Date: **Thursday, March 21, 2024**
Time: **3:30 PM**
Location: **Hybrid - In-Person: Estes Valley Community Center Classroom, 660 Community Dr, Estes Park, CO 80517 or Virtual, Zoom Link: https://larimer-org.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_gveRevTiSryOXOULPtYOxw**

ESTES VALLEY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

The Larimer County Estes Valley Planning Advisory Committee met in the Estes Valley Community Center Classroom as well as virtually by Zoom video at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2024, at which time the following business was transacted.

Committee members present included: Rex Poggenpohl, David Converse, Mike Kennedy, Drew Webb, Scott Stewart, and Nataly Handlos.

Staff present included: Rebecca Everette, Michael Whitley, Matt Lafferty, Amy White, Alan Kee, and Christina Scrutchins.

Board of County Commission present included: Jody Shadduck-McNally

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Member Webb moved, and member Converse seconded the motion to approve the March 21, 2024, agenda of the Larimer County Estes Valley Planning Advisory Committee as presented. Motion carried (6-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Page 1. Amendments to the Agenda – Amendment
  - Amendment: Committee proposed to add a discussion regarding the Larimer County Estes Valley Comprehensive Plan Action Item and Online Questionnaire under Discussion Items.

Member Converse moved and member Kennedy seconded the motion to approve the January 18, 2024, minutes of the Larimer County Estes Valley Planning Advisory Committee as presented and amended. Member Handlos abstained. Motion carried (5-0).

PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Nataly Handlos and Doyle Baker

Doyle Baker was not able to attend this months meeting.

Nataly Handlos provided an overview of her background during a meeting. Originally from Germany, she moved to the United States at 17 and holds a degree in urban and social planning from the University of Washington. For the past 30 years, she has primarily worked in transportation planning, focusing on urban and social aspects integral to transit systems. Currently employed by RTD for over 19 years, she oversees fixed route transit north of High 70 within the district, actively engaging with communities in the Front Range area. She has served in various capacities, including as secretary to planning boards and transportation boards, and has a background in finance. Having recently moved to Stanley Circle and the Munsinger Division, she is familiar with the area due to her passion for hiking, walking, biking, and running. She expressed enthusiasm about her new location and role.

COMMISSIONER UPDATES

Commissioner Shadduck-McNally expressed gratitude for the volunteers and staff during a meeting, noting her engagement with state legislators on broadband issues. She mentioned the possibility of stepping out to speak with lobbyists but assured ongoing communication and support. She encouraged everyone to stay engaged as there are upcoming topics for discussion.

STAFF UPDATES

Staff provided updates on various matters. They mentioned a recent tri-annual meeting between county and town planning and engineering staff, highlighting the new Community Development Director for the town and upcoming projects. Specifically, they noted vacancies in the town's planning commission and discussed the forthcoming update to the Land Development Code. Member Webb expressed interest in collaborating with the town on this project, emphasizing the importance of consistency in codes between town and county. Member Poggenpohl emphasized the need to align codes with the new comprehensive plan and suggested a reactive approach to the town's initiatives. The staff acknowledged the importance of updates and suggested opportunities for engagement with the town's projects, including the transportation plan and the review of a mountain coaster expansion application. Member Converse inquired about the progress of the Marriott Hotel project. Staff clarified that the project is within town limits and will be reviewed by the Estes Park Planning Commission, not the committee. Member Poggenpohl suggested that the property might be annexed by the town, but staff confirmed that the annexation process was underway, and the hotel project was part of the annexation application. Member Webb clarified the location of the project, and Staff confirmed it as the Spring Hill Suites property, with an annexation application submitted and under review. Member Converse expressed interest in being informed about annexations in the future, prompting a discussion about annexation plans and the town's approach to them. Member Poggenpohl raised questions about the town's annexation plan and its relation to the comprehensive plan, while Member Webb noted previous reluctance from town officials to discuss annexation. Member Converse also inquired about a short-term rental bill discussed previously, and Commissioner Shadduck-McNally mentioned ongoing discussions and potential changes to the bill, promising to provide updates in the future.

COMMITTEE MEMBER UPDATES

Member Poggenpohl shared information on several bills being considered by the state legislature. House Bill 24-1152 proposes allowing auxiliary dwelling units in residential zones, potentially overriding covenants, to increase affordable housing options. House Bill 24-1239 aims to reduce costs for multifamily buildings by allowing them to have only one fire exit. House Bill 24-1173 would mandate electric vehicle charging requirements for new residential construction, potentially impacting housing affordability. House Bill 24-1007 could prohibit residential occupancy limits to promote affordable housing. Member Poggenpohl requested updates on these bills from the Commissioner or staff as they progress through the legislature.

Commissioner Shadduck-McNally responded, acknowledging the bills and the county's active involvement in discussions and amendments. She highlighted concerns about safety regarding the proposed single fire exit requirement and emphasized the importance of local control to accommodate diverse community needs. She noted ongoing discussions and amendments, mentioning the county's engagement in various associations. The Commissioner appreciated the committee's attention to legislative developments and encouraged them to stay informed and provide feedback if needed.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S)

ITEM NO. 1 – 2024 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORK PLAN

Rebecca Everette, representing the Community Development Department, provided a detailed overview of the department's work plan for the year. This plan encompassed a wide array of initiatives, including the ongoing water master plan, legislative rezoning efforts, implementation of new building codes, and various public outreach activities. Notably, the department was also tasked with analyzing legislative topics and participating in rulemaking related to wildfire hazard mitigation within building codes. Additionally, Everette highlighted the importance of routine land use code updates, customer service improvements, and the full implementation of Electronic Plan Review. However, some members expressed concerns about the work plan's perceived lack of focus on Estes Valley-specific issues. Drew Webb, in particular, questioned the absence of initiatives directly addressing the needs and concerns of the Estes Valley community. Matthew Lafferty and Everette emphasized the need to first understand the town's stance on key issues like annexation before delving into specific committee priorities. Members engaged in a discussion about the committee's role in addressing potential annexation challenges and the importance of proactive planning. While some advocated for taking a proactive approach to potential annexation issues, others emphasized the committee's advisory role to the county commissioners and the need to respect the jurisdictional boundaries between the town and the county. Overall, the discussion highlighted the delicate balance between proactive planning and responsiveness to town and county initiatives, particularly concerning annexation and growth management. There was a consensus on the importance of understanding the town's direction before formulating specific committee priorities to ensure effective collaboration and coordination between the committee, the town, and the county.

ITEM NO. 2 – EVPAC DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

The discussion among the committee members covered various topics related to planning and collaboration with other commissions and agencies. Member Poggenpohl raised the question of whether Glenn Haven should be asked about joining the Estes Valley planning district, drawing on past experiences with Tahosa Valley. However, it was concluded that pursuing this inquiry was unnecessary. The conversation then shifted to reviewing the Larimer County Land Use Code, with suggestions to allocate time for this task. Member Poggenpohl also brought up potential modifications to the code, particularly regarding wildlife corridors and zoning classifications. Alan Kee clarified distinctions between land use and building code regulations.

The committee further deliberated on topics such as annexation, growth management, and the implications of water and fire regulations on land use codes. Member Converse emphasized the importance of understanding how these issues intersect with land use planning. There were also discussions about short-term rentals, wildfire and flood mitigation, and whether the committee should review variance applications. Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally highlighted existing efforts in these areas and suggested focusing on relevant policy impacts.

Member Poggenpohl proposed meetings with the County Planning Commission to align work plans and better understand each other's perspectives. However, concerns were raised about scheduling and the necessity of additional meetings. Some members preferred a flexible approach to engagement, suggesting interactions on an as-needed basis rather than regular meetings. Member

Handlos emphasized the value of building relationships with other commissions and agencies to facilitate productive collaboration.

The discussion concluded with considerations about meeting schedules and the importance of reciprocal communication between commissions. There was also a suggestion to review the committee's bylaws to ensure clarity and focus on planning-related matters. Overall, the conversation reflected a commitment to effective planning and collaboration while acknowledging the need to balance time and resources effectively.

The committee engages in a thorough discussion regarding their work plan for the upcoming year, contemplating whether adjustments are necessary. Rebecca Everette suggests revisiting the plan in a future meeting due to time constraints, prompting Member Poggenpohl to propose withdrawing the current list to avoid further discord. Despite this, Member Converse acknowledges the list's usefulness, especially for new members. There's a consensus on the importance of preparing thoughts in writing before the next meeting, streamlining the discussion process. Rebecca Everette presents the existing work plan, covering topics like growth management and comprehensive plan action items. Members deliberate on potential additions, such as regional planning and transportation considerations, with an emphasis on aligning them within the existing framework. Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally stresses the significance of getting the work plan approved, while members provide feedback on the meeting process, expressing a desire for more advanced notice for future decisions. Ultimately, Member Poggenpohl suggests postponing the decision on the work plan until the next meeting for further deliberation.

ITEM NO. 3 – EVPAC WORK PLAN PRIORITIES

MOTION

Member Converse moved, and member Webb seconded the motion to approve the work plan with the exception of removing the first bullet item, as it is encompassed within the second bulleted item. It appears the adjustment adequately addresses the concerns raised and aligns with the flexibility provided by the comprehensive plan. Additionally, it was suggested to leave the door open for future amendments to the work plan as needed. Member Kennedy abstained. Motion carried (5-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

With there being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.