

Verbatim Transcript

Planning & Zoning Commission
February 15, 2024

CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Planning and Zoning Commission

Held February 15, 2024

Council Chambers, 300 Laporte Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado

In the Matter of:

Mason Street Infrastructure Overall Development Plan

Meeting Time: 6:00 PM, February 15, 2024

Board Members Present:

David Katz, Chair
Julie Stackhouse, Vice Chair
Adam Sass
Samantha Stegner (Recused)
Ted Shepard
York

Staff Members Present:

Paul Sizemore
Clay Frickey
Shar Manno
Katie Claypool
Clark Mapes
Ryan Mounce
Steve Gilchrist
Matt Simpson
Em Myler

1 CHAIR DAVID KATZ: Next agenda item...that one is Clark too. This is the North Mason ODP.

2 CLARK MAPES: Alright, there it is.

3 CHAIR KATZ: Alright, Clark, before we get started, I think Sam has to disclose...

4 COMMISSIONER SAMANTHA STEGNER: I have a conflict of interest on this one and so I am
5 going to sit out of this one and the future ODPs of the shelter...or PDPs, when they come, because of my
6 volunteer work in those mobile home communities.

7 CHAIR KATZ: And while Sam is exiting, I will look to Shar and ask Shar if there's any new
8 information. Did we receive anything new?

9 SHAR MANNO: No, we have not received any new information.

10 CHAIR KATZ: Alright, Clark, overview when you're prepared.

11 CLARK MAPES: Alright, thanks. This Mason Street Infrastructure Overall Development Plan,
12 we're going to be using the term ODP, is a general master plan for infrastructure...let's go ahead and look
13 at the location. So, see the location here. This is north of Hickory Street down here, and at the west end
14 of a little one block long street called Hibdon Court, back behind the College Avenue commercial
15 frontage on the west side of College Avenue. There's an access drive built fairly recently, 2016, here,
16 that runs along kind of an alley-like access drive in an access easement that is now getting set to become
17 the alignment of an actual new North Mason Street.

18 This kind of master plan, called an ODP, is based on the idea that ODPs show general parameters
19 for development that would follow in multiple phases over time. The private property owner who is
20 proposing this infrastructure plan does have a goal to provide for the proposed homeless shelter that
21 would go on some of this property. But, this hearing tonight is not about the shelter...I think that's clear
22 now to everybody. The plans for the infrastructure here are submitted separately and they are proceeding
23 independently, and the ODP here does not indicate any land use, shelter or otherwise. The owner's idea,
24 as staff understands it, is that even if the homeless shelter does not happen, the owner still wanted to
25 know how the land could be developable for any type of land use. And likewise, a goal for the City, who
26 is one of the owners of the land in question...there are two land owners on this land...the City would also
27 like to know and confirm how regional stormwater flows could be accommodated now and in the long-
28 term future, and also the City would like to know how Mason Street can be retrofitted back in there. I'll
29 be saying more...about thirty years of planning that has specifically called for this infrastructure and
30 specifically described the difficulties of retrofitting it back in here across multiple properties and some
31 existing development, a lot of ad hoc development from earlier in the 1900's and through kind of the mid-
32 century, 1900's.

33 So, anyway, this ODP is just three pages that show alignments for drainage, a street, pipes, and
34 electric lines. A detailed development plan for this infrastructure would follow the ODP, and that would
35 be hundreds of pages, hundreds of plan sheets, for the design and construction of the infrastructure. And
36 then, the homeless shelter, if it continues to proceed forward, would go to a hearing after that. Assuming
37 the homeless shelter proceeds to a hearing, there will be a notification for that and that would be the time
38 for anyone to speak to P and Z about that, and also anyone can contact staff at any time with any thoughts
39 or questions, and those would be included in a P and Z package for the homeless shelter when the time
40 comes, if that's okay with the person who gives the comments or questions. And, there's some details
41 about how to contact our person, Em Myler, but if anyone has any questions, we can get to that later.

1 Again, I mentioned about thirty years talking about the need for circulator streets in addition to
2 the highway, and those needs have been shown in adopted plan documents: the 1995 North College
3 Corridor Plan, a 2000 joint access control plan for North College Avenue itself, U.S. Highway 287, State
4 Highway 14, jointly adopted by the Colorado Department of Transportation and the City, that also
5 highlighted the need for this kind of circulator street, and then a 2005 update of the North College
6 Corridor Plan which very specifically describes in detail the need for this drainage and this kind of a street
7 connection.

8 There are, again, two parcels of land involved in this ODP; it comprises two parcels, one owned
9 by the City for several years now for a stormwater drainage system in the area, and the other owned by a
10 private owner. The ODP shows how these two parcels would be reconfigured in a land transaction
11 between those owners, and that reconfiguration is based on allowing for the proposed infrastructure. That
12 infrastructure is a regional stormwater detention pond, upgrading that access drive to become a segment
13 of Mason Street, and then all the underground utilities that go along with the street, water, sewer, electric.
14 This is the basic site plan from the three sheets in the ODP, then the ODP includes a sheet that shows the
15 parameters for drainage in kind of reshaped land forms. Drainage is an especially fundamental issue with
16 this land which was formerly the floodway for Dry Creek, which before settlement of this whole part of
17 Colorado was a significant tributary to the Poudre River. There's a little remnant of Dry Creek left, it
18 happens to run across these two parcels of land, so that has a lot to do with the need for drainage. It's
19 low-lying, flat land, and there's been, again, years of planning, designed by the Utilities Department
20 coming up with stormwater master planning for the whole regional detention system and drainage system
21 that never was included in early ad hoc development along the whole North College corridor, much of it
22 outside of City limits. And the development that did happen within City limits happened before there was
23 any such thing as a Planning Department or anything like that...Stormwater Department, et cetera.

24 And then, finally, the third sheet shows utilities. And again, it's more alignments, and again,
25 this...a sheet like this will probably lead to fifty pages of design and construction drawings in the next
26 iteration which will be an actual development plan for this infrastructure which is shown in this ODP.
27 The criteria for ODPs are pretty limited and simple and straightforward, consistent with the zone district
28 standards. And again, this ODP doesn't even refer to use, but to the extent that the use could potentially
29 be a homeless shelter, a homeless shelter actually is permitted in the zone district. And again, some
30 ODPs do indicate land uses; this one doesn't. This is just for the infrastructure, and then land uses come
31 later.

32 The ODP has to conform to the Master Street Plan requirements and street pattern connectivity
33 requirements, and this ODP just precisely implements longstanding provisions in the Master Street Plan
34 identifying the need for this kind of a connection. It has to provide for the location of transportation
35 connections to adjoining properties, and ensure...let me see...connectivity into and through the
36 development plan. Anyway, that access drive already does provide transportation connections to
37 adjoining properties, although, you know, in the case of the newly developable parcel that is created in
38 this, the plan does show these transportation connections both for vehicle access and pedestrian access.
39 And then the ODP has to show the general location and approximate size of natural areas and habitats and
40 features, and indicate a proposed rough estimate of natural habitat buffer zones, and this ODP does do
41 that. Again, here's the site plan. The natural feature is Dry Creek...it's outlined in kind of a darker green
42 line. And then this hatched area is just that, it is a rough estimate of a natural habitat buffer zone that
43 would be required under the Land Use Code, and there's a note on the ODP, and the legend for the ODP
44 explains how the subsequent later specific development plan for the infrastructure will need to comply

1 with Land Use Code provisions to allow for how to apply this kind of habitat buffer zone. And, there's
2 not much else to this, so I'll stop there and see if we have any questions.

3 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Clark. This is a joint project...go ahead, Clay.

4 CLAY FRICKEY: And I might add, too, just for the Commission, and just for anybody
5 listening...Clay Frickey, Planning Manager...Clark mentioned that this is one of three projects that is
6 associated with the proposed Rescue Mission relocation to North College, and just wanted to clarify, too,
7 that the subsequent hearings that Clark was talking about related to the specific infrastructure plan and the
8 shelter itself, those are not scheduled yet, but if you received a letter for this particular hearing, you will
9 get a letter notifying you of those hearings so that way you will know when the right time is to come
10 share your concerns about the shelter itself. So, just wanted to make that abundantly clear for anybody
11 listening in the audience. So, thank you for that, Chairman Katz.

12 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you for the clarification. You know, this is a joint project with City and a
13 private landowner. Judging by the body language over here, and Ripley Designs being listed as an
14 applicant, I assume there's a presentation.

15 KLARA ROSSOUW: Let me get my screen share going. Alright, thank you staff, and good
16 evening Commissioners. I also want to take a quick moment to thank you for clarifying some of
17 those...sort of the intent behind the application, and educating us a little bit more about what process we
18 are in and how that might be separate to some future submittals that you will see come across your desks.
19 My name is Klara Rossouw; I am here with Ripley Design representing the applicant for the Mason Street
20 ODP. Also from the design team we have Blaine Mathison of Northern Engineering, Andy Reese of
21 Kimley-Horn, and Russ Lee, also with Ripley Design. We are happy to be here tonight and hopefully we
22 can answer all the questions you have.

23 So, to help guide our conversation tonight...I just wanted to structure the presentation a little bit
24 and make sure we hit on all the key points we heard at work session last Friday. So, we'll begin with
25 discussing the purpose of the overall...ODP...what it is, go over site context, look at the proposed ODP,
26 or the overall development plan, and then ground it in the land use criteria, and we'll review each criteria
27 on its own, and tell you guys how we comply. And then we have a bunch of appendices in the back so if
28 you have any questions.

29 So, really the question is why do we need an overall development plan? And in order to
30 understand why it is needed, we look to the purpose statement as it is taken directly from the Land Use
31 Code, Section 2.1.3. So, the purpose of the overall development plan is to establish general planning and
32 development control parameters for projects that will be developed in phases with multiple submittals
33 while allowing sufficient flexibility to permit detailed planning and subsequent submittals. So, in simpler
34 terms, the ODP is a map that guides how future development happens, and it allows it to happen at...and
35 be developed at different times.

36 Clark already did a good job of covering site context, so I'll keep this kind of brief, but our site is
37 located in the North College corridor; we are west of College Avenue and north of Hickory Street. It's
38 also worth mentioning that it is located within the North College Corridor Plan boundary. From a zoning
39 perspective, it is currently zoned Commercial Service District. It is surrounded by the same zone district
40 on the north, the east, and the south, and then the western boundary butts up on Low-Density Mixed-Use
41 Neighborhood. Zoom up on the site just a little bit...as you can see, except for that access drive, which is
42 the future Mason Street, it is undeveloped. There is a remnant of the Dry Creek habitat feature that runs

1 and kind of bisects the site going east-west. And then we have our Hickory Village folks and community
2 to the west as well as the railway that's kind of diagonal on your screen there.

3 The proposed Mason Street ODP is divided into three different parcels, so parcel one and two are
4 to the west of the future Mason Street alignment, and parcel three is located to the east of Mason Street
5 and to the south of Hibdon Court. Much of the layout of the ODP is driven by the future City of Fort
6 Collins regional detention facility which will come online and be constructed on parcel one, and then of
7 course the alignment of Mason Street drives the overall layout. Also included on the ODP is...we're
8 acknowledging the Dry Creek remnant that exists on site and we're proposing...not proposing, but we're
9 estimating roughly what that buffer area could look like on that. In addition, vehicular and pedestrian
10 access points are approximated.

11 Okay, so now we get into the actual ODP criteria, and Clark, you've already covered most of
12 these, but I think it's worth just touching on each one again. They're up on your screen here; there are
13 seven of them, and I'll continue to go through each one. Okay, so ODP criteria one states that the plan
14 shall be consistent with the permitted uses and applicable zoning district standards in Article 4 and
15 general standards of Article 3. Now, this is paraphrased, so whatever is in italics is kind of paraphrased
16 from the Code. We acknowledge that any subsequent PDP application that comes online within the ODP
17 boundary shall be subject to the development review process, that means the zoning district standards of
18 Article 4 would apply, and so would the general development standards of Article 3.

19 The second criteria states that the plan shall be consistent with the required density range for
20 residential uses for the applicable zoning district. While the ODP doesn't identify specific uses, if a
21 future PDP were to come in, it would still need to comply with Article 3 and 4. And I also wanted to note
22 here that CS is the existing zoning and we're not proposing any changes to the zoning.

23 Criteria three asks that the plan shall conform to the Master Street Plan. The snippet up on your
24 screen there is a zoomed up version on the Master Street Plan and you can see Mason Street runs north-
25 south through the site, and it is identified as a two-lane collector, and it is called out as such on the ODP.

26 Criteria four asks that the ODP shall provide transportation connections to adjoining properties to
27 ensure connectivity. Each of the parcels have adequate access to Mason Street and the access is provided
28 in such a way that no development shall preclude another from gaining access to the public street. And
29 then also, once Mason Street and Hibdon Court are designed, there would be a series of detached walks,
30 so you're getting that full picture pedestrian connectivity.

31 ODP criteria five asks that the natural features be delineated and a rough estimate of the buffer
32 area be proposed. We already mentioned the Dry Creek remnant that's on the plans. On your screen
33 here, it's in red, and that's kind of the top of bank delineation, and then the massing in green you see there
34 is the hundred-foot buffer that we're assuming. It's worth noting here that if a project were to...or a
35 subsequent PDP would come online in parcel two, for example, they would evaluate and mitigate, or
36 adjust, to that buffer at that time.

37 Criteria six requests that the ODP be consistent with the appropriate drainage basin master plan.
38 Our site is located within the Dry Creek Master Drainage Basin...that's kind of a tongue twister. It shall
39 comply with the required release rates, and it also begins to address facilities that were identified in the
40 North College Infrastructure Funding Project, so one of them being that regional detention facility that I
41 mentioned for parcel one. We're also providing drainage corridors for future storm pipes.

1 And the last criteria asks that the standards related to housing density and mix of uses shall apply
2 over the entire ODP. Again, you know, we're not proposing specific uses with this overall development
3 plan, but if something were to come online, it would have to be in compliance with Article 4 and Article 3
4 which are the zoning and general development standards. Housing standards in Article 3 and 4 shall also
5 apply over the entire plan, not just the parcel.

6 So, that's all seven criteria. In kind of concluding the presentation, relatively short presentation,
7 this land use application only pertains to the ODP. We understand there is energy around this area and
8 there will be opportunity for public comment on other development proposals that come online. This
9 ODP provides framework by which multiple parcels within this property shall develop, and it also allows
10 them to happen at different times. The ODP complies with all seven criteria listed in the Land Use Code,
11 and then, again, site specific parameters shall be reviewed against Articles 3 and 4 of the Code with
12 subsequent applications. And that brings us to the end of our piece. Thank you all.

13 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much. Clark, do you need to do a detailed analysis on this, or do
14 you feel like your introduction was...?

15 CLARK MAPES: I don't have anything else, thanks.

16 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, thank you. Before we move into clarifying questions, both Clark and
17 Klara have emphasized that this is the ODP. I know I sound like a broken record; it's very difficult to silo
18 this since we all kind of know what's potentially coming to develop here. Klara put it well and said
19 'there's energy around it;' I thought that was put very well. But, try to bear with us. This is a framework
20 for future development, and we have to keep it as general that this is street alignment, this is plumbing,
21 drainage, detention, delineation of natural features. So, I know it's difficult...there's a lot of emotion
22 around this, but let's...we're going to do our best on the Commission to silo that and focus on the ODP.
23 So, with that, who has a clarifying question?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, I had a question on the drainage feature there. Looking at the
25 map on page 384 of our packet, if I remember right. It was showing, I think it was contour lines, and I
26 couldn't tell how far apart those were...what the elevation difference is from the low part of the drainage
27 area to the top part. And so I was wondering if I could just get real quick.

28 ANDY REESE: Yeah, my name is Andy Resse with Kimley-Horn. It's approximately five feet
29 deep from the top of the pond to the bottom...those are one-foot contours that you're seeing.

30 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, thank you.

31 CHAIR KATZ: Go ahead, Adam.

32 COMMISSIONER ADAM SASS: I have a couple. I think I'm going to start with a pretty simple
33 one. I need a little back story, and this may be a Clay question potentially, maybe Clark. The North
34 College stormwater improvements that were part of that 2004, or 2010 I think is when I read we had a
35 North Fort Collins urban renewal...that's it...the urban renewal plan. There was supposed to be a
36 significant amount of stormwater improvements on the west side of College. How does this ODP further
37 that view, or does that have any impact on that framework that was set in motion, that ball that was sent
38 rolling down in 2010 to help renew the west side of College. Does this ODP continue or further that
39 plan? And I mention you because I'm pretty sure you were heading, or at least speaking for that group?

40 CLAY FRICKEY: Commissioner Sass...that was my previous role at the City was managing the
41 Urban Renewal Authority. But, Clark was also heavily involved with setting up the North College Urban

1 Renewal Plan when it was created back in the early 2000's, so between the two of us, we'll answer your
2 question. So, Commissioner Sass, the regional detention pond that's identified here is the regional
3 detention pond that was identified in the infrastructure improvement plan in 2010, and so this is one of the
4 last remaining big ticket items that the Urban Renewal Authority highlighted in terms of infrastructure
5 deficiencies to fund in the North College area. And at the time, there were two big regional detention
6 facilities identified, one is the Northeast College Corridor outfall which is just south of the old Aspen
7 Heights student housing project that provides an outfall for the east side of the College corridor. We've
8 long known that there was no outfall on the west side of the North College corridor, so this will be the
9 first pond that would collect regional detention and then discharge it down to the Poudre River eventually.
10 There's going to be another pond or two closer to the Poudre River to provide an outfall for properties
11 south of Hickory. So, this is part of that system and would help create a portion of that system identified
12 in that infrastructure plan.

13 COMMISSIONER SASS: Thank you. I bring that up because, if you don't understand the back
14 story for why things are getting developed the way that they are, I think it's important that everybody
15 listening knows that this is part of a plan that was set in motion in the early 2000's and this is furthering
16 that vision for North College.

17 This one may be a little bit, I guess...can I ask my second question? Alright...a little more
18 outside the box, or potentially a little more reaching. The North College Corridor Plan that I read
19 identified several issues that needed to be addressed, and one of them was the Hickory and Conifer
20 intersections. And, I'm not sure one hundred percent this ODP is addressing anything with that, but
21 potentially increasing traffic in this area seems like it would not be addressing that potentially. Is there
22 something we are doing, or should be doing? Because an ODP that's going to allow for more
23 development to happen I think, before we...we're getting the cart in front of the horse, right?

24 STEVE GILCHRIST: Good evening Commissioners, Steve Gilchrist with Traffic Operations. I
25 would have to look and see what the actual improvements are required at Conifer and Hickory. We
26 required a traffic study for this development of the ODP to look at the, basically development of this
27 small portion of Mason, so to speak, the easement that is there, and the extension to Hibdon Court, which
28 is within this development. The overall development of the possible Conifer and Hickory intersection is
29 definitely one we can review, you know, based on the actual traffic that's going to be knowing that these
30 uses, you know, within this traffic study, they did kind of outline the potential use of the Rescue Mission
31 and a daycare. That's not guaranteed, and so it's one of those, with any ODP, we kind of want to look at
32 the traffic and understand what's projected, but we're really not looking at the bigger intersections at this
33 point, you know, just based on that level of traffic.

34 COMMISSIONER SASS: Great, I would ask then that prior to additional ones, we have a good
35 understanding of what the reason was that that intersection was identified as a major issue in the North
36 College Corridor Plan, and is still two signalized T's a hundred and fifty feet apart.

37 STEVE GILCHRIST: And I imagine that's the big part of it is the two signalized intersections
38 that close together, and the alignment of those. Within a typical traffic study, that's not going to probably
39 allow for them to require that full improvement. I mean that's a bigger improvement that probably
40 requires significant right-of-way acquisition. So, it's one we can definitely have evaluated and looked at,
41 and we will definitely in any subsequent submittals, you know, look at that.

42 CLARK MAPES: Can I chime in, and you might want to comment on what I'm going to say.
43 The staff report notes that the traffic study, even though it's assuming some land uses just so that it can do
44 something with some numbers, concludes that the traffic generated here would have little to no impact on

1 the intersections that were studied, and that unless there is some unusual high level of development in the
2 future, that this collector street in its classification would actually function as a local street. So, it sounds
3 like...well, anyway, that's what the TIS...that's what the traffic study says. Steve, do you want to...?

4 STEVE GILCHRIST: And that's correct, that's where within this traffic study, it's a little
5 different because it's mainly infrastructure. There isn't...we've had them include what's projected with
6 the Rescue Mission and the daycare, but honestly, that's not a guarantee. Those volumes could change.
7 And with the subsequent PDPs that come in, if they decide to relocate the Rescue Mission to somewhere
8 else, we'll reevaluate that traffic study and anticipated trips, and if needed, if there's something projected
9 that's going to possibly increase the volume of traffic on that collector street, we can have them add
10 additional infrastructure needs or evaluations.

11 CLARK MAPES: And then there's something else I've got to add. The plan that you're looking
12 at, that you're citing, the 2006 plan, that's a plan that was showing a different scenario that was on the
13 books in the Master Street Plan for a long time, and that was to realign Conifer Street, demolish the
14 Palomino Motel which is at the corner of Conifer and College...so the plan always showed a long-term
15 vision for realigning Conifer Street to go up and meet Hickory so that there would be only one
16 intersection at College Avenue. That was on the books for years; it was looked at multiple times. And as
17 a follow-up to that 2006 plan calling for more attention and studies to that, some detailed engineering
18 studies led to a conclusion that it would be acceptable to create the two signals, add the turn lanes,
19 medians, et cetera, to make the intersections work the way that they are even though it's unusual and not
20 ideal. But, in the spirit of the whole North College Plan, which is to adapt city-wide standards to the
21 unique conditions and the difficulty of retrofitting. So, Steve, anything to add to that?

22 STEVE GILCHRIST: Just to chime in, too, there have been some improvements at Conifer and
23 Hickory with the turn lanes. We've separated those out. There used to be kind of a mixed use in between
24 the two intersections where the left turners kind of combined together. They've kind of separated those
25 out now with the widening of that, so there have been some improvements, but not the full extent of
26 what's really required.

27 COMMISSIONER SASS: Great, and I guess my intention with asking was not to put on blast
28 that we haven't done anything; my intention was that we are moving toward what we laid out in 2004, or
29 2006, with our North College Corridor Plan, and those are being addressed as the areas around the
30 identified areas such as the stormwater detention pond...this intersection has had improvements made to
31 it to identify those problems. That was my intention with asking that question, so thank you for clarifying
32 it. Like I said, I think some of the people that have been here for a long time...they've seen a lot of
33 change, and change is hard. And, we are still moving in the direction that was shown, so thanks for
34 clarifying that. I know you guys have worked hard on that North College area, so seeing it come to life is
35 fun.

36 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, Adam. Is there a scenario that the detention pond is built,
37 constructed...if any development on these combined sites was stalled or didn't happen? It seems like the
38 region needs it, and the City owns land there. Is there a situation where that actually happens exclusive to
39 a development?

40 CLAY FRICKEY: Yeah, Chairman Katz, there is a scenario where that happens since the
41 regional detention facility is separate from any development project. You know, the issue is...is the case
42 in pretty much any other larger infrastructure project is just getting the funding set aside for those
43 projects. And we have some stormwater engineers on the line if I misspeak or if they want to clarify a
44 little bit further. But like our traffic system, Stormwater has to go through an exercise of prioritizing all

1 of their projects, and this is just one of many projects that is on Stormwater's radar. And so, you know, it
2 has to reach a certain priority level before getting funding. The other thing that I would note in the past is
3 that the Urban Renewal Authority has funded a portion of the design of the regional detention facility, and
4 that's another potential funding source for constructing the regional detention pond, and that would also,
5 too, happen independently of development of any of these sites. And so, with that, I see Matt Simpson
6 from the Stormwater Utility has come on camera, so I'll let him speak a little bit further if you'd like.

7 CHAIR KATZ: Matt, whenever you're ready; thanks for jumping on.

8 MATT SIMPSON: Thanks Clay, thanks Commission members, can you guys hear me okay?

9 CHAIR KATZ: Yes.

10 MATT SIMPSON: Great. Clay is generally correct. This area west of College, we call it the
11 North College Drainage Improvement District...it's just a term we've given for the drainage west of
12 College north of the Poudre River. We've studied this about two times in the last twenty years. And then
13 the current plans are really in a capital projects program that are looking at the construction of
14 infrastructure from a stormwater perspective from the Poudre River north to three different independent
15 ponds that are in series of each other with pipes linking them. Up until the activity here north of Hickory,
16 the portions south of Hickory were identified kind of as a phase one, and then north of Hickory is phase
17 two. So, with funding, kind of looking at that order of development from the outfall of the Poudre River
18 north up...you know all the way up to the Hickory pond. This is kind of changing a little bit of priorities
19 on our end, and we've actually put into a budget offer for '25 and '26 the potential to look at bringing this
20 pond online sooner than that with some details of kind of how some infrastructure would work out. Does
21 that answer your question or would you like a little more detail or other clarifications?

22 CHAIR KATZ: That answers it, and it's very helpful. Thank you so much for jumping on, Matt.

23 MATT SIMPSON: You're welcome, let me know if you have any other questions.

24 CLARK MAPES: Can I ask Matt to perhaps chime in and clarify one aspect of this? My
25 perception, my understanding of this, is that this is kind of an opportunity for the developer of the
26 infrastructure to do an initial, not phase, but you know, to start to actually create a portion of this regional
27 detention pond. The City may still come in later and actually make it even deeper and do some more
28 work, but I was thinking, Matt, am I right, that there is the capital improvement planning based on what
29 was known before this opportunity came up, but is this an opportunity that's kind of being captured by the
30 City with this stormwater feature?

31 MATT SIMPSON: Yes, Clark, you're exactly correct. The infrastructure project would excavate
32 out a large portion of the future City Hickory pond, which is a huge advantage to the Stormwater Utility
33 that that earth work would be done by the developer; however, this is not going to be an ultimate
34 condition. The developer is going to leave this at an interim condition that is a significant improvement
35 to all in this area as far as storm drainage and flood protection; however, an ultimate City capital project is
36 still being formulated for this area. This detention basin will go through an outreach process to solicit
37 input from the community as far as what amenities the community will want in the ultimate pond as far as
38 passive, active recreation within the Hickory pond. Did I answer your question? I can go into more
39 detail, Clark, if you'd like.

40 CLARK MAPES: Thanks, no, that's good for me.

1 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you both, I learned a lot. Imagine that, developer is putting in
2 infrastructure that benefits the City.

3 COMMISSIONER TED SHEPARD: Steve, will the future signalization of Suniga and College
4 take pressure off the Conifer intersection with College?

5 STEVE GILCHRIST: I don't have a full detailed analysis, but we do kind of project that. You
6 know, Suniga as it develops even further to the east of Lemay is projected to carry the larger bulk of the
7 traffic in this area as the major arterial east-west. So, we're hoping its going to take some of that pressure
8 off Conifer, which is a collector, and also off Vine, which is another minor arterial to the south. So, yeah,
9 we're projecting that, we just don't have any detailed analysis on it.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And while you're there, can you tell me, will the roadway
11 classification for Hibdon Court change?

12 STEVE GILCHRIST: No, it's still just a local street. Mason is a collector and it will remain a
13 collector as well.

14 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And Hibdon and College is right in, right out?

15 STEVE GILCHRIST: I don't...

16 CLARK MAPES: I think there's a median.

17 STEVE GILCHRIST: I'd have to verify that.

18 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Would we ever expect that to be modified in any way do you
19 think?

20 STEVE GILCHRIST: So within the North College enhanced travel corridor, they are looking at
21 possible locations where pedestrian improvements might be needed, especially with the transit facilities
22 that are going to be across here. So, it's one that, yeah, there's possibilities of needing some
23 improvements, but I can't guarantee it's going to be at Hibdon. If you look at the Master Street Plan now,
24 Mason goes north of Hibdon and turns back out to College, so there's potential need there, it just hasn't
25 been fully determined yet within that plan.

26 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: It's been a while since I've been on Hibdon. Will it need to be
27 upgraded at some point, perhaps with a future development project?

28 STEVE GILCHRIST: I would imagine it could remain a local street, and that's one, if there is
29 future development, we can look at the volumes and...especially, there's a proposed daycare, so to speak,
30 on the south side. If the north side develops, we can look at that as well.

31 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: But it might need to have a widened sidewalk, or a bike lane, or
32 something like that? You'd look at all that?

33 STEVE GILCHRIST: If it remains a local, it would more than likely not require a bike lane.
34 Widened sidewalks, yes, adjacent frontage improvements, yes, we would look at that.

35 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Great, thank you.

36 CHAIR KATZ: Any other clarifying questions for staff or the other applicant? Great, at this time
37 we'll open it up for public comment. Again, let's focus on the infrastructure ODP. Who in the Chamber

1 would like to speak to the Commission this evening? Quick show of hands? We have one. Okay, come
2 on up. Please state your name and address for the record, and you will have three minutes, sir.

3 CHARLIE MESSERLIAN: Name is Charlie Messerlian, 700 North College. I've been there
4 selling trucks for the last thirty-five years, and I've built 65,000 feet of warehouse space on Hickory
5 Street. So, one question is, if these are local streets, Mason and Hibdon, and this homeless thing didn't go
6 through but they wanted to put up a...I'm trying to think ahead here...if they wanted to put, instead of
7 this homeless, they want to put up some kind of low-income high-density housing, would a local
8 classified street accommodate that? That's one question. Another question is, would this...is it going to
9 be required...before you consider this homeless thing, is it going to be required that Hibdon and Mason
10 and all the infrastructure, drainage and so forth, is that going to have to be approved and built, or...at
11 what level before you consider another proposal for the land?

12 CHAIR KATZ: And we'll let staff answer all these when you're done, so keep going.

13 CHARLIE MESSERLIAN: I had some other ones; I can't think of it. Okay now, if they build
14 this thing...this proposal seems kind of...it doesn't seem all that defined right now, but would you require
15 it to be defined to the extent that they could, instead of building this homeless thing which nobody wants,
16 and its going to have all kinds of legal and publicity type challenges, which I don't think
17 anybody...you're not going to ever overcome it. Are you going to require those improvements to be to
18 the level where you can put up some multi-family, low-income type housing, which I think everybody
19 would be behind that.

20 CHAIR KATZ: Yeah, staff...just keep going and they'll have an opportunity to answer all your
21 questions.

22 CHARLIE MESSERLIAN: I can't think of any more questions.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Okay...and a lot of that is zoning...

24 CHARLIE MESSERLIAN: ...more in the future, but I can't right now.

25 CHAIR KATZ: Well, I appreciate the questions. First, we're going to go online and see if there's
26 anyone else that wants to comment, and we'll let the applicant and staff answer you, so please stick
27 around. Real quick, anyone else in the Chamber like to address the Commission. Anyone online, Shar,
28 or via phone?

29 SHAR MANNO: We do not have any raised hands.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, with that we will close public comment. We will turn it over to...I think
31 normally we would go to the applicant first, but I think this one might be more staff appropriate, so if
32 Clark or Clay would like to respond to Charlie's questions.

33 CLAY FRICKEY: Just real quick, I did see a hand come up online.

34 CHAIR KATZ: They still there, Shar?

35 SHAR MANNO: Yes, it is Dave, and if he gives me one moment, I will allow him to talk.
36 Alright, he should be all set.

37 CHAIR KATZ: Alright, Dave, three minutes, please state your name and address for the record.

38 DAVID GARNER: Hello, my name is David Garner, 1505 North College. Can you hear me?

1 CHAIR KATZ: Yep, go ahead, sir.

2 DAVID GARNER: I just have a quick question regarding the parcels and the dotted lines. It
3 appears that in certain site plans the red line goes on the south side of Hibdon Court, and then there's a
4 few site plans where the dotted line extends past to where parcel three goes north of Hibdon Court. And,
5 specifically, if that does go north and the site plans extend...I'm curious about the pedestrian access point
6 on the north side of Hibdon Court, which was not identified in Carol's [sic] blue circles for access for
7 pedestrians.

8 CHAIR KATZ: We'll have staff and the applicant address all questions. Do you have anything
9 else, Dave?

10 DAVID GARNER: No, that's it, thank you.

11 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you for your time, appreciate you chiming in. Clark, do you want to
12 address the few questions that we've heard, first?

13 CLARK MAPES: Sure. First, I'm going to start on the question of whether this infrastructure
14 could serve another use, such as multi-family housing. And, based on the reading of the traffic study that
15 I mentioned, where the traffic generated by the assumptions so far has little to no effect on the other
16 streets. So, it would be speculation, but Steve, the Traffic Engineer, do you think that this infrastructure
17 could serve other uses such as multi-family housing?

18 STEVE GILCHRIST: Yes, let me first clarify to the gentleman, Mason is actually a collector
19 street, so it's a higher classification street. Hibdon is the local street which connects out to College.
20 Based on, you know, the anticipated trips with what they're proposing, this is more than going to function
21 well, but it also does provide with the collector street, it will provide the infrastructure for something
22 different. And that's one of the things with, depending on if the Rescue Mission doesn't come in, we'll
23 evaluate that again to make sure that whatever they've built is consistent with what's required.

24 CLARK MAPES: Right, and then the site plan lines. On ODPs, those lines are drawn on a
25 computer and they're...they look pretty specific, and if any of the different drawings show them a little
26 bit differently, I would suggest that anyone can just imagine that those lines are drawn with a marker, and
27 that they're drawn as like bubbles around the parcels. I've got...I could show you what I mean I think. I
28 don't know what's going on here...let me just skip down to the bottom of the presentation, just to show
29 you what I mean. I don't have the image that I was thinking of.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Clark, is it fair to say that what you're trying to get at is that they're very
31 conceptual because they're not firm lines, and they're more...

32 CLARK MAPES: Yeah, but...yes, sorry...but regarding the specific question of getting to the
33 north side of Hibdon, that is a different parcel that is not part of this ODP. The property owners that own
34 the land that is involved in this ODP don't own land that extends across to the north side of Hibdon, and
35 if one of the lines crosses over and it seems to raise a question of whether this ODP says anything about
36 the land uses on the north side of Hibdon, that answer would be no.

37 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Clark. Does the Ripley team want to add anything to address the
38 public's questions?

39 STEVE GILCHRIST: Can I chime in really quick?

40 CHAIR KATZ: Go ahead, Steve.

1 STEVE GILCHRIST: Regarding the pedestrian access...one of the things we did require with
2 this ODP is we were sure to include sidewalks along the south side of Hibdon that connect from Mason
3 out to College Avenue, that was one of the critical pieces.

4 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, that is an important detail. I appreciate you sharing that, Steve.
5 Klara?

6 KLARA ROSSOUW: Really quickly, wanted to just add, I know we had an earlier question
7 about future development if it were, you know, not to be a shelter and something else came in. I think
8 whatever that use is would be subject to what is allowed within the zoning district, and I believe there are
9 some multi-family uses that are allowed. I think a permanent supportive housing type of situation was
10 also mentioned...we would have to go back and see if that's an allowable use, but if it were an allowable
11 use, that could certainly be something that could happen in the future. And then there was another
12 question about...and what we would refer to as adequate public facilities...any project that developed on
13 any of those parcels would have to ensure that they're meeting those standards. So, hopefully that clears
14 that question up.

15 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, and just to note to both the members of the public, that when there is
16 a project development plan, that will be scrutinized for adequate infrastructure, circulation, both, you
17 know, pedestrians and vehicular, as well as, if it's something different, probably a new traffic impact
18 study that would be reviewed by City traffic engineers. Any other follow-up clarifying questions to staff
19 or the applicant before we jump to a deliberation? Okay, with that I'll close the input to the applicant.
20 Who would like to start us off on deliberation? Thank you, Ted.

21 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: There's a lot of value in doing overall development plans. It's a
22 precursor, it's a big high-level view of some of the constraints, it's a very valuable planning exercise, it's
23 good strategic thinking, it's looking ahead and identifies the issues. And, I appreciate the folks that have
24 come down to speak to us about the future potential land use. Klara said it well, there's energy in the
25 room, and we're not naïve, we know what's being proposed somewhere down the line perhaps, but the
26 first step is an overall development plan that captures all of the issues related to land development, which
27 certainly needs to be addressed no matter what the potential land use is. So, I appreciate the application
28 and the staff analysis. And stormwater jumping in, thank you, and to Steve, thank you for your input as
29 well.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Yeah, I'll echo Ted; I'm going to support the ODP. You know, if and when this
31 does come as the proposed homeless shelter, remember guys, there's a lot of development standards that
32 we're not addressing with this that that application is going to have to overcome, and I would certainly
33 encourage you to come back, please address us, you know, bring all your neighbors and friends with your
34 concerns, because public input is so important here. And thank you for being restrained, because it could
35 get emotional. But, we do have to review what is in front of us, and that's the ODP today.

36 COMMISSIONER YORK: I like the ODP plan here because it does do the things that are
37 required from the stormwater...sorry, it took me a minute to get back to stormwater...to the stormwater
38 retention, and the plan that was in place there. I know that North College has had a problem with that for
39 a long time, and if this is what catalyzes getting more of that infrastructure in place and getting utilities in
40 place where they are protected so that it saves the City money in the future regardless of what happens
41 later on the private parcels, I think this is a great way to move about it, so I'll be supporting getting that
42 work done.

43 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, York. Anyone else, or do we want to hear a motion?

1 COMMISSIONER SASS: I'll echo what Ted said a little bit, that the ODP is...identifies the
2 challenges, it does, and it brings it to light and lets the designers identify some of those problems and
3 making their design fun while it's within the confines of the Land Use Code. It's important to identify
4 the challenges so that you can overcome them. And when whatever plan gets presented following this,
5 the groundwork is there, and they've got to meet the Land Use Code. So, I'll be supporting this for the
6 reasons I mentioned before with the Urban Renewal and the North College Corridor Plan and furthering
7 pushing those forward, moving North College forward, this is helping do that.

8 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: And I'll add too, I do support this. I appreciate everyone
9 sticking with us...we're taking a look at a narrow issue, not a future issue, so thank you for your
10 understanding on that. We talked extensively at the workshop of how important it was to keep this very
11 narrow in scope. So, within the scope of what's being proposed, I support it as well.

12 CHAIR KATZ: Anybody want to take a shot at a motion? Thank you, Adam.

13 COMMISSIONER SASS: I move that the City of Fort Collins Planning and Zoning Commission
14 approve the Mason Street Infrastructure Overall Development Plan ODP230001. The Commission finds
15 that the overall development plan complies with all applicable Land Use Code standards. This decision is
16 based on the agenda materials, the information and materials presented during the work session and this
17 hearing, and the Commission discussion on this item. Further, the Commission hereby adopts the
18 information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions regarding the overall development plan contained
19 in the staff report included in the agenda materials for this item.

20 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Adam. Do we have a second?

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Second.

22 CHAIR KATZ: Roll call please?

23 SHAR MANNO: Sass?

24 COMMISSIONER SASS: Yes.

25 SHAR MANNO: Shepard?

26 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Yes.

27 SHAR MANNO: Stackhouse?

28 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yes.

29 SHAR MANNO: Stegner? Oops, sorry, York?

30 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

31 SHAR MANNO: And, Katz?

32 CHAIR KATZ: Yes. And with that, the Mason Street Infrastructure Overall Development Plan
33 ODP has been approved.