

RIDGWAY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Wednesday, August 24th, 2016

Planning Commission Regular Meeting: 5:30 pm

Ridgway Community Center

201 North Railroad Street, Ridgway, Colorado

ROLL CALL Chairperson: Doug Canright, Commissioners: John Clark, Thomas Emilson, Ellen Hunter, Bill Liske, Jennifer Nelson, and Nick Wasser

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **Application:** Amended Plat and Plat Restrictions; **Location:** Various Ridgway Land Company Subdivisions: Eastside Replat, Ridgway Land Company, Lot 3 PUD, Northridge Subdivision, Ridgway Village West Condos, Trailtown Subdivision, Trailtown Condos, Village Square West Condominiums; **Address:** Hunter Parkway, Palomino Trail, Redcliff Drive, US Highway 550; **Zone:** General Commercial (GC); **Applicant:** Ridgway USA Association Inc.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. Minutes from the meeting of July 26th, 2016

ADJOURN

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Ridgway Planning Commission will hold a **PUBLIC HEARING** at the Town Hall Community Center, 201 N. Railroad Street, Ridgway, Colorado, on Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 5:30 p.m., to receive and consider all evidence and reports relative to the application described below:

Application for: Amended Plat/ Plat Restrictions

Location: Various Ridgway Land Company Subdivisions: Eastside Replat, Ridgway Land Co., Lot 3 PUD, Northridge Subdivision, Ridgway Village West Condos, Trailtown Subdivision, Trailtown Condos, Village Square Condominiums

Address: Hunter Parkway, Palomino Trail, Redcliff Drive

Zoned: General Commercial (GC)

Applicant: Ridgway USA Association, Inc.

ALL INTERESTED PARTIES are invited to attend said hearing and express opinions or submit written testimony for or against the proposal, to the Town Clerk.

FURTHER INFORMATION on the above application may be obtained or viewed at the Office of the Town Clerk, Ridgway Town Hall, or by phoning 626-5308, Ext. 11.



DATED: August 8th, 2016

Jen Coates, Town Manager

Jennifer Coates

From: Tom McKenney <mckenney@independence.net>
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2016 12:27 PM
To: Tom McKenney
Subject: 7/26/16 RPC (Ridgway USA)

Ridgway PC:

Thanks for your consideration.

This is very complex. I do not see it as a whole but rather several desperate points having to do with Ridgway USA. I am not convinced that this couldn't be better dealt with as five stand alone "problems" that may need fixing or not.

Generally, I do not see a problem in Ridgway USA. The answers to all the individual "problems" need to be driven by our Master Plans, Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Updates. Used to consider the answers should be town guiding documents:

- 1) (page 48 of Ridg Comp Plan 2000) describes Highway Commercial in 4 paragraphs as "intended to accommodate highway and tourist oriented businesses along the highway while maintaining an attractive entrance to town."
- 2) (page 19 of Land Use Plan 2011 Update) the importance of "Gateways" is enumerated clearly.
- 3) (pages 52 and 54 of of Ridg Comp Plan 2000) "Gateways" and "South Gateway" are referenced. It advises on lighting, signage, parking, landscaping and a host of other considerations necessary to "first impressions".

This is a zone; it has different uses by right, conditional uses and restrictions from the town due to it's location. It is one to the major gateways. That it should have restrictions similar to some other town zone makes no sense to me; that it answer the town development plan is important.

Specific to changing covenences, plat notes, set backs and land use parameters at this stage, I would like to see the town attorney present during this phase of the discussion.

Respectfully,

Tom McKenney

STAFF REPORT – REV. 1

To: Planning Commission
Subject: Amended Plats and Plat Restrictions for the various Ridgway Land Company properties and subdivisions
Legal Description: Various Ridgway Land Company Subdivisions: Replat of the Eastside Subdivision, Ridgway Land Co., Lot 3 PUD, Northridge Subdivision, Ridgway Village West Condos, Trail Town Subdivision, Trail Town Condominiums, Village Square Condominiums
Address: Hunter Parkway, Palomino Trail, Redcliff Drive
Zone: General Commercial (GC)
Applicant: John Peters and Associates, Managing Partner for Village Square Investors, LLC
Initiated By: Jen Coates, Town Manager/Planner
Date: July 26th, 2016 – **this staff report was updated on 8/22/2016 from prior public hearings on April 26th and July 26th, 2016 (updates are in red font)**

BACKGROUND:

Applicant was in front of the Planning Commission on April 26th, 2016 with this request and public hearing. The public hearing was opened and there was discussion (see attached minutes from April 26). The Applicant requested a continuation of the public hearing for the purpose of providing additional information to the Commission.

For background of this request, please see the staff report dated April 22nd, 2016, and Meeting Minutes data April 26, 2016, attached to this report.

The properties and this hearing have been properly noticed.

Submitted with this revised application are the following:

1. Revised **Notice to Landowners and Owner Associations** (from Applicant)
2. Revised **Amendment to the plats, plat restrictions and CC&Rs of various recorded documents** (from Applicant) with exhibits of documents being amended, including: Plat Maps, Restrictions, CC&Rs, including:
 - Exhibit A: Declaration of CCRS for the Ridgway USA Development
 - Exhibit B: Ridgway Land Company Subdivision Plat Restrictions
 - Exhibit C: Replat of Eastside Subdivision Plat Restrictions
 - Exhibit D: Ridgway Land Company Subdivision Plat Map
 - Exhibit E: Lot 3 PUD Ridgway Land Company Subdivision
 - Exhibit F: Replat of the Eastside Subdivision Plat Map
 - Exhibit G: Amendment to the replat of the Eastside Subdivision
 - Exhibit H: Trail Town Subdivision Plat Map
 - Exhibit I: Trail Town Subdivision Lot 26-B Amended Plat Map
 - Exhibit J: Village Square Condominiums
 - Exhibit K: Trail Town Condominiums
3. 2016.07.26 (email/public comment from Bob Kelly and Mary Beth Hollenbeck on the revised submittal)

During the April 26, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, the following general observations and comments were heard (refer to PC Meeting minutes for the official record), these are staff observations only:

- *OAs/HOAs/ARCs to remain as formed (eg: maintenance of green belt, open spaces, etc.);*
- *General idea is to clean up the overlapping regulations and make the land use review and permit review processes cleaner simpler for Town Staff;*
- *Removal of the Rear Area Signs restrictions on Highway 550 seemed to be the single biggest request with this public hearing, with most of the other restrictions covered in the Ridgway Municipal Code;*
- *Discussion of the Commercial Design Guidelines and how they apply here (not mandatory but guidelines just as they are for the rest of town);*
- *Importance of gateways, as described in the 2011 land use plan, specifically regarding signage;*
- *Removal of the following plat restrictions were generally discussed as acceptable (refer to the staff report dated April 22, 2016 for detail on the plat restrictions):*
 - *Setbacks*
 - *Off-street Parking requirements*
 - *Loading Areas*
 - *Outside Storage*
 - *Landscaping*
 - *Property Maintenance*
 - *Utility Connections*
 - *Height Restrictions*
 - *Appurtenances*
 - *On-site Drainage*
- *The Planning Commission requested more discussion of the following (refer to the staff report dated April 22, 2016 for detail on the plat restrictions):*
 - *Directional Off-premise signage – (PC question this request to keep directional signage and remove 3 sf restriction to allow for larger; (PC discussed that this request does not comply with the Town Sign Code, and suggested looking at some size specifications and restrictions to reconcile with town code for off-premise signs)*
 - *Rear Area Sign Restrictions – (PC discussed modifying the restrictions to be more business friendly but also comply with the Land Use plan and consideration of gateway enhancement and preservation)*
- *In addition to the above, there are some plat restrictions that the Commission did not discuss and that are re-stated in this staff report for consideration and direction.*

ANALYSIS:

This application is considered under RMC §7-4-10: Plat Amendments and RMC §7-3-11: PUD Amendments.

RMC 7-4: Subdivisions; RMC 7-3-11 Planned Unit Developments; RMC 7-4-11: Multi-site Developments

There are various subdivisions, planned unit developments (PUDs) and multi-site developments encompassed in this request. Subdivisions are prescriptive in nature. PUDs are reviewed similarly to subdivisions; however pursuant to RMC 7-3-11(E)(2): *approval of a Planned Unit Development by the Town is purely discretionary. If the Town and the Applicant do not agree on all required conditions and the plan, the Town may deny approval,*

or the Town may unilaterally impose conditions. If the developer does not accept the conditions, that development must adhere to standard dimensional, subdivision and zoning requirements.

In general, the application request is to remove or amend all of the plat restrictions currently referenced on the various plats, separate plat restriction documents and private covenants.

This report is organized for the Commission and public to clearly consider each of the requested changes for each recorded document, which did not receive detailed discussion, or that appears to need more discussion, during the April 26, 2016 initial public hearing. The information is not complete but summarized to try and make the review manageable and clear.

Plat Restriction Amendments

The procedure for removing or amending these restrictions is in Note 10 on both the Ridgway Land Company Plat Restrictions (recep no. 147697) and Replat of the Eastside Subdivision Plat Restrictions (recep no. 147699) as follows: This Agreement may be amended by written agreement of the Town and the Association or if such an Association does not exist, by the owners of the individual lots in Ridgway Land Company Subdivision/ Replat of Eastside Subdivision.

REVIEW OF REVISED SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS *(documents submitted July 22, 2016):*

Notice to Landowners and Owner Associations

The following is not included in the table on page 1 and should be added:
Recep No. 198126 – Ridgway Village West Condos Amend #1 – 6/25/2008

Amendment to the Plats, Plat Restrictions & CCRs of Various Recorded Documents

In the first “whereas” the reception number for the Replat of the Eastside Subdivision Plat Restrictions should be 147699.

The following is not included in the table on page 1 and should be added:
Recep No. 198126 – Ridgway Village West Condos Amend #1 – 6/25/2008

The first “Whereas” clause on page 2 should say “... and desires to remove **or modify** those obligations...”

The following “Whereas” clause should be added:
Whereas, there are numerous governing documents and subdivisions that are impacted by these requested amendments, and the Town and Declarant wish to clarify the governing rules for each of these documents and subdivisions by including the amended documents by stating the amendments here and appending the affected documents and subdivision plat maps as exhibits to this amendment.

A “whereas” clause indicating approval dates of the Planning Commission and Town Council and Declarant (that corresponds to each body’s meeting date approval) should be added.

This amendment proposes the following (see detailed summaries above and below):

- 1) Remove Section IV of the Ridgway Land Company Subdivision CC&Rs (*Commission discussed this section on April 26, 2016*);

- 2) Removes Notes 5-11 in the Ridgway Land Company Plat Restrictions (recep no. 147697) and Replat of the Eastside Subdivision Plat Restrictions (recep no. 147699);
- 3) Removes the first sentence of Note 8 in the Ridgway Land Company and Eastside Replat Plat Restrictions that addresses the 20’ landscape easement along Hwy 550 and the planting and development of it by the Declarant and maintenance by the Association in accordance with the SIA;
- 4) Removes restrictions on Rear Area Signs along Highway 550;
- 5) Removes restrictions on travel parks and drive-in theaters;
- 6) Removes parking restrictions for vehicles larger than the spaces, including RVs;
- 7) It appears that the Applicant is proposing to retain the plat note regarding directional signage.

Exhibit A: Ridgway USA CCRs (reception No. 147105)

The Commission reviewed this during the April 26, 2016 meeting, with general direction to approve the removal of Section 4, except for changes to restrictions on Directional Signs and Rear Area Signs.

Exhibit B: Ridgway Land Co Plat Restrictions – Recep No. 147697

The Reception No. at the bottom of the page needs corrected to be 147697.

| Regulation | Plat Restrictions | Town Code | Applicant Request | Discussion / Outcomes |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Note 4: Directional / off premise signs | Located only as on the plat; no individual sign larger than 3 sf; erected and maintained by Association | RMC 7-3-12(D): off premise not allowed unless a town-owned directional sign with construction and maintenance charged to the business or organization | Please clarify – the previous request was to “Leave as-is written in this document, except remove the 3 sf maximum restriction”; Applicant should clarify request to change or not. | 7/26 public hearing: Applicant confirm that this requested amendment is removed from this request; Directional signage to remain as is. |
| Note 5: Rear Area Signs | Lots abutting SH 550 no more than 50% of the total sign area allowable for that business for signs facing highway; signs facing highway must be attached directly and flush to building, not free-standing | RMC 7-3-12: no restrictions on rear-area signs | Remove and default to Town Code | 7/26 hearing – Applicant request that this previously requested amendment be removed from this request; Rear Area Signage to remain as is. |
| Notes 6A1-5,7,8: Dimensional Requirements/ Building Permit Requirements | Submit construction plan and sketch, including: Outside dimensions of lot, easements, setbacks, foundation line, locations of | | Remove and default to Town Code | Ok to default to Town Code. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | structures, sf of customer floor area, parking spaces and aisle widths, 1 parking space per 250 sf customer floor area, min 12' lane widths, location of delivery areas, no backing of vehicles | | | |
| Note 6A6: Parking | 1 space for 250 sf of customer floor area | RMC 7-3-10(C): varies depending on use (eg: 1/50 sf to 1/400 sf and also # dwelling units, exam rooms, seats, etc. 2014 Commercial Design Guidelines | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 6A9: Trash/Storage Pickup | Located at rear of front building line and access by a parking aisle or travel way; trash located behind building, etc. | RMC 9-2: size and number restrictions; tight lids, placed at alley or street if no alley and not to impede traffic; etc. | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 6A10: Street Access | Limited to 2 single driveway lanes (ingress/egress) with minimum of 12' each lane, may combine to 24'; access points not closer than 12' to side lot line; amended in 2014 to allow for deviations | RMC 14-5-15: Driveway access permits to comply with Town standards, no adverse impact to drainage, no damage to town property, etc. | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 6A11: Parking Spaces | Parking spaces, aisles and travel ways may be located within utility easements | RMC 7-3-10(C): 8' x 20' can go in setback areas 2014 Commercial Design Guidelines | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 6B: Issuing a building permit | Building official to issue permit based on demonstrated conformance with all dimensional requirements in the plat restriction notes; any increase in sf | RMC 6-1: Building Regulations | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| | above what is in the building permit shall be a violation of the building code | | | |
| Note 6C: Customer floor area | Defined as spaces within the inner walls of a commercial structure to which members of the general public either have or are allowed access on a routine basis for the transaction of business. It shall not include spaces used principally for storage, warehouse, product assembly and fabrication or administrative office purposes, even though members of the public might be granted occasional access. | RMC 7-3-10(C)(4): "gross floor area" is the heated square footage of a building measured along the outside enclosing walls, excluding interior parking areas and outdoor common areas; "customer floor area" is the aggregate amount of internal floor area generally used by the public, or fifteen percent of the total floor area, whichever is greater. | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 7: Screening of trash | All screened from view | 2014 Commercial Design Guidelines: <i>Screening of utility boxes, trash enclosures, and similar uses should be around all sides except for those required for access, which will be screened with a gate on the access side.</i> | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 8: Landscape Maintenance | 20' easement at Hwy 550 planted, developed and maintained by Declarant; Maintained in good order by Association; Town has right to provide for maintenance and collect costs from | RMC 6-1-11(F): Failure to maintain is a nuisance and enforced as such | Remove first sentence re: 20' easement to be planted, developed and maintained by Declarant; keep remainder of plat restriction language in the proposed amendment; Staff recommends Note 8 | No conclusive direction. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Association or Owners and /or record lien and certify costs as delinquent; Town may require cut off irrigation and abandonment of system | | remains intact. | |
| Note 9: Most restrictive applies | Provisions of Plat Restrictions are covered by Town code or other law, then most restrictive applies | Most restrictive applies | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 10: Amendment Procedure | Written agreement of Town and Association or if no Association the property owners | Municipal Code Provisions | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |
| Note 11: Town Action | Plat restrictions enforced by Town; Town entitled to recover costs and attorneys fees | Enforcement Procedures in Town Code for enforcing Code only | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |

Exhibit C: Replat of the Eastside Subdivision Plat Restrictions – Recep No. 147699

These are the same as the ones above (RLC Restrictions – 147697). Staff recommends Note #8 remain intact.

Exhibits D-F and H-K:

All of the following exhibits and plat maps have the same notes requested for removal regarding travel home parks, drive in theaters and parking:

- Exhibit D: Ridgway Land Co Plat – Recep No. 147701
- Exhibit E: Lot 3 PUD plat map – Recep No. 147702
- Exhibit F: Replat of the East Side Subdivision – Recep No. 147703
- Exhibit H: Trail Town Subdivision – Recep No. 206722
- Exhibit I: Trail Town Subdivision Lot 26-B Amended Plat – Recep No. 207836
- Exhibit J: Village Square Condominiums – Recep No. 212772
- Exhibit K: Trail Town Condos – Recep No. 214989

| Regulation | Plat Restrictions | Town Code | Applicant Request | Discussion / Outcomes |
|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Travel Home Parks and Drive in Theaters | Not allowed | RMC 7-3-9(C)(11): Travel home parks allowed as a conditional use; RMC 7-3-9(D)(7): Drive in Theaters not allowed. | Remove and default to Town Code | Keep plat restrictions to not allow travel home parks or drive in theaters. |

| | | | | |
|----------------|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Parking | Can't be larger than parking space; no RV parking | RMC 7-3-10: varies depending on use (eg: 1/50 sf to 1/400 sf and also # dwelling units, exam rooms, seats, etc. 2014 Commercial Design Guidelines | Remove and default to Town Code | Discussion of RV parking ok, but no RV parks; some public opposition to removing this restriction; possibly clarify plat restriction. |
|----------------|---|--|---------------------------------|---|

Exhibit G: Amendment to Replat of the Eastside Subdivision – Recep No. 165294

| Regulation | Plat Restrictions | Town Code | Applicant Request | Discussion / Outcomes |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Access to Streets | Restricts access to public streets to 2 single driveway lanes with a minimum 12' width that can be combined for one 24' access and no closer than 12' to side lot line | RMC 14-5-15: Driveway access permits to comply with Town standards, no adverse impact to drainage, no damage to town property, etc. | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |

Exhibit (?) not included but needs addressed: Amendment to the Replat of the Eastside Subdivision –*Not Recorded*

In 2014 the Planning Commission and Council approved a second amendment to these plat restrictions. Section 6.A.10, as amended, is amended to read in its entirety, as follows:

| Regulation | Plat Restrictions | Town Code | Applicant Request | Discussion / Outcomes |
|-------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Access to Streets | Restricts access to public streets to 2 single driveway lanes with a minimum 12' width that can be combined for one 24' access and no closer than 12' to side lot line; allows for Town approval to deviate from this requirement using review process in 7-3-18 and will be evaluated for compatibility with the | RMC 14-5-15: Driveway access permits to comply with Town standards, no adverse impact to drainage, no damage to town property, etc. | Remove and default to Town Code | No conclusive direction. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>existing accesses, and infrastructure in the area, and the necessity to accommodate the proposed uses on the lot.</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

The following plat maps are listed here because they reference something requested for amendment (eg: plat restrictions) but the plat maps are not directly amended with this request:

Northridge Apts – Recep No. 191625

Reference on the plat map to the Ridgway USA CC&Rs (147105), proposed to be amended.
 Ridgway Land Company Plat (147701), proposed to be amended.

Ridgway Village West Condos Flg 1 – Recep No. 191627 and Amendment to Ridgway Village West Condos Flg 1 – Recep No. 198126

Reference on the plat map to the Ridgway USA CC&Rs (147105), proposed to be amended.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

There is a lot to review, organize, consider and reconcile with this request and numerous overlapping documents. Staff supports this effort, although there are some salient changes requested and a significant amount of information to be considered and reconciled.

These plat restrictions were agreed restrictions with the owners/developers of the properties. It appears that some or most of these plat restriction exist for the preservation of this critical gateway and is rooted in land use conversations with the Ridgway community over many years. The preservation of gateways and regulation of land use thereof has been embedded in many of Ridgway’s Land Use plans, and is included in the most recent 2011 Land Use Plan and the location identified as a key gateway on the 2011 Land Use Map.

Staff is generally supportive of the effort to clarify these restrictions and suggests careful consideration of these requested modifications to be sure appropriate land use regulations are in place for the preservation of this critical gateway area. The removal and/or modification of plat restrictions that have been in place for more than 2.5 decades could be at cross-purposes with the 2011 Land Use Plan and the community vision for preservation of gateway areas, and any such removal or modification will need to be carefully contemplated.

Staff would like additional direction from the Planning Commission on a number of the plat restrictions, including but not limited to Directional Signage and Rear-Area Signage.

Staff would also like to request the opportunity for a more comprehensive review of this amendment and the review and approval of the Town Attorney on the final amendments, format, structure and process.

EXHIBITS:

1. 2016.04.26 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
2. 2016.04.26 – Planning Commission Staff Report

PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

JULY 26, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Canright called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. with Commissioners Emilson, Liske, Nelson, Wasser, Councilor Hunter and Chairperson Canright in attendance. Mayor Clark was absent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Application for Amended Plat and Plat Restrictions; Location: Various Ridgway Land Company Subdivisions; Eastside Replat, Ridgway Land Company, Lot 3 Planned Unit Development, Northridge Subdivision, Ridgway Village West Condos, Trailtown Subdivision, Trailtown Condos, Village Square West Condominiums; Address: Hunter Parkway, Palomino Trail, Redcliff Drive, U.S. Highway 550; Zone: General Commercial; Applicant: Ridgway USA Association, Inc.

Notice of Public Hearing dated July 16, 2016; Staff Report from the Town Manager/Planner dated July 26, 2016; Email dated May 31, 2016 from Mary Beth Hollenbeck and Bob Kelly; Notice to landowners and owners association from Ridgway USA Association Inc. with Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions as Exhibit A, Ridgway Land Company Subdivision Plat Restrictions as Exhibit B, Replat of Eastside Subdivision Plat Restrictions as Exhibit C, Ridgway Land Company Subdivision Final Plat as Exhibit D, Final Plat of Lot 3, PUD Ridgway Land Company Subdivision as Exhibit E, Replat Eastside Subdivision Final Plat as Exhibit F, Amendment to the Replat of Eastside Subdivision Plat Restriction as Exhibit G, Trailtown Subdivision Amended Plat of Lot 26 as Exhibit H, Trailtown Subdivision Lot 26-B Amended Plat as Exhibit I, Village Square Condominiums Plat as Exhibit J, and Trail Town Condominiums Plat as Exhibit K.

Commissioner Nelson stepped down citing not being in attendance at the previous hearing.

Town Manager Coates reported a revised submittal has been received from the applicant, and notice given to property owners regarding proposed amendments and revisions to the CCR's and plats. She summarized the April 26th Planning Commission meeting, and noted Town Council recently received an application for a free standing sign in Eastside Subdivision, which is located within the Ridgway Land Company Subdivision. She suggested separately reviewing each item in the Staff Report, and allowing public input during discussion of each item.

There was discussion regarding directional off-premise signs between applicant representative John Peters and the Commission.

SPEAKING FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Larry Falk favored directional signage on Palomino Trail and opposed signage for individual businesses on Highway 550.

Bob Kelly, commercial property owner on Palomino Trail, spoke in favor of directional off-premise signage in Eastside Subdivision.

Mr. Peters stated “directional signs should remain as addressed in the plats,” and requested that rear area sign plat restrictions be removed, and the Town sign code “become the regulating document.”

Manager Coates noted if plat restrictions are removed and the Municipal Code followed, then pole, monument and detached signs would be allowed.

There was lengthy discussion between the Commission and Mr. Peters.

Commercial property owner, Mary Beth Hollenbeck, spoke in opposition to signage on Highway 550.

The Town Manager reviewed plat notes pertaining to travel home parks, drive-in theaters, and parking spaces.

Bob Kelly spoke in opposition to eliminating the restrictions, stating “we feel this will diminish the value of our property.”

Vicky Spencer spoke in opposition to removing travel home restrictions from the plat notes.

There was discussion with the applicant’s representative.

Consensus of the Commission was to not remove travel home parks from restrictions.

Bob Kelly addressed the CC&Rs and stated “as a property owner and business owner, I like the restrictive covenants,” noting CC&Rs are more restrictive than the Town Code. He spoke in favor of the requirement for an Architectural Review Committee, not changing the CC&Rs, and not allowing on-street parking on Palomino Trail.

Larry Falk noted when property is purchased, “they also buy into the CC&Rs.”

Mr. Peters stated “the desire is to eliminate confusion between Town regulations and the CC&Rs.”

Bob Kelly stated he had expressed concerns to the Ridgway USA Association and “they never responded.” He noted “no vote was taken” or polling of the association members. He stated “we asked for a special meeting and it was not called.” He further noted “the developer holds the majority of the property.”

The Town Manager recommended continuation of the hearing to allow the owners association to reach consensus regarding the request.

Speaking from the audience, Tom McKenney asked if the applicant could “break into small parts,” discussion items “like signage, to be more manageable for the public.”

Mr. Peters requested, and the Planning Commission agreed, to remove the rear area signage amendment request from this amended plat request, and to continue the hearing to a special meeting on August 24th at 5:30 p.m.

Commissioner Nelson returned to sit with the Commission.

POLICY MATTERS

2. Discussion regarding adding High Density and Mixed Use Zoning

Staff Report from the Town Manager/Planner and Assistant Planner Lauren Hauger dated June 28, 2016.

Manager Coates presented examples of different options for high density and mixed use zoning. She referenced the Northwest Area Plan and the 2011 Land Use Plan, noting some of these densities are located in these adopted documents. She also presented examples of existing zones and developments within Town, outlining dwelling units per acre. It was noted the Northwest Area Plan contained mixed use/high density zoning at 12-18 dwelling units per acre, located adjacent to the existing light industry zone. She stated the goal is to consider creation of the zones, and application would be made for rezoning specific properties. She asked the Commission “do we want to pursue these different densities?”

There was discussion between the Commission, staff, and the public. The Town Manager explained “the idea is to build from the inside out” and to transition the property adjacent to the Industrial Park into mixed use, and the next adjacent property into high density.

SPEAKING FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Kellie Day expressed concerns with traffic in higher density areas.

Ken Miller expressed concerns regarding affordable housing and rezoning. He questioned the Town’s water supply and storage capacity because “population has increased three times.”

There was discussion between Mr. Miller and the Commission.

Mary Beth Hollenbeck stated the parks and open space should be preserved, and opposed higher density in those areas. She suggested creating high density zoning “around the industrial portion of Town.”

Chris Hawkins with Alpine Planning spoke in favor of creating a high density zone in the center of Town and retaining open space in surrounding areas.

Tom McKenney supported more single family residences and duplexes, "instead of four story buildings", and stated he would "like to see diversity."

Kellie Day agreed and noted "what makes a great neighborhood is the mix," with affordable and higher priced houses. She further stated she would like the Town to carefully consider where to place areas of commercial buildings.

Commissioner Emilson stated he supports higher density "radiating from the center of Town outward."

Mary Beth Hollenbeck spoke in opposition, noting she would like the center of Town "to be a courtyard" with higher densities "on the outside."

There was discussion among the Commission regarding the next steps in the process, including discussing allowable dwelling units per acre.

3. Adoption of the Community Forest Management Plan

Ridgway Community Forest Management Plan dated May 2016.

Town Manager Coates explained the process the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee went through to create the Ridgway Community Forest Management Plan. The Town was awarded a \$2000 grant through the Colorado Tree Coalition and the State of Colorado Forest Service. A GIS database that includes values of the trees has been created. She further explained a Memorandum of Understanding with the State Forest Service has been created to help manage the database.

ACTION:

Councilor Hunter moved to recommend adopting the Community Forest Management Plan. Commissioner Liske seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jess Nunn
Administrative Clerk

Pam Kraft
Town Clerk