CITY OF ARVADA

SUMMARY MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION HELD
February 18, 2025

Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion.

1. **CALLED MEETING TO ORDER– By Michael P. Griffith at 6:17 P.M.**

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Those present: Michael P. Griffith, Andrew Gay, Tim Knapp, Brandon Figliolino, Doug Magee, Steve Hannan

THOSE ABSENT Tom Aljinovich

Motion to excuse Mr. Aljinovich for his absence

Those voting Yes: Griffith, Hannan, Knapp, Figliolino, Magee, Gay,
Those voting No:
Those absent: Aljinovich
The motion carried 6-0

ALSO PRESENT: Rob Smetana, City Planning Manager; Emily Grogg, Sr. Ass't. City Attorney; Kelsy Sargent, Sr. Ass't. City Attorney; Jessica Garner, Director of Community and Economic Development ; Josie Suk, Systems and Administrative Manager; Rozalynne Thompson, Principal Planner; Chris Sandine, Planner II; Dixielee Rodriguez, Recording Secretary.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

November 12, 2024. The minutes stand approved as printed.

Ms. Grogg suggested we suspend our bylaw, convene with the planning commission first and go directly into public hearing before general business (public comment and public hearing).

Mr. Griffith motioned to move public comment and the public hearing to the beginning of the meeting

Discussion to the motion

NONE

The Following votes were cast on the motion:

Those voting Yes: Figliolino, Gay, Hannan, Griffith, Magee, Knapp
Those voting No:
Those absent: Aljinovich
The motion carried: 6-0

MOTION TO MOVE Public Comment and Public Hearing BEFORE BUSINESS MEETING approved by Commission

The Following votes were cast on the motion:

Those voting Yes: Figliolino, Gay, Hannan, Griffith, Magee, Knapp
Those voting No:
Those absent: Aljinovich
The motion carried: 6-0

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Jon Girand lives at 11970 W. 67th Ave, Arvada, he reviewed the staff report for the 3-mile plan, he feels there are three areas that in the terms of planning have not been followed very closely. Two of them related to Colorado revised statutes and one relates to the LDC. As it relates comprehensive plan references - CRS 31-12.105.E pp 1 second sentence. Prior to annexation in, there shall be in place a plan for that area that describes various improvements provided by the municipality and land uses. Historically the comprehensive plan has always quit at the city boundary limits and has not extended in that. Any future comprehensive plan should extend into the three-mile limit as in the statute. When the new comp plan is done that it would extend to the limit it would be helpful. CRS 43-2-125B requires an adopting of a street plan showing where the arterial streets are. He could not find the annual map on the city website and said it would be helpful to see it. Per LDC 4-4-3-4, street hierarchy and connectivity, arterial streets should be provided in a one mile interval for connectivity. He hopes the Planning Commission will be more involved in connectivity and follow the guidance by state statues and the Land Development Code.

Mr. Knapp asked if staff could elaborate on the extension of the comp plan beyond the three-mile boundary of city limits and the adoption of the arterial streets plan.

Mr. Smetana stated with respect to the comp plan and boundaries, it does extend a little ways out of the city limits. However, it does not extend to the full three miles. The city has agreements with adjacent cities as to where the city of Arvada's boundaries should be set. He will have to look into arterial plans.

Mr. Griffith asked staff if they heard about the comp plan effort, will there be a member from council or planning commission involved?

Mr. Smetana stated the city is still working on it, but is also waiting on funding from the city council. Hopefully, there will be one time funds available after the close of the last budget year. The city will still need to get a consultant, most likely towards the end of the year for the update. The comprehensive plan is the planning commission's document. Certainly there will be Planning Commission involvement.

Mr. Griffith stated how himself and Mr. Magee were involved in the Land Development Code update and the committees were well organized.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

8.A. <u>DA2025-0003 Bonfire Burritos Alternative Sign Program for Bonfire Burritos sign located approximately at 5800 Wadsworth Blvd.</u>

Mr. Griffith swore in all guests that will be speaking.

Mr. Griffith opened the public hearing.

Mr. Griffith asked if all of the required documents were in order.

Mr. Sandine stated the publication, posting log, and mailing notice are in order.

Mr. Griffith entered into the record the staff report, publication, and mailing notice received.

Mr. Griffith asked Mr. Sandine to introduce the project.

Mr. Sandine introduced the project applicant Bonfire Burritos is requesting approval of an Alternative Sign Program (ASP), which would allow for an increase in the number of allowable wall signs from one (1) sign to three (3) signs. The ASP would also allow for two (2) of the three (3) wall signs to exceed the maximum square footage allowed by-right in the Olde Town/Commercial Sign District.

Ian Lanier, 5792 McIntyre Court, Golden, 80403, CFO and founder of Bonfire Burritos started the company with 4 friends in a camper trailer. In 2019, they opened their first brick and mortar location. Now they want to open in the City of Arvada. A full revitalization project. These signs are simplistic in nature but tie into the architectural design elements of the entire project. Our southwestern finishes are rough in nature with rust and char being the main exterior finishes. The steel metal letters of the sign will have a 3D welded shape and will have a southwestern pastel yellow with light rusted markings. Height, sign area, number and location of signs relate to the overall size of the development and the scale of the use. This development is large as the patio, building and parking are over 1 acre of combined space. Bonfire Burritos is a very popular concept, and we expect an average of 600-800 customers per day. Safely and clearly seeing signage to indicate where to turn into the property is a key component that our customer base will rely on. The relationship between the building setback and sign location is affixed to the roof approximately 7'4" back from the start of the roofline. Adequate visibility is obtained with this placement, and it creates a visually appealing placement (no clutter or blockage). The property frontage is large as there are 3 main areas in this project site: parking (50+ spaces), the 2,200 sq ft building and the 3,000 sq ft patio. Our sign size of 2' 8" X 22' 6" is the appropriate size for visibility/functionality and proper design. It is positioned towards the front side of the building for a balanced viewpoint. Access and visibility to the property, Bonfire has put a lot of focus into the size and positioning of the signage. Visibility is maximized and size is balanced to be large enough to be legible at an approaching distance and the correct size for complimenting the architectural design elements of the building. The traffic circulation pattern of the property can be seen on the architectural plan below. Previous signage of this building was low quality while the new signage matches the complete revitalization of the property. Improvement of the relationship between the property and adjacent properties or land uses, there are many high-quality restaurant establishments in the immediate area and the proposed signage for this property compliments the caliber and design elements of adjacent properties. They have received an approved Certificate of Compliance with the Design Guidelines from the Planning Department related to our sign proposal and overall project within the Olde Town Zoning District.

PUBLIC COMMENT

IN OPPOSITION

NONE

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

NONE

Mr. Griffith closed public comment portion of the meeting

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr. Hannan asked staff how this sign compared to other signs along Ralston Road in the Olde Town area? Seems to be the rest in that area have complied in the area.

Mr. Smetana believes signs on the south side are in compliance, they are in Olde Town historic district. The properties on the north side are not in the historic district, so there is more flexibility. These signs will be more in compliance than the Arby's signs that were there, per his recollection.

Mr. Hannan questioned if the lighting was going to be 24/7 or only during business hours.

Mr. Lanier stated around business hours which are early in the day. Around Breakfast and Lunch time between the hours of 6am and 2 or 3pm.

Mr. Smetana stated that there are restrictions in our sign code regarding lighting and the times lighting can occur.

Mr. Hannan asked if they would have to comply with all the restrictions in our Code?

Mr. Sandine stated yes.

Mr. Knapp asked what the illumination standard is of the lighting in that area. He also stated that to his understanding the lot sizes are not changing from the Site Plan?

Mr. Lanier stated when the certificate of compliance was going through with the planner this was addressed.

Mr. Knapp asked if the city has standards on illumination?

Mr. Sandine stated that yes we do have illumination standards.

Mr. Knapp asked, was Arby's there before the formation of the historic District?

Mr. Smetana stated yes it was there for several decades prior to the establishment.

Ms. Grogg stated there is a whole LDC article 4-8 that talks about exterior lighting. The requirement has to be met or else the applicant would have to apply for a modification which is not what is being presented tonight.

Mr. Gay asked about the Arby's sign and recalled that it was huge. His question is the sign requesting 144 sq ft, would this precedence will this set?

Ms. Grogg stated she will give her personal legal opinion on precedence, each application must be looked at individually; the Commission must look at the specific facts and how they relate to the code for the specific project in front of them. This must be done for each project to be fair now and in the future.

Mr. Knapp asked if the applicant could have requested a single sign on a post out front?

Mr. Smetana stated a monument (6' feet or less) sign would be permitted, not a pole sign.

MOTION:

It was moved by Mr. Knapp, that Bonfire Burritos Alternative Sign Program for signs on the West and East side, approximately located at 5800 Wadsworth Blvd. be recommended to the Director for Approval.

This motion is based on the finds of fact and approved criteria on Page(s) 4 and 5 of the Staff Report.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Mr. Magee stated he didn't have any questions and the staff report answered all his questions. He will be voting in favor of this project.

Mr. Gay stated he really likes this project and will be a patron, he likes the design even though it is pretty big.

Mr. Figliolino stated the overall site plan is fantastic. Taking up an old parking lot and making it active.

Mr. Hannan will be supporting this project. If you were on the south side no way. Likes that the applicant could have been brighter but decided to go with the low light.

Mr. Knapp concurs with his other commissioners, he will be supporting it. Even though there are 3 signs out there and it sets a tone for the future. He feels the alternative could be a less appealing sign.

Mr. Griffith stated that he is really excited to see it. He thanked the applicant for their efforts and chose to do business here. Great location and will be supporting this project.

Those voting Yes: Griffith, Hannan, Knapp, Figliolino, Magee, Gay
Those voting No:
Those absent: Ajinovich
The motion carried: 6-0

WENT BACK TO GENERAL BUSINESS

5. GENERAL BUSINESS

5.A. CP2025-0001 a Resolution by the Planning Commission for the City of Arvada, Colorado, Adopting the 2014 Arvada Comprehensive Plan as Arvada's Three Mile Plan Pursuant to Section 31-12-105(1)(E), C.R.S., as Amended be approved and recommended to City Council for Ratification.

Mr. Smetana introduced the Three-Mile plan and recommended approval.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr. Magee asked about parcels of land that conflict with the comprehensive plan and this has been fixed or we will just deal with them as we come across them.

Ms. Grogg asked Commissioner Mr. Magee if this was in regards to the Kilmer project or was it the CDOT project.

Mr. Magee was speaking of a strip of right of way that needs to be annexed.

Mr. Smetana stated that, no it does not conflict, and that all of these enclaves are typically included in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Grogg stated that was one that was identified as right of way but when the project was annexed in the strip was missed.

MOTION

It was moved by Mr. Figliolino that CP2025-0001 a Resolution by the Planning Commission for the City of Arvada, Colorado, Adopting the 2014 Arvada Comprehensive Plan as Arvada's Three Mile Plan Pursuant to Section 31-12-105(1)(E), C.R.S.,As Amended be approved and recommended to City Council for ratification.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

None

The Following votes were cast on the motion:

Those voting Yes: Figliolino, Gay, Hannan, Griffith, Magee, Knapp
Those voting No:
Those absent: Aljinovich
The motion carried: 6-0

5.B. Review and Update Bylaws 2025

Ms. Grogg went over the changes in bylaws

Mr. Figliolino moved to accept the changes in the Bylaws

Those voting Yes: Griffith, Hannan, Knapp, Figliolino, Magee, Gay
Those voting No:
Those absent: Ajinovich
The motion carried: 6-0

6. REPORTS

None

WENT TO OTHER ITEMS

9. OTHER ITEMS

9.A. WORKSHOP - New Legislative items

Rozalynn Thompson went over and gave a presentation on New Legislative items related to land use.

9.B. Compensation Update

Ms. Suk stated an ordinance that the Planning Commissioner will be paid $100.00 dollars per meeting. A meeting is defined as Planning Commission meeting only is one meeting and payment would be $100.00 dollars or a Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission on the same day is one meeting and payment would be $100.00 dollars.

Mr. Smetana stated that March 5, 2025 and March 19, 2025 Commission meetings can be canceled.

Those voting Yes: Griffith, Hannan, Knapp, Figliolino, Magee, Gay
Those voting No:
Those absent: Ajinovich
The motion carried 6-0

Mr. Griffith wanted to acknowledge there were two members from the Planning Commission that made it as a finalist for the appointment to City Council.

10. **ADJOURNED** at 8:03 P.M.

Brandon Figliolino, Secretary

Michael Griffith, Chair

Tim Kwapp, Acting Chair

Dixielee Rodriguez, Recording Secretary