

City of Alamosa
Planning Commission
June 28, 2017
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, Debbie Clark, Farris Bervig, Darrel Cooper and Scott Travis. A quorum was declared. Staff present: Pat Steenburg, Harry Reynolds, and Julie Scott.

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

Approval of the Minutes: M/S/C. Clark, Travis. Motion made to approve the minutes of the May 24, 2017 meeting as presented. (Unanimous)

Public Comments: None.

Regular Business - Conduct Public Hearings – Zoning Board of Adjustments

The request of Vertical Construction Management for a variance from the required Off Street Parking requirements. The property affected is Lot 1, Sangre Tract Replat and Lot 12, Block 1, Callbreath's Addition, City of Alamosa. Alamosa County also known as 1310 Main St.

The public hearing opened at 6:01 p.m.

Manzanares: Step forward please and state your name and address for the record.

Stackhouse: My name is Tim Stackhouse, Civil Consulting Engineers, Inc.; I'm here representing Vertical Construction Management on the Starbucks. We are requesting a variance for a reduction of one parking spot from the requirements. I'm here to answer any questions you might have.

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

The public hearing closed at 6:02 p.m.

Adcock: I have a question that doesn't pertain to this. You are now taking a driveway entrance off of Main Street instead of coming through Sonic?

Steenburg: That is the original design.

Stackhouse: I don't believe that's changed. We will have a cross access easement through Sonic and also a driveway off Main St.

Adcock: Okay, I thought it was just through Sonic.

Clark: Which parking space will you do away with?

Stackhouse: It's not shown on this drawing; we're just out of space and this is the plan that would show the reduction of just one space.

Manzanares: Any other questions or a motion?

M/S/C. Adcock, Travis. Motion made to approve the request of Vertical Construction Management for a variance from the required off street parking of 23 spaces to 22 spaces. The property affected is Lot 1, Sangre Tract Replat and Lot 12, Block 1, Callbreath's Addition, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 1310 Main St. (Unanimous)

Adcock inquired if with the changes to the new zoning code this type of minor variance could be handled by staff and Steenburg replied that it would most likely be added to administrative approvals.

This is final action on the request.

Next item:

The request of Del Sol Plaza, LLC and Owens Town n' Country Limited Partnership LLLP for a lot line adjustment. The property affected is the Villa Mall Subdivision Replat, being a replat of Lot 3 of the Villa Mall Subdivision and of Lot 4, Plaza Del Sol Subdivision, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County also known as 688 Del Sol.

The public hearing opened at 6: 05 p.m.

Manzanares: Please state your name and address for the record.

Owens: Lohn Owens, 6203 Rd 12 South, Alamosa, representing Del Sol Plaza and Owens Limited Partnership. We've sold this lot and there was not enough space for the required parking for the dental clinic. We are asking for a lot line adjustment for the three additional parking spaces.

Manzanares: Thank you. Questions?

Steenburg: I just want to make note the rest of the parking lot more than meets the requirements.

Adcock: So the variance is just the three spaces?

Owens: It goes back to the island, we are actually sharing the parking lot but instead of leasing the property to him, he (Dr. Harding) requested to purchase instead of a long term lease.

Steenburg: What they are trying to do is move the lot line so the lot to the north has the required parking.

Adcock: So the variance is just the three spaces?

Steenburg: It is not a variance; it is a lot line adjustment. They are adding to that lot but not creating a new parcel. It is taking square footage from the large parcel to meet the parking requirements for the smaller lot.

Manzanares: Thank you; are there more questions, or a motion?

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

M/S/C. Travis, Clark. Motion made to recommend approval of the request of Del Sol Plaza, LLC and Owens Town n' Country Limited Partnership LLLP for a lot line adjustment. The property affected is the Villa Mall Subdivision Replat, being a replat of Lot 3 of the Villa Mall Subdivision and of Lot 4, Plaza Del Sol Subdivision, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County also known as 688 Del Sol. (Unanimous)

This is final action on this request.

Planning Issues:

The request of Community Resources and Housing Development Corporation for review of a final plat. The property affected is Montana Azul Estates, Filing No.6, located in a fraction of the NE ¼ of Section 8, Township 37 North, Range 10 East, New Mexico Principal Meridian, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, situated west of Craft Drive and south of Tremont Street.

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

Manzanares: Who here would like to speak on behalf of this request?

McGranahan: My name is Chris McGranahan, LSC Transportation Consultants; the rest of our project team doesn't appear to be here. We completed the traffic study so I can answer any questions related to the study. I am not sure if anyone else was planning on coming, but I want you to know I am here to answer any questions.

Manzanares: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on behalf of this request?

Lucero: Janet Lucero, with Community Resources and Housing, 1016 West Ave. and I am here with Martin Reynolds our engineer to request final plat approval.

Manzanares: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on behalf? Against? Leroy, please state your name and address.

Martinez: Leroy Martinez, 13224 Hwy 285 South and I'm one of the adjacent property owners to this project. I'm not opposed to growth in Alamosa but I am opposed to growing it in this manner where you put this many people in those small lots like is requested here when there is no reason to crowd people in this area where we have too much land and not enough people.

I'm not against growth, believe me, I sold the property to these people. Watching it grow and Craft St. is busy and they go fast; I'm assuming they are putting ingress and egress lanes on Craft. The speed limit is 40-50 mph and you feed them across from the Workers Housing Apartments, for migrant workers I guess and we are going to double up with this many more lots and granted they can go back to Adcock and feed on to Tremont. Craft is the future Main St. of Alamosa and as long as the schools continue to grow and Wal Mart is out there. I know they did a count out there they claim. I don't think we need to have this many vehicles feed into Craft in the morning or evening. To crowd this many families into this small area, there's no reason for it. I don't know which one of you would like to live like this or put your family five foot across from your neighbor. There's no reason for that.

I think they were doing a good job before but I don't agree with what they are doing now. That's about all I have to say.

Manzanares: Thank you. Is there anyone else to speak against this request? We will close the public hearing and take questions from the Commission.

The public hearing closed at 6:14 p.m.

Manzanares: Leroy, I have a question for you. Are you against the number of units and using the street and they go out one area rather than two additional areas?

Martinez: Right, I think they need to make the lots bigger the way they started - it was uniform and it looks good. Grow it the way it should be.

I'm a native to this country, native to Alamosa and so when you see something like this happening, we're going the wrong direction with it. We're going to have more and more people moving here. Why crowd them like that; we don't have to - good neighbors need elbow room. It doesn't matter where you're at, you have to have it. Craft St will have to have wider approaches and feed it back to Tremont and it would be alright. I still don't like the small lots.

Manzanares: Right, so it the small lots and access.

Martinez: What he's been doing has been excellent, it looks good, it's good growth for our community and we need it but we don't need this kind of stuff, what they are proposing now. We absolutely don't need it and that's my thinking on it.

Manzanares: Thank you. It makes sense to me. You go to the Denver area and you have busier, fast streets and one entrance that might serve a circle in a subdivision and then another entrance to a street and they are driving faster than allowed.

Bervig: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I don't know the lot size and square footage. I commend Mr. Gold and what he has done in the past but 48 lots in that small area? Craft Dr. is busy now and I don't like the plan. They have way too many lots.

Steenburg: To address the lot size, our ordinance requires 7,000 sq. ft. in that zoning district. Most of these lots are approximately 8,000 sq. ft.; some are 10,000 sq. ft. These lots are similarly sized to many lots in the city.

Manzanares: Okay.

Adcock: May I talk to the gentleman who did the traffic study? I know Craft is a very busy street, I read your report and that's a lot of cars at those hours. You don't recommend any kind of extra lane until they add more houses?

McGranahan: We looked at the Colorado Highway Dept. and they have access code and their requirements for arterial roads in urban areas which Craft Dr. would fall under so we looked at the CDOT access codes and they suggested for a right turn lane more than 50 vehicles in one hour as a trigger and we predicted about 20. For the left turn lane coming from the south the CDOT trigger is 20 vehicles in one hour and we have 11. So what our report says is that these 48 homes won't require the lane but in the future it could. If it goes off to the west and could connect to future homes if they were built to the west but that is not the case with these 48 homes.

Clark: Was the traffic study done when school was in session?

McGranahan: I can give you the exact date – May 17th and it was done constantly from about 6:45 am until about 5:30pm to catch morning peak hour and the afternoon peak hour and counted when school was in session and the counts look higher because the school does add some to counts.

Adcock: I live off First St. and sometimes it's really hard to get on Craft.

Bervig: How to get 48 cars at the peak hour. How much bigger are the other lots to the north?

Steenburg: They are very similar, some are a little bigger. They are not dimensioned.

McGranahan: With the building footprint on this plat it makes the lots look bigger to the north.

Adcock: So Adcock Drive will go all the way through there? It won't have a stop?

McGranahan: Adcock would connect to the site and the volume would be low I would expect Adcock to have a stop sign.

Adcock: But they could go all the way to Tremont?

McGranahan: They could and that's important if there is an incident at one of those other points. We don't expect a lot to use Tremont but they could.

Clark: Tremont is not a through street?

Adcock: It is to the end of Adcock.

McGranahan: I like our access east - west and it could extend to the west if future development does.

Manzanares: Pat, I see you checking the lot size on the previous filing?

Steenburg: About 9,000 sq. ft., all the ones on the south are 8,500- 8,100 sq. ft. As I said, these lots all meet our requirements.

McGranahan: If there is an accident at one point there is another access. There are lots of benefits for two access points, the existing and the proposed development.

Steenburg: And for the Commissions' notice, we have worked extensively with the applicant and the Fire Chief, Don Chapman to guarantee emergency access on the west end and Lot 86 at the end won't be sold or developed until that road is extended so if they need to get a big tower truck they can still get out there.

Bervig: That is a 60 ft. right of way?

Steenburg: Yes.

Bervig had additional comments but they were not audible due to microphone problems.

McGranahan: Our traffic study shows it works acceptably, the delay is pretty low - for this specific project and does not show the need for traffic turn lanes or signals at this time. Over time with more development that may change.

Adcock: How many cars did you figure this particular development generates?

McGranahan: A single family home generates roughly nine and a half trips per day- one way trips.

Adcock: How many vehicles?

McGranahan: During peak hour, these homes each will generate three quarters of a trip per hour in, 32 trips in the morning, evening peak hour about one per household so about 48 new trips.

Adcock: So you're saying they have one car per house?

McGranahan: No, I'm saying in the peak hour one car comes or goes. They may have five cars but they parked or at work or sitting at someone's house. Of the ten trips throughout per day, only two of them happen at rush hours. We may have one resident that makes a lot of trips or one that lives by themselves and does not drive often. On the average, about one during the peak hour per home in

the morning and the evening. In the peak hour about one every one minute, 15 seconds. Forty eight cars per hour is less than one a minute at peak times. You wouldn't expect to see six cars in a row, it may be an anomaly, it's a car less than one a minute.

Manzanares: Any other questions? My issue is the possibility of modular homes, just an opinion basically.

Steenburg: That's handled at the building permit point. As long as it meets our codes and requirements it can be done. We have a moratorium right now on manufactured homes, there is some distinction between modular and manufactured homes. A home that meets IRC codes we've adopted are perfectly legal. Some you don't even know they are not site built.

Manzanares: A manufactured home still has a tag on it for highway and a modular does not?

Reynolds: A manufactured home is built under HUD code requirements and is built on a permanent chassis not brought in on a trailer and will continue to remain on it.

Adcock: If you put in turning lanes does that eliminate 138 & 137?

McGranahan: To me, it depends on how wide our right of way is, our traffic report suggests while we don't recommend turn lanes at this point, we should have room in the future. We wouldn't want to plat homes and not have room for a turn lane.

Steenburg: It is 80 ft. What our code requires is a level of service A (LOS), so they meet the requirements. They meet the requirements for the lot size, the traffic flow LOS. Everything meets the requirements of our current code. Right now, this application meets the requirements.

Manzanares: And what we base our recommendation on it what we have here presented to us.

Steenburg: In light of our existing code not what we think it should be.

McGranahan: Our study lays out kind of a baseline of what those triggers might be. We can check any of the new projects against that threshold.

Adcock: I think what bothers me is the fact you did put in the report if they add any more homes they need to put in turn lanes.

McGranahan: We would need to check that; if it was eight homes, probably not. If it was 150 homes maybe so. It depends on how many and where.

Clark: How much more could they add?

Steenburg: It depends on their connectivity; there is a lot of property that could be developed.

McGranahan: It would be something a similar study could figure out pretty quickly, depending on development in the future. It depends on how many homes. We are nowhere near the threshold.

Manzanares: I think to maintain consistency. Thank you. A motion?

Martinez: I don't think he's considered how many vehicles can be parked there, each family will have two cars minimum. There isn't even enough parking. You have to look in the future, if this is all the growth I guess it's all right I think we need to look into the future. They wrote them up so you can change regulations.

Manzanares: Thank you.

Adcock: I live in that area and I know how busy Craft Dr. can be.

Manzanares: I know growth is happening and in the northwest side also. I my area that I represent we have concerns with traffic near the high school, just as this area with the elementary school. At what point are signals, lights considered?

Steenburg: The needs for signal are controlled by warrants that are clearing defined in the uniform traffic code. This area here isn't even close.

Clark: Even if I don't agree with the amount of lots, it is in with what is allowed.

M/S/C.Travis,Cooper. Motion made to recommend approval of Community Resources and Housing Development Corporation final plat. The property affected is Montana Azul Estates, Filing No.6, located in a fraction of the NE ¼ of Section 8, Township 37 North, Range 10 East, New Mexico Principal Meridian, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, situated west of Craft Drive and south of Tremont Street. (four yes's -Travis, Cooper, Manzanares, Clark, two nays -Adcock, Bervig)

The recommendation will go to City Council for consideration on July 19, 2017 at the regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. or shortly thereafter.

Next item:

The request of Christine Caton for a Permitted Use by Special Review to allow a single family dwelling (Use Group R-1) in a Commercial Business zone. The property affected is Alamosa Addition #1, Block 19, Fractions of Lots 6-8, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 431 3rd St.

The public hearing opened at 6:43 p.m.

Manzanares: Is there someone here to speak for this?

Lancaster: Mary Lancaster, 431 3rd St. Alamosa, CO 81101. I am here representing Chris. I'm going to be one of the people in the building in the apartments and in the middle part I'm hoping to have a B & B.

Ms. Lancaster presented a power of attorney from Ms. Caton.

Manzanares: Is there anyone else that would like to speak for this? Against? We will close the public hearing.

The public hearing was closed at 6:45p.m.

The B & B aspect has some issues that are a bit different from what was stated on the application (apartments)

Ms. Lancaster had not seen the drawing that Ms. Caton had submitted when applying for an apartment use and could not answer questions regarding kitchen, bathroom access.

After further discussion it was determined the application would be tabled until further information regarding the change of use as stated on the application (apartments) from what was requested at the hearing (bed & breakfast) could be researched as to zoning requirements.

M/S/C. Adcock, Bervig. Motion made to table the request of Christine Caton for a Permitted Use by Special Review to allow a single family dwelling (Use Group R-1) in a Commercial Business zone. The property affected is Alamosa Addition #1, Block 19, Fractions of Lots 6-8, City of Alamosa, Alamosa County, also known as 431 3rd St. (Unanimous)

It was recommended Ms. Lancaster make an appointment with the building official prior to the next meeting and discuss code requirements regarding a B & B.

The applicant was informed it would be heard at the next regular hearing on July 26th

Other business:

It was brought up if there was any code addressing tires on roofs of residences. Staff is not aware of any ordinances specific to this issue.

Other issues brought up were blight in the alley off Victoria and First St. near the bowling alley and the zoning issue on the sober living house on Main St.

After no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Scott

Recording Secretary