesting that many of the engineering requirements be deferred
21 until the time of building permit application. CRHDC's preliminary budget did not
22 include the expense to provide engineering as required by the Municipal Code.
23 Town Engineer Jeff Simonson agreed to allow CRHDC to submit detailed
24 construction drawings for his review prior to approval of building permits.

25
26 Planner Cain said the application was generally compatible with adjacent properties
27 that included single-family and multi-family units, as well as vacant land. . The
28 parcel on the west side is owned by the RE-2 School District; the acreage of the
29 parcel is typically too small to be developed for a school. However, the land might
30 be used for another school district function, although it was unknown what it might
31 be. The land on the eastern border is zoned Mixed Use and is on the market to be
32 sold. Land on the southern edge of the subject property is precipitously steep,
33 however, the property further south is entitled to be developed for either single or
34 multiple family homes.

35
36 Planner Cain said the application was **consistent with the Town's Comprehensive**
37 **Plan Section 5 – Housing, Goal HO-1 of the Town's Comprehensive Plan** was to
38 **"preserve and create affordable housing"** for the community. Part A and B of the
39 goal stated that the town would like to partner with non-profit agencies to promote
40 and create affordable housing. CRHDC was working to utilize low income housing
41 tax credits for the development.

42
43 Section 5 of the Comprehensive Plan, Housing, Goal HO-2 aligned well with the
44 development because the applicant proposed a housing density that will vary from
45 the surrounding community. The density exceeded the allowable number of units by
46 close to 15. But without 50 units, the applicant felt the project would not be able to
47 obtain funding.

48 Planner Cain said that the applicant expressly noted Policy HO-2E of the Town's
49 Comprehensive Plan in which the town would support development that provided
50 housing for those with special needs, such as senior housing. The section also

1 stated the town would like the Garfield County Housing Authority (GCHA) to be
2 more engaged in affordable housing development. The applicant has partnered with
3 GCHA as a Special Limited Interest which will allow the property to be property tax
4 exempt which will help with the operating budget and to ensure the rents will
5 remain affordable. Planner Cain felt the application demonstrated substantial
6 compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.
7

8 Planner Cain said that the town had the capacity to serve the proposed use with
9 water and sewer services as well as fire and police protection. The Fire Marshall and
10 Town Police Chief supported the application and protective services are very
11 satisfactory. The fire station is located less than 300 feet from the proposed senior
12 housing project and will be able to respond extremely quickly to an emergency call.
13

14 Planner Cain stated that the subject property was zoned Mixed Use in the Lakota
15 Canyon Subdivision. The purpose and intent of the zone district was **"To provide**
16 **standards and criteria for development of a compatible mix of conventional and**
17 **clustered commercial, service, entertainment, low impact business and residential**
18 **uses.... And to also encourage clustered development..." The proposed development**
19 **is a "use by right."**
20

21 He also said that the number of dwelling units permitted by the underlying zone
22 district is not exceeded by the PUD Plan.
23

24 .
25
26 The PUD utilized the natural character of the land, included compatible land uses,
27 and provided fire and police protection, off-street parking, vehicular, pedestrian,
28 and bicycle circulation and outdoor recreation. The project is of overall compatible
29 architectural design, has achieved adequate screening, buffering and aesthetic
30 landscaping, avoided development of areas of potential hazard, ensured compliance
31 with performance standards, and has met all other provisions of the applicable
32 ordinances of the Town.
33

34 Therefore, the staff recommended approval of the Final Development PUD Plan with
35 the following conditions:
36

- 37 1. All representations of the applicant in written and verbal presentations
38 submitted to the Town or made at public hearings before the planning
39 commission or Town Council shall be considered part of the application and
40 binding on the applicant.
41
- 42 2. The applicant shall reimburse the Town for any and all expenses incurred by
43 **the Town, including without limitation all costs incurred by the Town's outside**
44 **consultants such as legal and engineering costs.**
45
- 46 3. The applicant will provide construction drawings that are in compliance with
47 the March 23, 2016 Memorandum from Public Works Director, John Wenzel
48 Town Engineer and Colorado River Fire & Rescue Fire Marshall, Orrin Moon
49 prior to building permit application.
50

- 1 4. The applicant will pay for all water, sewer and water rights dedication fees as
2 approved by Town Council prior to the first building permit approval.
3
- 4 5. All disturbed land shall be predominantly weed free during and after
5 development and re-seeded according to the seed mix used by the Town of
6 **New Castle Park's Department.**
7
- 8 6. CRHDC will enter into a Subdivision Improvement Agreement with the Town
9 as approved by Town Council.
10

11 Carly Johansson, Director of Real Estate Development for CRHDC, said they had
12 been negotiating an agreement with the neighboring property owned by Jim
13 Columbo, but could not reach a mutual understanding.

14 Ms. Johannssen said they had submitted an application to Colorado Housing and
15 Finance Authority (CHFA) for funding. She believed they had a strong application.
16 CRHDC will continue to move through the PUD process regardless of approval from
17 CHFA.
18

19 JV DeSousa, Architect for CRHDC, said in the submission to CHFA for funding of the
20 property, CRHDC was required to have full site control. Mr. DeSousa said that
21 submitting a design where half of the access road was on neighboring property
22 where CRHDC does not have site control would void the CHFA application. Since
23 there was not an agreement reached early on in the application process, the road
24 had **been shifted entirely onto CRHDC's property.**
25

26 Ms. Johansson said a Traffic Study and Geotechnical Study had been completed.
27 CRHDC once again requested that the drainage report/calculations, water design
28 calculations, sewer design calculations be completed and delivered to the Town of
29 New Castle when the project was ready for a building permit. The findings of the
30 study are as follows:
31

- 32 1. The grading and drainage plan will need to assure that not only the
33 finish grade contours are provided for the roadway construction, but
34 also for the whole site. The development will properly design the
35 finish grade contours to assure that the grading and drainage plan
36 requirements are met. This will be submitted at the time of a plan
37 review for permits.
38
- 39 2. There appears to be a need for either drain inlets or valley pans to
40 mitigate shoulder/ditch erosion into the receiving borrow ditch. The
41 small portion of the road that is below the double inlet will not be
42 captured or treated for water quality due to site and topography
43 constraints. However, the net runoff from the site will meet all water
44 quality and detention standards. A valley pan will be provided to
45 direct flows into the ditch and mitigate erosion. This will be
46 submitted at the time of a plan review for permits.
47
- 48 3. The site plan for the bike path crossing at the entrance onto Castle
49 Valley BLVD needs to be better defined identifying the cross walk
50 striping as well as the need (or not) for ADA accessible ramps across

1 the driveway. All crossing paths will be further defined and all ADA
2 accessible routes will conform to all ADA requirements. This will be
3 submitted at the time of a plan review for permits.
4

- 5 4. The grading in the roadside swale in the vicinity of the detention
6 facility is excessive (particularly next to Castle Valley BLVD). The
7 future of Castle Valley BLVD will be the need of an additional travel
8 lane thus construction of facilities that compromise this will need to
9 be avoided. Note that the 10 foot width of the bike path is
10 **unnecessary; rather, an 8' wide path is required. The bike path will**
11 **be 8' wide rather than 10' wide. Our development will take this**
12 design of the future Castle Valley BLVD into consideration to assure
13 coordination. This will be submitted at the time of a plan review for
14 permits.
15
- 16 5. For the storm drain line from the double inlet to the detention pond,
17 at the change in direction of the alignment, a storm drain manhole is
18 necessary. The project will provide a storm drain manhole if it is
19 necessary. This will be submitted at the time of a plan review for
20 permits.
21
- 22 6. **Water and sewer separation (including manholes) needs to be 10'.**
23 The current alignments do not provide for such. All separation and
24 other design requirements of the Town of New Castle for water and
25 sewer will be met. This will be shown on the plans that will be
26 submitted for permit review.
27
- 28 7. Water service lines off of the main line are identified. Shut off
29 locations, meter locations and line sizes need to be provided.
30 Calculations supporting the service size and meter size need to be
31 submitted for review. Fire service demands need to be identified for
32 the line sizing as well. Detailed design of water service infrastructure
33 as well as calculations supporting the design will be provided on the
34 plans for building permit review.
35
- 36 8. It appears that the location of the sewer service line to building 3 will
37 not work. The finish floor for the lowest level is at an elevation of
38 71.75 while the finish road grade elevation at the service line
39 location tie to the proposed sewer main is near elevation 74. The
40 sewer service lines that were shown on the Preliminary PUD Plan set
41 were preliminary by nature. The final plans submitted for permit
42 review will be fully designed and functioning.
43
- 44 9. Profiles of the storm drain, sewer and water lines will need to be
45 provided to determine specific vertical installation requirements. All
46 proposed crossings (or potential conflicts) of all utility crossings will
47 need to be identified. Construction level, detailed plan and profiles
48 will be provided for all utilities at the time of building permit review.
49 They will identify crossings and address potential conflicts.
50

- 1 10. Identification of transformer locations, junction boxes and service
2 pedestals need to be identified to assure that no conflicts exist with
3 placement of hydrants, valves, snow storage locations, landscaping,
4 etc.... **This will be submitted at the time of a plan review for permits.**
5
- 6 11. For the water and sewer termination points in Castle Valley BLVD,
7 the water and sewer will need to be extended/stubbed to a point
8 that is 5 feet beyond the edge of proposed improvements. In the
9 case of the sewer line, the sewer may need to be extended in such a
10 fashion that it is located 5 feet beyond the west termination of the
11 bike path such that future extension of the sewer line will not require
12 reconstruction of the bike path as well. For the waterline, the water
13 line will need to be stubbed at least 5 feet beyond the eventual edge
14 of asphalt. Through the traffic study, there is likely a need to provide
15 a right hand turn into the property (for eastbound traffic). As such,
16 the waterline will need to be installed to a point that is 5 feet beyond
17 the edge of asphalt necessary to construct the turn lane and
18 transition width to such. In this manner, extension of the waterline,
19 in the future will not require cutting the improvements being
20 constructed with this project. The water and sewer mains along
21 Castle Valley BLVD will be realigned and extended to 5 feet beyond
22 the edge of asphalt to eliminate the need for reconstruction of the
23 bike path, driveways, and Castle Valley BLVD. This will be shown on
24 the plans submitted for building permit review.
25
- 26 12. At a minimum, lighting of the roadway tie to Castle Valley BLVD is
27 necessary to promote safety of pedestrians at the trail crossing.
28 Recommendation lighting be in place to highlight pedestrian
29 crossings inside the project as well. This will be submitted at the
30 time of a plan review for permits.
31
- 32 13. Grand River Fire Protection District is in concurrence with the access
33 planning (for fire apparatus) as well as the fire hydrant placements
34 and disbursement throughout the site. The Colorado River Fire
35 Rescue Department has confirmed the fire hydrant locations are
36 appropriate. Building 2 has been altered to address the Fire
37 Departments concerns about the portion of the building that was
38 three story. The entire building is not two stories to conform to the
39 requirements of the Fire Department.
40
- 41 14. Water/storm drain crossings will need to be insulated. The
42 preference is to insulate the storm drain lines to protect the water
43 lines from freezing as the likelihood for the need to access the water
44 line is higher than that of the storm drain. This will be submitted at
45 the time of a plan review for permits.
46
- 47 15. Given the close proximity of the building corners for Building 2 and
48 Building 4 (Buildings 3 and 5 on the Architects plan) to the west
49 property line, either show how construction will not trespass onto the
50 neighboring property or provide the Town the proof of a temporary

1 construction easement from the school district? On the Architects
2 plan, it appears some improvements cross onto the adjacent
3 property (Building 5). Provide proof for the permanent easement for
4 these improvements. Assure that the drainage plan (swale proposed)
5 identified can function properly. The architectural drawings have
6 been revised to illustrate that no improvements will cross the
7 property line at the corners of buildings 3 and 5. The five foot
8 distance to the property line should provide adequate space for any
9 foundation over excavation. If needed the contractor shall shore and
10 protect the edge of any excavation within ten feet of the property
11 line so that the adjacent site is not impacted. The building footprints
12 shown on the PUD plan show the maximum extent of the building
13 footprint. If necessary to make the interceptor swale work properly
14 the southwest corner of building 5 will be redesigned to provide
15 additional clearance. Design calculations and details of the
16 interceptor swale will be provided at the time of submission for plan
17 review.

- 18
- 19 16. Building number labels between the engineers plans and the
20 **architects' plans need to be consistent. This has been addressed to**
21 **assure all plans are consistent.**
- 22
- 23 17. For final plan, a storm water management plan (SWMP) identifying
24 **phasing and BMP's will be necessary to assure contractor compliance**
25 **with such during construction. This will be submitted at the time of a**
26 **plan review for permits.**
- 27
- 28 18. For final plan, details for construction will be needed including the
29 **applicable details from the Town's Public Works Manual to avoid any**
30 **confusion as to what is being constructed. This will be submitted at**
31 **the time of a plan review for permits.**
- 32
- 33 19. A signage and striping plan will be necessary (particularly as it
34 relates to Castle Valley BLVD) to accommodate turn lanes into this
35 project. This will be submitted at the time of a plan review for
36 permits.

37

38 Colorado River Fire and Rescue Fire (CRFR) Marshall, Orrin Moon has
39 requested the following:

- 40
- 41 1. Fire truck turnaround at the end of the street and along the east side
42 **of the main entrance road shall have "NO PARKING" signs installed.**
43 This signage shall be installed.
- 44
- 45 2. Buildings shall have separate street addressing. The buildings shall
46 have separate street addressing.
- 47
- 48 3. Unknown if the Access Street will have a street name. I would
49 suggest the road be named so the buildings can be addressed off of

1 the street. We will request the Street Name from the Town of New
2 Castle and will address the buildings off this new Street Name.

- 3
- 4 4. Use 2012 Fire Code when laying out and planning the solar panels.
5 All panel layouts will conform with the 2012 Fire Code.
6
- 7 5. Try to locate the fire riser rooms and locations in the same location
8 at each building as much as possible. All fire riser rooms will be
9 located in the same location on each building, as much as possible
10 given that buildings have different sizes and orientations. The design
11 team will meet with CRFR during subsequent design phases to gain
12 input and approval of all final locations prior to submission of final
13 drawings for plan review.
14
- 15 6. The disconnects and switches are all to be located in the fire riser
16 room. Electrical system disconnects and switches for both the power
17 being provided by the utility company and power being generated by
18 renewable energy systems on site shall be in or adjacent to the Fire
19 Riser rooms subject to the requirements of the National Energy Code
20 and International Fire Code.
21
- 22 7. Plan on having copper phone lines to each building. Copper phone
23 lines will be installed in each building.
24
- 25 8. Exterior back balconies are not going to be permitted to have grills,
26 this will be made available at the community building. CRHDC
27 property management will not allow grills on back balconies and
28 porches. Nor will grills be allowed anywhere that the might be
29 operated beneath an overhanging eave, soffit or balcony. This will be
30 written into our house rules.
31
- 32 9. The elevator will be large enough to accommodate gurneys, for door
33 locations the side is better. Project will include an elevator large
34 enough to accommodate gurneys and the door location will be on the
35 side.
36
- 37 10. CRHDC will contact the surveyor to identify the existing tree
38 locations to make sure they are not too close the building. This is
39 currently in process. The design team will meet with CRFR during
40 subsequent design phases to develop a wildland interface fire
41 protection plan. Removal of trees close to new structures,
42 development of a fire break zone around structures and removal of
43 ladder fuels on all trees within a minimum distance of any structure
44 will be undertaken at the direction of CRFR.
45
- 46 11. Relocate two units on the third story of building 3 so that they are
47 easier to access with the fire departments equipment. These two
48 units have been relocated to the east end of building 6.
49

- 1 12. The fire sprinkler system shall be installed to National Fire
2 Protection Association (NFPA) 13 R. The fire sprinkler system shall
3 be installed as per NFPA 13 R.
4
- 5 13. Fire Alarm system shall be installed to NFPA 72. The Fire Alarm
6 system shall be installed as per NFPA 72.
7
- 8 14. CRHDC design team will meet with CRFR during subsequent design
9 phases to develop an approved addressed monitoring system and
10 knock boxes will be provided in locations to be approved by CRFR.
11 Fire zones and other wildland fire protection plans shall be developed
12 as described.
13

14 Town of New Castle Public Works, John Wenzel has requested the
15 following:
16

- 17 1. Sidewalks located in the Public Right-of-Way shall be concrete and a
18 minimum of five feet wide. A green belt (4 to 5 feet wide) shall be
19 placed between the edge of sidewalk and back of curb to provide for
20 improved walkability and additional snow storage. Asphalt is an
21 acceptable material for the 10 foot trail that runs parallel to Castle
22 Valley Blvd. CRHDC project team will provide a multi-use trail along
23 the north property line in compliance with Town of New Castle
24 standards. Please note that differing departments of the Town are
25 currently requiring differing widths. The project will provide detached
26 sidewalks with a minimum four foot wide planted parkway along
27 portions of the new street that do not provide space for parallel car
28 parking. In areas of parallel car parking the sidewalk shall be
29 attached to the back side of the curb.
30
- 31 2. Mr. Wenzel suggest combining/enlarging the parking islands to
32 provide for additional snow storage. The suggestion is appreciated
33 and duly noted. CRHDC and the project design team will carefully
34 consider and balance needs for snow storage space with the desire
35 to provide an attractive landscape character for the parking areas
36 that may require multiple peninsulas to support a tree canopy.
37
- 38 3. Fire Hydrant type to be Kennedy. Fire hydrants must be set at
39 proper elevation, with a 3 inch minimum clearance between
40 breakaway flange and finished grade. Mega lug fittings shall be used
41 for fire hydrants and fire hydrant isolation valves. CRHDC will
42 comply.
43
- 44 4. **Tracer wire shall be placed with water main lines. It's recommended**
45 that tracer wire also be placed with water service lines. CRHDC
46 project will comply.
47
- 48 5. At a minimum, each building should have its own water meter.
49 Water meter touch pads should be placed in a convenient location
50 for ease of use. (Ground level, close proximity to each other).
CRHDC project will comply. Each building will have a separate water

1 meter. Locations of water meters shall be coordinated with the Town
2 and CRHDC requirements. Meters will be grouped in close proximity
3 while recognizing that CRHDC also needs to limit the length of lines
4 on the private side of the meter. Thus meters for buildings 1, 2 and
5 3 may be grouped fairly close together near the north end of the site
6 and meters for buildings 4, 5 and 6 may be grouped fairly close
7 together near the south end of the site.
8

- 9 6. A man hole shall be placed at the termination point of the sewer
10 main line. CRHDC will comply.
11
- 12 7. Detailed utility As-Built plans shall be submitted. As-Built plans shall
13 include the location of water/sewer main lines and the point of
14 connection for all water/sewer service lines. CRHDC will comply.
15
- 16 8. Developer shall be responsible for disinfection, testing, sampling,
17 and reporting for all newly placed potable water and sewer lines. A
18 Public Works representative shall be contacted to observe the
19 disinfection, testing, sampling, and reporting process. CRHDC will
20 comply.
21
- 22 9. Street lights shall be placed at intersections for pedestrian safety.
23 CRHDC will comply. Street lights shall be placed in accordance with
24 Town requirements.
25
- 26 10. The Final Plot plan shall clearly define boundaries between public
27 and private roads, parking, and sidewalks. The Final Plot plan will
28 show and define the subdivision of the existing parcel into two
29 smaller parcels, one for residential development and the second to
30 be deeded to the Town of New Castle for public right-of-way. All
31 improvements within the right-of-way shall become the property of
32 **the town and shall be the town's responsibility to maintain. All**
33 improvements within the residential property shall be owned and
34 maintained by CRHDC. The proposed property line location provides
35 a clear separation between systems owned and maintained by the
36 Town and owned and maintained by CRHDC with the exception of
37 the ADA accessible trail near the south end of the property. During
38 subsequent design phases the design team will meet with Town staff
39 to design and detail this system so that the boundary between public
40 and private ownership and responsibility is clear.
41
- 42 11. Work in or directly adjacent to the roadway will require a right-of-
43 **way permit. The Developer's contractors can pick up a right-of-way**
44 permit from the Town Clerk. CRHDC will comply.
45

46 Colorado Department of Parks and Wildlife, Brian Gray requested the
47 following:
48

- 49 1. A buffer of vegetation could be planted at the southern border of the
50 property in order to screen the apartments from the land to the

1 south. The ridge directly to the south of the property does provide
2 habitat for many wildlife species. The vegetative buffer could
3 possibly lessen visual, noise and lighting impacts to the south.
4 Additionally, prohibiting pets from wandering to the south of the
5 property would help lessen impacts to wildlife. CRHDC design team
6 will carefully design the landscape of the southern portion of the site,
7 particularly near building 6, the edge of the coniferous forest and the
8 sharp ridge that falls away to the south to balance the needs and
9 desires for wildlife, the residents of the community (both on the site
10 and within the broader neighborhood and town), the local fire
11 department and the Town of New Castle requirements. If a
12 vegetative buffer can be provided without creating issues, wildfire
13 risk for example, it will be.

14
15 Mr. DeSousa explained the following list of comments received from Lakota
16 Canyon Ranch Design Review Board members meeting:

- 17
18 1. Stucco is not an acceptable material in the Lakota Ridge
19 neighborhood. CRHDC is redesigning to have either no stucco
20 cladding or no stucco cladding visible from Castle Valley Boulevard.
21
- 22 2. Stone cladding is preferred at the base of walls. Stone cladding is
23 beyond the budget of the project but the design team will look at
24 using other materials in similar way to **give buildings a "grounded"**
25 appearance with a heavy base material.
26
- 27 3. Rooflines should be broken up. The design of the project has been
28 modified to eliminate long unbroken ridge lines on the roof.
29
- 30 4. Dormers should have gable roofs or at a minimum steeper shed
31 roofs. CRHDC will explore gable dormers although those add
32 considerable cost to the project and may not be feasible. Steeper
33 shed dormers will be used if gable dormers cannot be implemented.
34
- 35 5. Acceptable colors are earth tones. Beige is not allowed. CRHDC has
36 studied the color schemes of many of the houses with the Lakota
37 Ridge neighborhood and will implement a color scheme drawing
38 upon those examples.
39

40 Chair Apostolik closed the Public Hearing at 7:51p.m.

41
42 Motion: Chair Apostolik made a motion recommending approval of PZ-
43 2016-04, A Resolution of the New Castle Planning and Zoning Commission
44 Recommending Approval of a Conditional Use Permit for Lakota Ridge
45 **Senior Apartments, LLC's Final PUD Development Plan Application.**
46 Commissioner Metzger seconded the motion.
47

48 The motion passed on a roll call vote: Commissioner Ruggles: Yes;
49 Commissioner Metzger: Yes; Chair Apostolik: Yes; and Commissioner
50 Borgard: Yes.

1
2 Commissioner Urnise and Commissioner Gates returned to the council chambers at
3 7:54p.m.
4

5 Items for Consideration

6 Consider Setting a Date for Workshop for Reviewing Comprehensive Plan.
7 Commission had a brief discussion possible having a combined workshop with
8 council to review the Comprehensive Plan.
9

10 Planner Cain suggested reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and Master Zoning at
11 the same time.
12

13 Commissioner Metzger agreed to speak with council about setting the date for the
14 workshop for July 27, 2016.
15

16 Items for next Planning and Zoning Agenda

17 There were no items.
18

19 Commission Comments and Reports

20 There were no comments or reports.
21
22
23

24 Staff Reports

25 Planner Cain reported that building was up from last year. There were 14 building
26 permits in 2015, and there are 20 building permits in 2016. He also said that
27 Roaring Fork Transit Authority (RFTA) had broken ground for the Park and Ride.
28

29 Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

30 Motion: Commissioner Borgard made a motion to approve the May 11,
31 2016 meeting minutes as submitted. Commissioner Urnise seconded the
32 motion and it passed unanimously.
33

34 Motion: Chair Apostolik made a motion to adjourn the meeting.
35 Commissioner Metzger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.
36

37 The meeting adjourned at 8:10p.m.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2 Respectfully Submitted,

3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Planning and Zoning Commission Chair
Chuck Apostolik

10 Deputy Town Clerk Mindy Andis
11

DRAFT