

City of Alamosa
Planning Commission
August 24, 2016
6:00 p.m.
Minutes of the Meeting

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order on the above date at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Mark Manzanares. Present were the following members: Shirley Adcock, Farris Bervig, Debbie Clark and Darrel Cooper. Excused: Robert McWhirter. Scott Travis arrived at 6:06p.m. A quorum was declared. Staff present: Pat Steenburg, Harry Reynolds and Julie Scott.

Agenda Approval: M/S/C. Adcock, Clark. Motion was made to approve the agenda as presented. (Unanimous)

Approval of the Minutes: M/S/C. Bervig, Clark. Motion made to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2016 meeting as presented.

Public Comments: None

Regular Business - Conduct Public Hearings- Zoning Issues

The request of John and Lorraine Willett for variances from the City Code of Ordinances to allow an existing shed with a side and rear yard setback of three feet for the allowed five feet for an accessory building in a Residential Low Density zone. The property affected is Lot 5, Block 14, Carroll Subdivision, Addition No. 2, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County also known as 802 Douglas Dr.

The public hearing opened at 6:04 pm.

Manzanares: Who is here that would like to speak for this request? Please step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Willett: John Willett, 802 Douglas Dr., me and my wife Lorraine moved here in July. Does everyone have a copy of what I submitted?

Manzanares: Yes.

Willett: Okay, like I said we moved here in July and one of the first things we did was tear down an old shed in the corner of the backyard, it looked more like an outhouse and put up a decent shed. It was built by Pro-Shed and I hired Romero's Construction Co. to pour the concrete slab, I didn't want a wooden floor. Pro Shed came and built the shed and while the Pro Shed crew was putting it up, Mr. Reynolds happened by and asked me if I know about the five foot setback and I said no, I thought it was a three foot setback. Before I go any further, I'm not trying to lay the blame on anybody but myself, ignorance is no excuse. Mr. Reynolds allowed the construction to

proceed but said I would either have to move the shed or apply for a variance. That is why I am here tonight.

Manzanares: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on behalf of this request? Against? We will close the public hearing. Questions?

The public hearing closed at 6:06 p.m.

Clark: The old shed, where was it located?

Willett: It was in the same corner and I would estimate that the setback on that was about 1 foot. It was torn down and taken to the dump. I also have an estimate on what it would be to move the shed.

Bervig: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. What is the responsibility of the contractor who poured the slab?

Reynolds: Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the home owner to know the requirements. I don't believe he is a licensed contractor in the City.

Adcock: So he didn't get a building permit?

Reynolds: A permit isn't required for this; it's under 200 sq. ft.

Manzanares: Any other questions, motion?

For the record, all adjacent property owners were notified of the hearing.

M/S/C. Adcock, Travis. Motion made to approve the variance request of John and Lorraine Willett for variances from the City Code of Ordinances to allow an existing shed with a side and rear yard setback of three feet for the allowed five feet for an accessory building in a Residential Low Density zone. The property affected is Lot 5, Block 14, Carroll Subdivision, Addition No. 2, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County also known as 802 Douglas Dr. Yes's-Clark, Manzanares, Adcock, Travis. No's- Bervig. Motion passes.

The applicant was informed that this was final action on the request.

Next Item:

The request of MDR Hospitality for variances from the City Code of Ordinances for sign height and side and front setbacks. The property affected is a tract in the E ½ NE ¼ , Section 9, Township 37, Range 10 East, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County also known as 2005 Main St.

The public hearing opened at 6:09p.m.

Manzanares: Who here would like to speak for this request? Please state your name and address for the record. Tell us about your request.

Rathi: My name is Bina Rathi, 2005 Main St. We have a Best Western and the franchise is requiring a new logo and we have to change our sign. Old sign is big and submitted if we put same sign at same height it is in the way of KFC, that's why I am asking to have it at forty feet. So that they don't hide

Manzanares: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak for this request? Against the request? Being no one has stepped forward; we will close the public hearing. Questions from the commission

The public hearing closed at 6:11 p.m.

Bervig: I have a question; there is a new sign on the building. That is not part of the request?

Rathi: Yes, that is the same size; just the new logo. We can't use the old logo. And the new sign is the exact size, same location on the building.

Manzanares: What is the reason for moving it up? It's fairly clear from the photos.

Rathi: From 160 from Monte, you can't see. The sign is lower and we are replacing with a new pole and the engineering for base is done.

Travis: The sign is a different shape; would the total height stay the same or be above the KFC sign?

Rathi: The sign is now 33.8 ft., I would like it at 40 ft.

Clark: Is it a lighted sign? LED or is it flashing?

Rathi: No, it is not flashing just lighted.

Bervig: I think the request makes sense but the comment from our building official that if we start changing the rules on the highway and we have had requests for signs set farther in the back parking lots that are taller.

Manzanares: It could set precedence along the highway.

Adcock: It's a variance for 0' setback both side and front but she is placing it in the same place?

Reynolds: Because she is placing a new pole that wouldn't be grandfathered in. Where it is existing now is nonconforming. That's part of the variance request besides the height.

Steenburg pulled the location up on the map.

Reynolds explained the current sign location and height variances. There are a lot of options and it is two different variances- height and setbacks.

Clark felt to move the sign ten ft. into the lot would create a parking hazard especially for larger RV's, trucks. It would not be very visible, it would make it worse.

Manzanares felt keeping it where it currently is seems reasonable and lower rather than higher.

Cooper inquired as to various alternative locations for the sign and options for the motion.

Rathi stated that there are two signs now instead of four.

All adjacent property owners were notified of the public hearing.

M/S/C. Travis, Clark. Motion made to approve the request of MDR Hospitality for a variance from the City Code of Ordinances for sign side and front setbacks from the allowed 10ft. to 0 ft. The request for a variance from the maximum allowed sign height of 30 ft. to 40 ft. is denied. The new sign can be installed at the same height as the existing sign that is at 32 ft. The property affected is a Tract in the E ½ NE ¼ , Section 9, Township 37, Range 10 East, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County also known as 2005 Main St. (Unanimous)

Steenburg clarified that the motion Travis was proposing allowed the height of the existing sign (32 ft.) to remain.

Next item:

The request of William and Janis DeSouchet for a variance from the City Code of Ordinances. The applicants are seeking relief from the required 25 ft. rearyard setback to 15 ft. for a proposed garage apartment. The property affected is Lots 11 and 12, Bellview Subdivision, Block 25, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 315 Ross Ave.

The public hearing opened at 6:26 p.m.

Manzanares: Is there anyone that would like to speak for this request? Please step up to the podium and state your name and address for the record.

DeSouchet: Bill DeSouchet, 315 Ross Ave. My wife and I are asking to convert the garage into an apartment behind my business that we could live in, a bunkhouse in a way.

Manzanares: Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak for this request? Against? We will close the public hearing as no one has stepped forward.

The public hearing closed at 6:27 p.m.

Manzanares: I went by this is the garage- the flat roofed garage?

DeSouchet: No, there is a detached garage at the back of the lot.

Adcock: I really like alleys, I went by and it is easy to check the last variance request did not have an alley. It sure helps.

Manzanares: Harry, this meets square footage requirements?

Reynolds: There is quite a bit of work to be done my understanding is it's a studio apartment and it will meet the I.R.C. We've had quite a few conversations and he is aware of the scope of work.

Manzanares: Will there be parking in the street.

DeSouchet: There is a lot of room to park in the alley.

Manzanares: This would be just for the existing building, it wouldn't change the footprint. Say they wanted to add a garage?

Steenburg: They would have to come back here.

Clark: And if they didn't live there and wanted to rent it? Is that a problem?

Steenburg: Technically, they could do that. What we are looking at is a variance now. The permitted use is the next hearing. It's a fairly typical use in this area.

Reynolds: The setbacks for a garage would be five ft.; a principal building would be 25 ft.

All adjacent property owners were notified of the public hearing.

M/S/C. Clark, Bervig. Motion made to approve the variance request of William and Janis DeSouchet for a variance from the City Code of Ordinances. The applicants are seeking relief from the required 25 ft. rearward setback to 15 ft. for a proposed garage apartment. The property affected is Lots 11 and 12, Bellview Subdivision, Block 25, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 315 Ross Ave. (Unanimous)

Planning Issues

1B. The request of William and Janis DeSouchet for a Permitted Use by Special Review to allow a single family dwelling in a Commercial Business/Residential Medium zone. The property affected is Lots 11 & 12, Bellview Subdivision, Block 25, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 315 Ross Ave.

The public hearing opened at 6:32 p.m.

Manzanares: Once again, please state your name and address again for the record.

DeSouchet: Bill DeSouchet, 315 Ross Ave. As you know, we would like to convert this garage.

Steenburg this is a permitted use by special review to allow a residential use in a commercial zone. The property is actually bisected by the zoning districts; the north half is Residential Medium and the south half is commercial. Our code clearly outlines that the least restrictive zone be used and this is a fairly common use in this area.

Manzanares: Thank you. Let it be noted there is no one else here to speak for or against this request. We will close the public hearing.

The public hearing closed at 6:33p.m.

Clark: You're not planning to make it a two story or anything?

DeSouchet: No, there is a loft and we will raise the loft a little bit.

Bervig: This will be your primary residence?

DeSouchet: Yes.

Adcock: Back to the parking situation, you can't park in the alley- is there room in the back?

DeSouchet: If you look at the picture, just north of it there is twelve to fifteen feet that is not in the alley.

Steenburg: My concern when I wrote the recommendation was that they didn't extend their fence all the way back and prevent parking there.

Adcock: Could we end the permitted use if it was ever to become a rental?

Steenburg: I don't know if we could enforce that.

Clark: I think it would clean it up and look nice. I'm sure they would take good care of it.

M/S/C. Clark, Travis. Motion made to recommend approval of the request of William and Janis DeSouchet for a Permitted Use by Special Review to allow a single family dwelling in a Commercial Business/Residential Medium zone. The property affected is Lots 11 & 12, Bellview Subdivision, Block 25, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 315 Ross Ave.
(Unanimous)

The recommendation will go to City Council for final action on Wednesday, September 21, 2016.

Other Business: Discussion of recreational possibilities on the Rio Grande.

Manzanares was approached by a citizen who requested that the Planning Commission explore the idea of tubing, paddle boats and other river recreation. The Comprehensive Plan review committee is looking at these exact uses. Steenburg mentioned that the City is also working with the Rio Grande Farm Park on a grant for launch areas and recreation areas.

After no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Scott
Recording Secretary