

City Council Meeting Minutes

**January 22, 2019
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
7:00 PM**

Call to Order – Mayor Muckle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: ***Mayor Robert Muckle
Councilmember Jay Keany
Councilmember Susan Loo
Councilmember Dennis Maloney
Councilmember Ashley Stolzmann***

Absent: ***Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton
Councilmember Chris Leh***

Staff Present: ***Heather Balsler, City Manager
Megan Davis, Deputy City Manager
Aaron DeJong, Economic Development Director
Kurt Kowar, Public Works Director
Rob Zuccaro, Planning & Building Safety Director
Lisa Ritchie, Senior Planner
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk***

Others Present: ***Kathleen Kelly, City Attorney***

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Muckle called for changes to the agenda and hearing none; moved to approve the agenda; seconded by Councilmember Maloney. All in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Mayor Muckle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Councilmember Maloney. All in favor.

- A. *Approval of Bills***
- B. *Approval of Minutes: January 8, 2019***

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Mayor Muckle invited everyone to the Recreation/Senior Center grand opening on Saturday, January 26. The facility will be free all day with a variety of activity demonstrations.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Balser also invited everyone to the grand opening.

REGULAR BUSINESS

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – DOWNTOWN PARKING STRUCTURE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Mayor Muckle introduced the item and noted in July of 2017 the Council asked the Louisville Revitalization Commission (LRC) to investigate options for a parking garage including height, massing, and look. He noted the intention of this hearing is not to make a decision to build a parking structure but to look at the issues related to design of a structure and give feedback.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked if an outcome could include directing staff to take no further action. Mayor Muckle stated yes.

Director DeJong stated the LRC has been reviewing this and introduced Hank Dalton of the LRC. Dalton stated some of the conversation circulating about this item has been incorrect. The goal is a robust conversation about the goals, objectives, and purpose of the Highway 42 Revitalization Area Urban Renewal Plan adopted by City Council in 2006. He reviewed how we got here, noting parking in downtown can be difficult especially on a busy night, but added committing to a parking structure without a broad set of goals, would be a waste of time and money. This structure isn't needed so much for current parking issues but to encourage future development and will also need robust enforcement of two-hour parking.

Dalton noted the LRC has brought forward this conceptual design for discussion of location, size and cost but not design or architecture. The LRC feels increased parking downtown could be a catalyst for development. The LRC believes using tax increment financing could be used to cover a significant amount of building a parking structure.

Dalton stated downtown has not seen redevelopment because construction costs are high, lots are small, redevelopment projects that meet zoning are not be large enough to achieve construction efficiencies; two and even three-story developments don't provide return on investment. Properties are difficult to design to meet zoning and parking requirements on site. Of seven projects that have been approved, five have not been completed for some or all of those reasons. Most investment downtown has been the small expansions of existing space that do not trigger parking requirements. Payments of the fee in lieu have not been spent to build parking. Additional supply is one of the few ways to eliminate the neighborhood impacts. If Council determines a parking structure is needed it could be done as part of the eclectic and organic downtown development without conflict with the character.

Andy Johnson, 922 Main Street, representing the consulting team of DAJ Design and Desman Design Management, noted these are conceptual and are studies to see what is possible in size, capacity and height within the parameters of this specific site.

Johnson reviewed the parking lot in question between Main Street and Front Street. He reviewed design considerations including the alley, utility relocation, the Voltage land swap, the connection between Main and Front, the core and transition area of the downtown design guidelines. He noted they are presenting an east/west option and a north/south option and there are pros and cons of each.

East/west design would have a setback from the northern buildings, entry from Front Street, with one floor below grade and three above. It would be a net gain of 277 spaces. All of the heights fall within the downtown design guidelines heights.

North/south options 2 and 3. Option 3 has a 26-foot setback from Front and includes an additional ½ level below ground.

Johnson reviewed the three option comparisons. Option one is the highest cost, option 2 is higher above ground, option 3 raises the cost but has better massing. The team did look at maintenance and operation; they are largely based on the size of the structure with option three having the lowest overall cost in those areas.

Councilmember Stolzmann noted the current lot has 101 spaces on it. She asked if more parking could be fit on that lot as it is not optimized. She asked how many more spaces could be added. Johnson stated an estimate would be perhaps 8 additional spaces.

Councilmember Maloney asked about the maintenance and operation costs and how it was calculated. Johnson stated it is from a cost per square foot basis of 50 cents per square foot.

Public Comments

Sid Vinall, 544 Leader Circle, stated he is concerned about under-utilizing of current parking during summer events. He noted parking on the east side of the railroad tracks always has parking and asked if the ball fields could be used better with an underpass or shuttles. He expressed concern about maintaining the attractiveness of town, the small town character, and the size of this building. He added the concern about climate change and this garage encouraging the use of fossil fuels.

Mark Cathcart, 1763 Sweet Clover Lane, stated he does not support the garage. The city should be enabling non-car focused travel projects before doing the garage. This is a fossil fuel infrastructure and brings congestion. He felt there should be work to be a city that is not car dependent. Walking and cycling is not encouraged or easy. More and more residents don't have cars.

Marilee O'Conner, 104 Barbara Street, a public health epidemiologist, noted many might agree on the goals of the urban renewal plan, but disagree with how to get there. She felt there needs to be a community health needs assessment. Parking garages are associated with many negative health impacts. There are other way to bring people downtown. Parking garages are on their way out as transportation changes. She asked if Council goes forward they consider a parking garage with a conversion option included. She asked Council to not consider design requests for proposals that were not open and the community did not have the opportunity to comment on. She asked Council to consider other options for this space.

Councilmember Loo stated the request for proposal (RFP) was done in public and none of this has been done behind closed doors. She wanted to correct the perception the city does things in secret; the public record will show there was a public process.

Tom Rafferty, 945 Rex Street, stated he wants this proposal to go away and thanked Council for the parking improvements that have been made. Parking during Street Faire is better with the smaller faires. This garage is too much concrete. He asked why there was no Planning Commission or other meetings before this came to Council and have all of the parking improvements of the parking framework plan been implemented. Downtown is too party-like and needs to attract locals walking; need more family themes to counter balance all the restaurants and bars. He wanted to maintain the small town character. Last Saturday night he noted multiple available parking places in town.

Zoey Davol, 1020 Rex, owner of Pica's with her husband, stated she is not against re-development and revitalization, but not for this garage. It is not in the scale, not what business owners are looking for, parking is under-utilized most of the time. She felt this is

not a sustainable or progressive strategy and does not encourage sustainability. It does not feel like this is the right strategy. Speaking for her husband she stated he does not support it as proposed and not in line with downtown character. People come downtown for the way it feels, not the parking. Need better selection of downtown businesses for a dynamic and interesting assortment. He urged don't lose the charm of downtown and utilize the existing parking.

John Leary, 1116 LaFarge Avenue, stated downtown is not blighted and this does not need to be addressed in downtown. During the past 10 years downtown has performed well economically. He felt Council should reevaluate the blight determination of 2006.

Rick Kron, president of the Downtown Business Association (DBA), said the Association Board has discussed these concepts and feel there is an emerging parking problem. As a result the DBA supports further research development and potential implementation of parking solutions that may include a parking garage in the future. The DBA feels it is premature to take any option off the table.

Blair McBride, 940 Elm Street, felt this will take away from the charm of downtown. He sees open parking spots on a regular basis. Only on special event nights are the extra spaces needed. He felt there are plenty of parking spaces in DELO and just off of Main Street.

Conor Seyle, 397 County Road, stated he opposes all the designs and does not see the need for more parking as there is much underutilized parking. If this is for future growth this is a bet and if it doesn't bring more development it will be a large empty building. He felt long-term trends will show this is not needed. If it goes forward he urged Council to go back to the drawing board and address new trends for conversion.

Brian Topping, 1550 White Violet Way, stated there are ways to combine density and charm that would make the area a destination point. These concepts are under inspired, they should have green space on top and they could be a way to bring people downtown. He suggested finding a way to add to the culture and be forward looking.

Sherry Sommer, 910 S. Palisade Ct., stated this plan is not consistent with the Hwy 42 Urban Renewal Plan and Market Feasibility Study. She noted the goals to use most efficient use of resources, consistent with the goals and policies of the City and enhance quality of life. She felt these goals are not met with the parking garage. She expressed the need to put people first in urban planning

Karen Tucker, 601 ½ Main, asked Council to think differently, it will be about alternative transportation in the future; need to look at alternatives. Make it special, make it a retail destination. This plan is going backwards; think forward.

Jean Morgan, 1131 Spruce Street, stated she wonders if Louisville is trying to compete with Lafayette. We need to look at alternatives, underground parking, utilizing the sports

complex, utilizing the lot east of the tracks. She didn't want tax dollars spent on this. This is a way to get residents to foot the bill for what developers should pay for. Future holds more mass transit and will be less car based. Look at alternatives to keep our small town character. Ms. Morgan read a note from Barb Hesson, 411 County Road, expressing her opposition and feeling there is too much congestion in this part of the city already from events and all effects will be on this neighborhood.

Randy Caranci, 441 Elk Trail, Lafayette, CO stated he and his partner have offered underground parking on their property at the mill site to the City and it could fit the size of the library garage, 80-90 spaces along with 40 additional spaces along the railroad track. It would be super low cost with minimal disruption during construction.

Sally Blair, 401 County Road, has photos showing the Sweet Cow lot is rarely full, even when there is plenty of adjacent street parking. There is enough parking at this location. Parking on residential streets is closer to where people want to go and additional parking won't solve that. She doesn't have an issue with additional square footage downtown, but residents shouldn't pay for the parking. There are better uses for the money that would encourage foot traffic.

Steve Poppitz, 1036 Walnut Street, suggested the City should invest in pedi-cabs to shuttle people. We are headed to a time when people won't own cars. Think outside the box for new options. Don't spend money on this, it will be a stranded asset. Plan for the future not the automobile.

Trish Webb, 134 Cherrywood Lane, loves being able to walk and bike downtown, a garage does not add to that. She didn't want to see it affect the charm.

Caleb Dickson, 721 Grant Avenue, member of HPC, DBA, Chamber, and business owner noted there has been a lot of feedback and is hoping Council will look at other options and other locations. As a resident, he doesn't want a big parking structure. As a business owner, he has 20 employees who can't afford to live here and they have a problem finding parking during different times of day; so there are some issues. He suggested looking at last mile options. If we want people from other communities to come to our businesses we need to solve the problem. If it is built and becomes unnecessary then can repurpose surface lots.

Michael Perkins, 229 Vulcan Street, stated his opposition to this. It does not belong in Louisville with our small town character. We don't need to address parking for just a few times per year. There are alternatives.

Cindy Bedell, 662 West Willow Street, stated she would like Council to stop this idea now. There are other parking options to meet our present needs. Invest in bike paths and alternative transportation. These proposals don't fit in downtown.

Madeline Cowell, 954 Elm Street, stated she wants to learn more and see other concepts to know what options there are moving forward.

Mayor Muckle thanked everyone for their comments.

Councilmember Maloney stated there has been a misperception this process was done in secret. This was done in public and this is an informational item and a conceptual design. He noted the LRC is about urban renewal and economic stimulation and they are trying to find ways to deal with long term economic stimulation which is the role we ask them to play. He stated all email and comments from residents inform the deliberative process.

Councilmember Maloney stated the gist of this topic is long term economic sustainability. Council needs to be looking at what will lead to economic sustainability and whether a parking garage is part of that. He agreed the block and scale at this location is incompatible with downtown and the neighborhood.

Councilmember Maloney stated the parking need downtown and that there is not a huge problem most days; there are other opportunities to optimize parking downtown. When looking at the costs for building and the operating and maintenance it is very significant over a 20 year period. We likely won't recover those costs from sales tax.

The reason Council asked LRC to do this was to define a shared vision with the LRC for economic sustainability. This is one potential opportunity but there are other areas to invest in to help with long term sustainability. We need a better vision on what we want and where to invest for long term sustainability.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she supports many of the changes made in the downtown, but has consistently been against this for three reasons 1) compatibility, 2) costs and 3) short and long term needs have not been demonstrated. She felt Council needs to give the community peace of mind we are not continuing down this path. Council and LRC need to work better together to collectively move forward. Council should give staff direction not to spend any more time or resources on this topic.

Councilmember Loo stated what we have now is more facts than we had before. Council asked LRC to look at this site specifically because the City owns it. Now we know using this site as conceptualized is not popular. She noted the costs of underground parking is incredibly expensive. She thinks there are a lot of misconceptions of what this was and where it was going. There are ways to disguise the mass and scale of the parking with retail. This is not about the current parking situation, but is about the future. One of the reasons why we aren't categorized as "best town" any longer is the cost of housing. Louisville is expensive and there is a need to understand that. If one looks at studies about people not using cars it is in very high density areas and we don't have that. We don't have the volume for transit service but if we talk about higher density in Louisville residents will pack the house in opposition.

Councilmember Loo stated to those who wrote and accused Council of being in developers pockets they need to know that is not the case and not in the Louisville character.

Councilmember Keany stated he read all the emails and saw what was posted on social media and noted many of the comments took him aback. To say Council is doing this for profit is offensive. Council constrained the LRC to the one specific location because we own it. Some day we may need a garage or parking facility. He agreed working together with the LRC is a goal. There are options and the intent of this study was to show what massing and scale would look like. This was not a specific design conversation.

Councilmember Keany stated he heard many comments that one can drive around and find plenty of parking. He noted many of the employees in downtown cannot afford to live here and have no transit options for them. Adding more office space or multi use buildings bring more employees and they will need a place to park. If we want downtown to have viable businesses we need to have a place for them to park. This is looking down the road and what we want to see in the future. There is more to talk about for sure.

Mayor Muckle stated what we learned is you can't build a garage in that location people will be happy with. There are other options that we can spend this money on. Personally he was willing to put this idea aside, but noted Council can't bind future councils to that.

Councilmember Stolzmann made a motion to give staff direction not to expend any more resources on this and to communicate to the citizens we are not intending to build a parking structure at this location. Councilmember Keany seconded.

Councilmember Loo asked if this was just binding this particular Council. Councilmember Stolzmann stated yes, this would only be the intent of this Council. Councilmember Loo stated her concern would be if commuter rail comes we may be foreclosing options.

Mayor Muckle stated none of the current Council will be here when and if a train comes; future Councils can change their minds depending on the circumstances.

Councilmember Keany asked if this is just for the specific location. Councilmember Stolzmann said yes. Councilmember Keany stated this motion would not preclude the City and/or LRC from doing something else if rail comes to town.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated when and if rail comes there are many more conversations to be had.

Voice vote: all in favor.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Mayor Muckle introduced the item.

Director Zuccaro stated TEI and EPS were hired as consultants for this item and staff from Planning, City Manager's Office, Public Works and Parks have all be working on this. This is a check in to look at a draft data and trends report and a summary of the public input. This has not included a statistical survey but includes lots of public outreach and lots of input to help inform the policies. Staff would like Council input at this point as they work toward a final plan.

Shaída Libhart, project manager from TEI, stated the goal is to look at long term needs of the city. Right now the team is developing recommendations and wants Council feedback before moving toward the final document.

Libhart reviewed some of the high level trends including regional population growth; employment projections particularly on the fringe areas of town (employment is a big driver of transportation); demographic trends including faster population growth of those over 55 in the City; rising housing costs and people living further away; travel demands and patterns including most people working in town live elsewhere or live here and work elsewhere, causing more driving.

Libhart noted over the last five years there have been slight decreases in driving and carpooling and increased transit, bike use, and working from home. Non commuting trips make up 60% of trips and are not work related with 31% of those less than 3 miles. Those shorter trips have more opportunity to be converted to other modes of transportation.

Councilmember Loo asked if there is a way to figure out where those trips are occurring. Libhart stated this data comes from the DRCOG model with a lot of survey information but it probably lacks the specific granularity. Councilmember Loo would like to know more about where they are going, it would be helpful to know why people are making these trips and how do you address it.

Libhart noted the implications for future transportation:

1. With increased vehicle miles travelled (VMT), regional corridors will see increased demand.
2. As cost of housing rises and as the population ages, multimodal and low-cost mobility options will gain more importance in the network.
3. Linking housing to destinations or mixed-use development can help reduce VMT and support the City's goals.
4. Leveraging and building upon existing assets and infrastructure will help provide options for mobility and growth.
5. Technology is rapidly changing, but ensuring people of all ages and abilities can understand and utilize mobility options will be important.

Libhart reviewed survey information showing;

- 83% of survey respondents drive frequently in Louisville

- Crossings, connectivity to destination, and protected bike lanes would most encourage walking/biking
- More routes and increased frequency would encourage more transit use
- Speeding and traffic congestion are the top issues for driving

Councilmember Loo asked what access to destinations referred to. Libhart noted trails and bike lanes might get them close, but better more direct access might be needed. There were also comments on not having destinations within a comfortable walking/biking distance of their home.

Councilmember Loo asked about the downtown parking. Libhart noted the comments on parking noted difficulty parking downtown and during events with 16% of responses noting that as a priority.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated it would be helpful to create an infographic to show people the average amount of time it takes to get somewhere. Louisville is not that big; people need to know how easy some of this is. Libhart stated there are some maps in the data and trends report. Councilmember Stolzmann would like a graphic that is easy to read for people to understand how easy it is to get around town.

Libhart reviewed the top spending priorities; underpasses, commuter rail, traffic congestion, intersection safety, and bike lane safety. She reviewed the intersection map showing where people think they need safety help and/or connections.

Libhart displayed an interactive map showing responses concerning a significant number of intersections/crossings identified as needing attention, new connections highly desired.

Focus Groups Major themes:

- Crossings are important for safety of all ages and accessing destinations
- More connections to destination are needed for walking/biking
- Transit to CTC is a high priority
- People driving and biking prefer to separate bikes and vehicles where possible
- More funding for Via transit services and improve local transit options
- Education and communication is valuable for changes, new facilities, and safety
- Make sure recommendations are feasible and implementable

Libhart reviewed the conceptual plans including the TMP goals. There is a focus on all ages and abilities. A network built around mobility and access for all ages and abilities regardless of mode and prioritizes safety, increases travel options, supports sustainability and is good for businesses.

The conceptual plan includes prioritized street investments, a bike network that builds on the trails, prioritized areas for pedestrian improvements, crossings that improve safety, and access and enhanced local and regional transit options.

Five recommendations include

- 1) Network of great streets with a street plan defining types of roadways, basis for design improvement, and coordinating with the Comp Plan.
- 2) Primary corridor enhancements; need to balance regional mobility with local access.
- 3) Walkable Places; improve pedestrian realm, walkable destinations, and high traffic volumes.
- 4) Bike network; expand on the trail network to connect more destinations and neighborhoods, closing gaps, upgrade existing facilities, improved crossings for bikes and pedestrians.
- 5) Transit Vision long-term; transit improvements to more areas, increased frequency, more regional and Bus Rapid Transit options, leverage future rail investment.

Key recommendations will include addressing issues on:

- Highway 42 – primary function is for vehicle access, includes sidewalks but no bike lanes, delay most significant between Pine Street and South Boulder Road, needs the ability to accommodate future transit. Five lanes (four lanes with left turn lanes), sidewalk on west side to access destinations, off street trail beyond the right of way on east side leveraging open space.
- Dillon Road corridor – Move forward with Dillon Road corridor study recommendations including capacity improvements around 96th Street and the railroad tracks, ensure ADA access is included in any improvements, enhance existing bike facility with signage and striping. Extend Campus Drive to 96th Street to improve functioning of Dillon Road and better services schools and hospital.
- South Boulder Road – Serves multiple needs for the community. Short term focus includes pedestrian crossings along with congestion and access at SH42. Long term calls for a study for redesign of the corridor including best allocation of right-of-way and regional consistency for modes.
- Via Appia – Reconfigure to prioritize multimodal access. Safety issues at intersections.
- McCaslin corridor – Overall traffic flows well, separate bikes from traffic, especially south of Centennial Parkway, multimodal secondary network in areas of redevelopment.
- Identify Locations for Walkable Places – wide, buffered sidewalks, narrow/visible crossings, lighting and trees/shade, benefits include attracting commercial activity and generating higher retail sales and higher rents. Walk score downtown is 82 vs 32 for City overall.

Andrew Knutson, EPS, addressed walkability. He noted office and retail rents can be higher in areas with walkability. By increasing walk score commercial activity increases. Want to create as many avenues for people to spend money; that can include large anchor stores within walkable centers that drive up user numbers.

Councilmember Loo asked how walkability can work and bring retail in a less dense area as Louisville tends to not want residential density. Knutson stated retail does follow rooftops, however total personal income also affects spending.

Councilmember Loo didn't understand how we increase the walk score when people don't have something to walk to especially retail. Director Zuccaro stated stores get to choose where they locate and some retailers will want to be where there is a draw for customers and one of those factors could be great access and infrastructure. If we create a place where people want to be that could attract businesses as well.

Councilmember Loo asked if additional streets are proposed in the McCaslin corridor. Director Zuccaro said there was a lot of discussion around this area and they could be streets, trails, access easements in the area to improve connectivity for the first and last mile. Knudson noted any car you can take off the system is good for the entire system and walkability helps in many ways.

Knudson stated with this the job market, finding talent and getting them to the office with transit is important. Even with just commercial, it still applies and is an asset to the end users.

Libhart stated the focus areas identified for the bike network are the powerline trail, downtown linkages to neighborhoods and trails, and an opportunity around Pine and Via Appia to activate the street. She also identified a pilot project of a Recreation Center to downtown urban trail. Councilmember Stolzmann noted there is already a trail that goes from the recreation center to near downtown. Libhart noted that is true and it may just need to be enhanced.

Recommended service enhancements include:

- Call and Ride service improvements
- Prioritize service to CTC
- First Mile/Last Mile connections to transit
- Improve stops and amenities at key locations
- Restructure local service to reach more destinations
- Faster trips on Dash
- Plan for Rail

Knudson noted ways to leverage external investment to realize local economic benefit. They see the greatest leverage in CTC potential office space and building new office development located within a half mile of transit.

Libhart reviewed next steps: develop recommendations from conceptual to draft form, prioritize opportunities and investments, obtain community input and develop implementation plan with targets, metrics, cost estimates, and funding opportunities. They anticipate having a draft completed transportation master plan sometime in April.

Public Comments

Chris Schmidt, Louisville Fire Protection District, stated they strongly oppose reducing the number of lanes on Via Appia as it impacts their station and the ability to maneuver large fire apparatus on the street.

Brian Topping, 1515 White Violet Way, stated it would really benefit residents to have an app showing people the best way to avoid congestion and then the City getting the data to learn where people are coming and going to and from.

Deb Fahey, 1118 West Enclave Circle, suggested a lot of our traffic is regional traffic cutting through town, one way to reduce the amount of drive through traffic and provide another option for transit would be reduce the speed limit to 25 mph on McCaslin and South Boulder Road.

Mayor Muckle stated one thing he was hoping to see in the plan is a defined strategy for traffic calming in neighborhoods so we have objective strategies based on volume and speed.

Councilmember Keany stated he would like to see the final report include a prioritized list of improvements and cost estimates. He would like to see safety prioritized and return on investment as well.

Councilmember Loo asked how the data on crashes compares to national statistics. The consultant team noted that can be included in the report. They tend to be in the areas of higher congestion such as Hwy 42. The plan will focus the recommendations on where they will have the most impact on safety.

Councilmember Loo stated she can't stress enough that high density will not resonate with the residents of Louisville. That needs to be considered in the model and the economics.

Mayor Muckle noted this looks at all transit options and you need to plan so if an opportunity presents itself you have enough of a plan in place to take advantage of it.

Councilmember Loo asked if Council was interested in looking at options for Via Appia or not, as in previous years there was no appetite for decreasing lanes on Via Appia. Mayor Muckle stated he is open to creative ideas for the route. Councilmember Maloney stated he does not support removing the lane, but there are other opportunities that should be considered to help pedestrians and biking.

Mayor Muckle thanked staff and the consultants and noted he was looking forward to the next steps.

RESOLUTION NO. 4, SERIES 2019 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT TO ADJUST THE LOT LINES OF LOTS 1A AND 2A, VACATE TRACT Q TAKODA SUBDIVISION, AND CREATE OUTLOT A TO BE CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING AN UNDERPASS

Mayor Muckle introduced the item. Planner Ritchie stated the project was advertised as required by code. She reviewed the site and location. The plat would allow the creation of an outlot for the installation of a new underpass to meet the intent of the comp plan for connectivity.

She reviewed the replat and the dedication noting it includes a request for a modification between the lots to create a new lot line that is non-conforming.

Ritchie stated the planning commission had an extensive discussion about criteria one and if the location of the shed on the site and the right of way locations could be considered a hardship. Staff finds the location of the ROW immediately to the north and south is a unique hardship. Planning Commission ultimately approved the request 4-2.

Ritchie stated the primary components of the resolution would vacate tract Q, shift the lot line between Lots 1A and 2A, create Outlot A for conveyance to the City and dedicate property for Hwy 42 right-of-way. A modification requires an open shed be located within the 10-foot rear setback.

Staff finds this proposal complies with all criteria for subdivision plats and the modification review.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked about the Comp Plan and the timing of dedicating ROW for the connectivity of Kaylix Street. Ritchie noted the dedication of ROW for Kaylix is not a part of this proposal but this does set the intent to allow for this on a future PUD.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked if moving this lot line gives both lots independent street access. Ritchie stated yes.

Public Comments

Mark Cathcart noted he supports the application and urged Council's approval.

Councilmember Keany moved to approve Resolution No. 4, Series 2019; seconded by Mayor Muckle.

Voice vote: all in favor.

ORDINANCE NO. 1768, SERIES 2019 – AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES FROM THE OFFICE ZONE TO THE

**AGRICULTURAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ZONE DISTRICTS – 2nd READING,
PUBLIC HEARING (advertised *Daily Camera* 1/13/19)**

City Attorney Kelly introduced the item noting this is a second reading. Mayor Muckle opened the public hearing.

Ritchie stated this is a 2018 Council work plan item. Ritchie reviewed both locations. These were zoned Office (O) in 1973, but this zoning was repealed in 1984 with the establishment of Administrative Office (AO) and Business Office (BO) zone districts.

Area 1 has two properties, owned by City of Louisville and Public Service Company of Colorado (Xcel), which are undeveloped and traversed by concrete trails. The Agricultural zone district is consistent with properties in the area used in a similar manner and will not require a change in use or maintenance.

The Area 2 properties are proposed for the administrative office zone and consist of five separately owned properties with smaller office buildings. Planning Commission minutes from 1984 indicate these properties were intended for Administrative Office zoning.

The criteria for the rezoning state the application must meet at least one criteria in Sec. 17.44.050. Staff finds it meets criterion 1, "The land to be rezoned was zoned in error and as presently zoned is inconsistent with the policies and goals of the city's comprehensive plan." The zoning changes will result in consistency with the comprehensive plan. Staff recommends approval.

Public Comments – None

Mayor Muckle closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Stolzmann agreed these changes meet the criteria.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve Ordinance No. 1768; Councilmember Maloney seconded the motion.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION – CITY COUNCIL SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE

Mayor Muckle noted Council had asked to look at options for a summer meeting break.

Councilmember Stolzmann suggested keeping the regular meeting schedule with no break.

Councilmember Maloney stated this should also include breaks from meetings of the Council committees (Finance Committee, Utility Committee etc.).

Councilmember Keany suggested holding June 4 and June 11 as the regular June meetings and take off from June 12 – July 5 followed by a four-week meeting schedule in July. Members agreed. Staff will bring an item for approval at a later meeting.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

None.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned at 11:13 pm.

Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk