



TOWN OF LARKSPUR
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
Town Hall - 8720 Spruce Mountain Road
PUBLIC HEARING

Date: April 20, 2021 @ 5:00 p.m.

Meeting Called to Order at 5:00pm

1. ROLL CALL	Present	Absent
Matias Cumsille (Chair)	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>
Lynn Pfaff (Co-Chair)	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>
Aksel Suvari	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>
Doyle Slack	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>
Jacob Gump	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>

Established Quorum

2. PUBLIC HEARING

- Rezoning of 8955 Spruce Mountain Rd.
- Commission Member Doyle Slack read the project narrative
 - Casey Adragna, representative for the project developers, stopped him midway, claiming it was old
- Commission Chairman Matias Cumsille asked for Casey to share the current narrative
 - Mr. Adragna complied and shared information from the referral packets they had sent
 - The Rezone requested was multi-use commercial and residential
- Mr. Cumsille also wanted to note that “As chairman of the planning commission I was not informed of this public hearing meeting except for when it was listed on the board outside town hall. I was never notified by town staff or the applicant to make an agenda for this meeting and had only received the documents for the meeting the

Thursday prior to the meeting and apparently were given old documentation for the packet.”

- Dan Krob, town lawyer, spoke to the fault of the town not communicating about the public hearing and how the election had made things very busy
- Mr. Adragna specified the projected size of the project as 4 commercial units and 12 residential units
- Mr. Cumsille asked about the size of the dwelling units
 - Mr. Adragna said the unfinalized size was around 1,000 sqft
- Mr. Slack asked about the density calculation of the project, as it only accounted for the residential density but not the commercial
- Councilmember Sandy McKeown asked about how many stories the retail and residential buildings would be and if it's possible to put the parking beneath the residential
 - Mr. Adragna answered that the developers when considering scale wanted to not need to make parking structures
- Councilmember McKeown asked Mr. Cumsille about the town's plan for controlled growth and what it would look like
 - Mr. Cumsille answered that the controlled growth comes in the means of fees and economic incentives to encourage or discourage growth, but that the town council has control over that, and the planning commissions job is to look at the impact of a project like this.
- Mr. Cumsille spoke to the effect that a rezone would allow developers to build whatever they want under the rights by use allowed
 - The applicant should have followed the code and submit the planned development and rezone at the same time since it is a request for a special multi-use zoning
 - Mr. Krob added his insight and agreed the code should be followed
 - Mr. Slack looked up the code (16-8-20 part A) and had Mr. Krob verify that according to the code before the rezone could be done a planned development must be submitted
 - Mr. Adragna said it was his understanding from working with town staff that they could break it into parts and submit the rezone then the planned development

- Commission Member Aksel Suvari brought up the words “corrective measures” from Mr. Adragna’s Abstract and asked what the town’s recourse was if they approve the rezoning
 - Mr. Cumsille responded that if a rezone were recommended that the rezoning would be open ended since the planned development would need to be done
- Mr. Cumsille took the attention to water sewer and asked Will Parker from Semocor about the project’s effects on the water and sewer
 - Mr. Parker did not believe that there would be impact on the water/sewer, but a feasibility study was proposed
 - Developer would have money in place for the town’s engineer to do studies and get insight
- Mr. Cumsille then brought up traffic and parking impacts
 - Mr. Adragna disputed the notion that they were still looking at using parking from the park and instead they would have plenty parking in their current plans
 - Councilmember McKeown asked for the typical breakdown of parking spaces to units, Mr. Adragna said it was 2 parking spaces for each of the 2/3-bedroom apartments and then for office space it requires 1 space for each 300qft
 - Requiring 39 spaces for their project and they would have 49 available
- Mr. Cumsille pointed out the consideration that must be taken of the impact to neighboring lots
 - Overall atmosphere to the town, there are no 2 story buildings or apartments in the town currently

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Brian Cook spoke for a group of people
 - There is already a zoning in place, already an aesthetic in town, why change it
 - With the location they think it would be not aesthetically pleasing
 - That a rezone could set a precedence, and instead the group wanted the ability to have the people vote on the rezoning and are going to make a recommendation to the town council to change the charter

- Florence Burch spoke and that she did not want the extra traffic near the main stop sign/intersection in town and believed that the water/sewer will be affected.
- Alex Welch, the developer, spoke and said they spent a lot of time and money and that he does not want to spend even more time and money if its going to get shot down
 - Mr. Welch was saying that even if they get the rezone, they will have to go through other processes that would not allow them to do whatever they want with the plot
- Mr. Cumsille opened public comments back up to the public after board member comments
- Allen Brodzeller, lives in the mobile home park, said they already have high traffic in the summer and asked if there are 20-30 people living in the residences are they really going to support the commercial side of the project
- Bill Lucero spoke that the little town should be developed more to the townspeople's liking, he is sure there is enough water but that the sewer system is not capable of the increase

4. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

- Mr. Cumsille wanted to hear from all members of the planning commission before a motion was made
- Commission Member Lynn Pfaff said that according to what the townspeople have been saying it feels that there is resistance in making the zoning change
- Commission Member Jacob Gump had a comment that he agrees with Ms. Pfaff about wanting controlled development and is wondering if making it planned development would give the town more leeway as to control what goes in and how it goes in
 - Mr. Cumsille asked Mr. Krob for his insight and Mr. Krob spoke to the effect that planned development would help because it becomes a collaborative effort between the council and developer to get what they both want
- Mr. Slack spoke that it seems high density for where the town is in its current

development

- He does not believe there was any wrongdoing as far as the misunderstanding that the rezone could be submitted first when the planned development and rezone needed to be submitted together
- Councilmember McKeown asked Mr. Welch why he did not use his other more northern piece of property in town to do his project
 - Mr. Welch answered that they spent a lot of time on this decision, but the main reason was they were trying to build a “town anchor” meaning new development near the most central part of town, this being the town park
- Mr. Cumsille asked Mr. Welch about going lower than 12 units and Mr. Welch said that going down from 20 to 12 units made the feasibility very tight and potentially unfeasible already, going smaller was not possible
- Mr. Suvari read the town mission statement and said that the rezone and development of the apartments could be a decision that is unchangeable in the future
 - He agreed with the other members of the commission that the development of the apartment complex in the downtown part of Larkspur is against what the townspeople want

5. PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION

- Mr. Suvari motioned for the planning commission to recommend the town council to deny the rezoning. Mr. Gump seconded it. Mr. Suvari said the reasoning is because he thinks they were not following the rules, allowing an open-ended development in the town leaves the town at a disadvantage if the plans change, and that the development at the center of town is an obstruction of the nature that makes the town special. No other comments from the commission. Unanimously agree to deny the rezoning.

6. ADJOURN

- Mr. Slack moved to adjourn with Ms. Pfaff seconding the motion. With a unanimous vote to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:20pm

Mattison G. Allen

Chairman of the Planning Commission

Reed Lutter

Secretary