

Verbatim Transcript

**Planning & Zoning
Commission**

March 23, 2023

CITY OF FORT COLLINS

Planning and Zoning Commission

Held March 23, 2023

Council Chambers, 300 Laporte Avenue, Fort Collins, Colorado

In the Matter of:

Ziegler-Corbett ODP Major Amendment

Meeting Time: 6:00 PM, March 23, 2023

Board Members Present:

David Katz, Chair

Julie Stackhouse, Vice Chair

Michelle Haefele

Samantha Stegner

Ted Shepard

York

Staff Members Present:

Rebecca Everette

Shar Manno

Paul Sizemore

Brad Yatabe

Ryan Mounce

Steve Gilcrest

Sophie Buckingham

1 CHAIR DAVID KATZ: We'll move on to agenda item five, the Ziegler-Corbett ODP Major
2 Amendment, and we will ask for a brief introduction from staff member Ryan Mounce whenever he is
3 ready.

4 MR. RYAN MOUNCE: We'll be just one moment, it looks like I got kicked off Zoom here.

5 CHAIR KATZ: And before that, I will say, is there any conflicts of interest from Commission
6 members on this one? I forgot to ask that.

7 COMMISSIONER TED SHEPARD: I'll just disclose that I have visited the site, I have driven
8 through the neighborhoods that are involved in this project, and I'm familiar with Front Range Village,
9 Sunstone, and Fox Meadows.

10 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, and then Shar, any new information since the agenda packet was
11 published?

12 MS. SHAR MANNO: Yes, Chair Katz, there have been a few additional public comments that
13 were received after the public comment cutoff time of twenty-four hours prior to the hearing. These
14 comments are in favor of a traffic light being placed at Ziegler and Paddington/Grand Teton. These will
15 be included in an updated version of the hearing packet after this hearing next week.

16 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Shar. Ryan, whenever you are ready.

17 MR. MOUNCE: Yep, we are all set. So, the presentation should be shared now...I'm just seeing
18 if it's popping up here. Okay, perfect. Again, yes, this is the Ziegler-Corbett Overall Development Plan
19 Major Amendment. As a project overview, this is a major amendment to the first overall development
20 plan, or original overall development plan, that was approved in February of 2022. The size of this
21 property is about thirty-three acres, and it's located in the Harmony Corridor zone district.

22 For this review, the major amendment, staff has been evaluating the impacts of the proposed
23 changes, not necessarily the full overall development plan. And so, those changes include first expanding
24 the size of the overall development plan by incorporating one additional property, and that's what is
25 outlined in the red shading on the map to the left. As part of that expansion, it allows for the
26 consideration of shifting the main access point to this property further north to align with Hidden Pond
27 Drive, and the proposal is to install a traffic signal at that intersection. There are no proposed changes to
28 the land uses or the density or intensity from the original overall development plan.

29 Zooming in a little bit on the site, you can see it's surrounded to the north and northeast by two
30 different types of residential zone districts, the LMN and RL zone districts. Predominantly the English
31 Ranch and Woodland Park Estates neighborhoods; there's also the Hidden Pond Estates neighborhood
32 further to the east but cut off from this map. To the west is the Affinity multi-family apartments, to the
33 south is Front Range Village, and then to the southeast is sort of the Broadcom/HP campus.

34 A few, you know, shots from the site. This is looking north towards various points in English
35 Ranch. To the northeast and southeast are some shots of Woodland Park and the HP/Broadcom campus.
36 To the south, some views towards Front Range Village, primarily kind of the rear loading areas of some
37 of the big box retail. And then to the west are the Affinity Apartments.

38 Before concluding the staff overview, I did want to follow-up with some work session questions
39 and clarifications. There were some questions about the proposed signal, what its configuration would be.
40 This would be a signal, as proposed, that would be funded by the project applicants, meaning they would
41 help pay for the installation of the signal, but ultimately it would become...it would be owned and

1 maintained by the City, and the City would work to time it with the rest of the traffic network nearby.
2 And this would be a stereotypical traffic signal that we're all pretty much familiar with...so it would
3 be...have various cycles and could be activated by bicyclists and pedestrians as well using a button.
4 There was a request to have available information about some of the traffic counts for nearby streets, and
5 as appropriate, we can come back and revisit this in the presentation...or discussion. There was a
6 question about if it was known the road classification for the main east-west road through the ODP...that
7 will likely be, you know, determined at the PDP level. As a public street, it would not likely be a
8 collector because it's not identified as such on the Master Street Plan. So, perhaps something around a
9 local street. There was also a question about the right-of-way, or width, needed if there was a potential
10 connection north from the site to Paddington Road. And so, I have a couple cross-sections that are
11 available for the discussion period. Most likely, you know, right now, it might be more of a residential,
12 local type street because of some history we'll get into with the collector-level designation. The width, or
13 right-of-way, necessary for a local street is 57 feet, and then you can see, for collectors, that's either 69 or
14 81 feet, depending on whether that collector street has parking or not. And so, with that, that will
15 conclude staff's overview.

16 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ryan. At this time, the applicant has an opportunity to present. Who
17 will be presenting on behalf of the applicant? Perfect, do you think you can do it in under thirty minutes?

18 MR. CHRIS BEABOUT: Absolutely. Do you need an update on the games?

19 CHAIR KATZ: I don't, no. Whenever you are ready.

20 MR. MOUNCE: And just for clarification, I am sharing...there were some technical issues; I am
21 sharing this from staff's computer, so they will be motioning me to proceed.

22 CHAIR KATZ: Perfect, thank you, Ryan.

23 MR. BEABOUT: Thank you, Ryan, thank you, Chair, and thank you, Commission, for your time.
24 We're excited to present the amendment to the approved ODP that was approved pretty much a year ago
25 this time to the Ziegler-Corbett ODP map. Our entire team is here tonight to answer questions from you,
26 and from the public as well. We have Jason Sherrill with Landmark Homes, Jason Claeys, civil engineer
27 with Highland Development Services, and probably the man of the hour is going to be Matt Delich who
28 we all know; he's our traffic engineer and will be able to answer all of the traffic questions that come up.
29 You want to go to the next slide, that would be great.

30 So, what we have here is the ODP map that was approved last year. And as Ryan told us, we're
31 not replacing this ODP map, we're just amending it with a few changes highlighted in blue and orange.
32 The blue area is the property that currently is not included within the ODP boundary, so the one change is
33 to include that property...it's about two, two and a half acres. And because of that, what's highlighted in
34 orange was the approved channelized T intersection, and because of the Young property and lining up the
35 entry to the development from Hidden Pond, the channelized T is not needed anymore and the traffic
36 study warrants a full movement signalized intersection. And so those are really the two changes that
37 we're making to the ODP map; we're not increasing density and we are not increasing the previously
38 allowed maximum dwelling units. So, in other words, the same amount of dwelling units as was
39 approved a year ago remains the same, density within each parcel...although the boundaries are changing
40 a little bit based on the new entry points...density and the dwelling units are not increasing because of this
41 change. So, hopefully that will eliminate some fears that the public has, maybe eliminate some questions.
42 But, I'll hand it off to Jason as he will go into more detail with the actual amendments to the map.

1 MR. JASON SHERRILL: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners, Jason Sherrill with
2 Landmark Homes. I don't have a lot to add, I just want to kind of highlight a few things that I think are
3 important. We all recognize that the ODP that was approved was workable, but there was a motivation
4 both from us and the staff one day to have a chance to capture the Young property, which I think we all
5 felt, even when we submitted the ODP originally, that if we could capture that Young property, it
6 certainly would make sense, right? It would make for an all-inclusive development and not leave this
7 kind of out parcel that doesn't kind of change with the evolution of our project, and create a much more
8 robust street frontage along Ziegler, which I think is important for all of us. So, there was motivation to
9 capture that. We were fortunate that we were able to capture that property, which we're thankful for, and
10 because of that, obviously there was a need to then align our main connection to Ziegler to Hidden Pond,
11 which is a development code standard for us to align when we can. So, by adding the Young property to
12 the parcel, you know, it made much more sense, and I think it made sense to us, and it certainly made
13 sense to staff, to align to Hidden Pond.

14 The next step was a new traffic study, right? For resubmitting this...this move generated the
15 need for an amended ODP. So, in the process of that, we had to generate a new traffic study, which Matt
16 prepared for us. As we prepared that, we soon discovered that a light...our traffic warranted a light. So, I
17 know there's a lot of conversation about where is the right location for a light. The reality is, it's only this
18 intersection that warrants a light. There's not any other intersections between us and the roundabout at
19 Horsetooth that actually warrants a light. So, you know, I know there's a lot of emotion, there's a lot of
20 history with the amount of traffic on Ziegler and the different communities, but we actually feel like this
21 particular move is a win win, right? It really created, for us, an opportunity...you can just see by the
22 shape of the ODP as far as the shape of the parcels, it creates a much more uniform plan for us to build
23 from as we submit and work through the process with our PDP. It creates a much cleaner alignment to
24 Ziegler with the full movement access, and then of course our project warranted a light. I know there's,
25 again, as I mentioned, there's some conversations about the need or the desire for lights at other
26 interchanges, or other intersections, but none of those are warranted; this actually is warranted, and I
27 really do believe that even though the light isn't at some of those intersections, any light along this
28 pathway, along Ziegler, is going to provide a respite for people travelling and trying to get on Ziegler.
29 So, in particular, obviously it's going to stop northbound traffic, so those that are heading out of
30 Woodland Park and going north, there's going to be a respite so they can move north. Those heading out
31 of Paddington crossing the southbound lane heading north, they only have now one lane of traffic to
32 navigate as opposed to two lanes of traffic because there's going to be the stoppage with our light,
33 because I think the biggest concern is that movement north. So, even though this light isn't at Paddington
34 or some of the other intersections...I really think it does solve a lot of the problems. Is it perfect? I can't
35 tell you if it's perfect. But, I know that it does generate, you know, a huge benefit for the community, and
36 certainly, as we said, it's warranted at our intersection to put in a light. So, you know, we're just trying to
37 follow the Code. We think we're doing the right thing by assembling the property; we think it makes for
38 a better plan, and we think it makes for an overall improved impact to the surrounding neighborhood,
39 so...looking forward to your comments, and I know the neighbors are going to have a few things to
40 say...hopefully we can address their concerns. Thank you.

41 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Jason. Anyone else on your team wish to address the Commission
42 right now, or is your presentation over? Okay. Ryan, would you mind giving us a detailed analysis
43 please?

44 MR. MOUNCE: Yes, I am just switching back here. Alright, so, as mentioned, I'm going to
45 kind of move through these first couple slides quickly because I feel the applicants did address this, but I

1 wanted to kind of walk through these proposed changes to the original overall development plan and
2 show you, sort of, visually, the impacts. First, as mentioned, the original plan, kind of here on the
3 screen...this was the 2022 plan. It had its main point of access to the site further south, kind of split
4 between where Hidden Pond Drive is right now and the service access entrance to Front Range Village,
5 which is that road that runs behind Target. It was proposing to use what is called a channelized T
6 intersection, which is a somewhat different type of intersection configuration.

7 What's being proposed with this major amendment is, again, as mentioned, the addition of this
8 additional property, highlighted in red, and then as a result of that, it does allow for the consideration of
9 moving the main access point further north to align with Hidden Pond. What's being proposed is a traffic
10 signal, a full movement intersection with a traffic signal at that location. And as a result of shifting that
11 main access point further north, you can see the main access road through the ODP site, or circulation,
12 has also shifted north as a result. And as mentioned, that has shifted some of the boundaries of the
13 original ODP parcels. Again, no changes proposed to land uses or density, but some of those parcels have
14 shifted slightly in size.

15 You know, an overall development plan, it's a plan...high-level plan for future phased
16 development. It's...the standards for review are found in Article 2 of the Land Use Code, and as
17 expected for kind of a high-level plan, there's only a handful of these, and so I wanted to kind of provide
18 a rundown of how this major amendment...if it would have any impact on some of the review criteria for
19 an ODP. The first one relates to permitted uses; all of the proposed land uses in this ODP, with the major
20 amendment in mind, are permitted in the Harmony Corridor zone district. You may recall there was a
21 previous modification for the ratio of primary and secondary uses; that has not changed as a result of the
22 proposal for the major amendment. The density remains the same, and it meets the Harmony Corridor's
23 minimum density requirements. There was an approved alternative compliance request for the ODP in
24 2022, and this related to a local street connection north of the site to Paddington Road in English Ranch,
25 and that's been probably the primary factor around this particular review, and so I'll be touching on that
26 here in more detail in just a moment. There are no natural features identified on the site, and no habitat
27 buffer zone is anticipated during the PDP level. The applicants have submitted drainage reports and
28 drainage information that this will comply with the Fox Meadows Drainage Basin Master Plan. And
29 then, the ODP also complies with requirements for the number of housing types given the acreage or size
30 of this particular project, and so there will be a minimum of three housing types. So, from those overall
31 development plan standards, this is, with the major amendment in mind, meeting all of these review
32 criteria.

33 Where the kind of primary focus for staff's review of this has come in is with that realignment of
34 the main access point to Hidden Pond Drive. And, need to kind of bring in some past history here,
35 because it relates to whether there is that mid-block connection, street connection, from this ODP site
36 north to Paddington Road; they are somewhat intertwined. So, the City has a Master Street Plan; it is our
37 kind of vision as a community for our arterial and collector street network. Past iterations of the Master
38 Street Plan, and you can see a couple of those from the late '90's and early 2000's on the screen here, had
39 identified that Corbett Drive, a collector street, would be running from even farther south of Harmony,
40 but all the way up north, through what is now the ODP site, to Paddington Road. After Front Range
41 Village was developed, there was a lot of concern from neighbors about the potential for cut-through
42 traffic, especially given that Front Range Village is more, kind of, a regional destination in nature. And
43 so there was a lot of meetings, and kind of public process around 2010 or so, as the City was updating its
44 Comprehensive Plan and the Master Street Plan at that time, to look at that particular connection. And
45 through that public process, ultimately it was decided that the Corbett Drive collector street level

1 connection would be removed from the Master Street Plan, and so, it would remove the requirement for
2 this collector street to run through this particular site and connect north to Paddington Road.

3 As part of that process...again, there were a number of different neighborhood meetings, there
4 was a work session with City Council, and that's what this slide you see on your screen is sharing; it's
5 one of the slides from the work session. And it seemed, from the staff's perspective at that time, to kind
6 of outline a couple of scenarios that we're now kind of grappling with, with this major amendment ODP
7 review. And wanted to draw attention to some of the bullet points on the bottom which talk about, if the
8 Corbett street connection is removed, which it was, there still may be a requirement for a local street
9 connection north to this site. That is found through standards in our Land Use Code. It was the subject of
10 a lot of discussion during the original ODP, but ultimately staff recommended, and what was approved,
11 was this alternative compliance request for a bike and pedestrian access only. And this gives...staff gave
12 this a lot of weight given some of the policy direction from this earlier decision to remove the collector
13 level street. Staff also mentioned at the time, and included in this information, that removing the Corbett
14 connection could impact the traffic signal location and access points along Ziegler. And again, this is
15 kind of the main focus for this review, and kind of the scenario that we're grappling with.

16 And so, as part of this...I think it's helpful to kind of zoom out, from staff's perspective. We
17 have a site here that is in the middle of surrounding other development, and so most of the puzzle pieces
18 are in place when it comes to the transportation network. And so, we have a few remaining pieces left
19 that are not quite fitting, and so we're trying to find kind of the best approach that we can given some of
20 the policy history on this site and kind of where different access points can realistically be placed given
21 other standards for intersection spacing, alignments, and so forth.

22 And so, I wanted to run through...you know, we've kind of identified several particular locations
23 that might be most relevant for access to the site, and implications for where a signal along this stretch of
24 Ziegler might be...we've been having a lot of conversations with neighbors and those around the site, and
25 wanted to really kind of share what we feel as staff are some of the different considerations, and some of
26 the different kinds of comments that we're hearing. So the first part of this relates to, should the be a
27 local street, or could there be a local street connection from the ODP site north to Paddington Road? This
28 would likely generate the warrants for a traffic signal at the Ziegler and Paddington/Grand Teton
29 intersection. Right now, without that connection, it doesn't appear current conditions warrant the traffic
30 signal. We have heard, you know, pretty consistently, a lot of opposition to a local street connection at
31 that location from neighbors in English Ranch, and that's also very consistent with what we find from the
32 meeting summaries and meeting materials back in 2010 when this was being considered to remove the
33 Corbett street collector-level connection.

34 And so, for staff, that's created a lot of uncertainty for us about sort of the policy direction of this.
35 On one hand, there are requirements in the Land Use Code that would normally, again, require a local
36 street connection. But, at the same time, in terms of form and function, it would be very similar to a
37 collector-level street, which was explicitly removed by Council in 2010 from the Master Street Plan. So,
38 again, we have kind of some uncertainty here and we're trying to honor that previous decision and not
39 kind of reverse that given that a local street connection would be very similar to a collector street.

40 Sort of the next aspect to this is, could there be a signal...you know, if there was a signal at the
41 intersection of Ziegler, Paddington/Grand Teton, what are some of the considerations there? We have
42 heard from staff a pretty consistent desire by many neighbors that that would be very beneficial and kind
43 of help improve access from those particular neighborhoods onto Ziegler, especially those left-hand turn
44 movements. We've heard from many neighbors in Woodland Park that it would be particularly beneficial

1 for them as Ziegler Road is their only access point into the neighborhood. A signal at that location could
2 potentially serve a lot of different neighborhoods and developments, if there is that local street connection
3 that would accompany it. A signal here could also help fulfill the Active Modes Plan which was recently
4 adopted; it identifies the need for a bike and pedestrian connection somewhere along this stretch of
5 Ziegler. And we've also heard from many neighbors about a desire for that type of crossing as well.
6 Again, as mentioned, right now, a signal doesn't appear to be warranted at this intersection based on
7 current traffic conditions. And, I think it's also important...we've had many neighbors point out as well
8 that Paddington makes a lot of sense because it also is a route to a nearby local school and
9 park...elementary school and park as well.

10 So, the next scenario is a signalized intersection at Ziegler and Hidden Pond, and that's what's
11 being proposed before you this evening with the major amendment proposal. This also provides a signal
12 along this stretch of Ziegler which can act as a bike and pedestrian crossing, and fulfill, you know, that
13 goal in the Active Modes Plan. The big implication with this is that it does preclude the future of a traffic
14 signal at the Paddington and Grand Teton intersection along Ziegler. That's true vice versa as well, so
15 there's kind of a one shot, you know, one signal along this stretch of Ziegler given our spacing
16 requirements. It doesn't necessarily follow the traditional location of where a signal would be placed.
17 Kind of absent some of the history and guidance...policy guidance we have for this with the Corbett
18 street connection, you know, typically, this type of signal would occur at a collector/arterial street
19 intersection, which is Paddington. But, again, this was sort of pointed out by staff at the time, that
20 removing that Corbett street connection could lead to an outcome of moving the location of a future
21 traffic signal. This traffic signal would serve potentially several different developments, although perhaps
22 not as many as at Paddington/Grand Teton...it doesn't help address those particular concerns we've been
23 hearing a lot of as staff about access onto Ziegler from those neighborhoods. We've also heard that many
24 feel that a signal at this particular location kind of prioritizes new development over some of those
25 existing conditions that these neighborhoods have faced for many years. We've also heard from
26 neighbors in Hidden Pond Estates, which is further east, kind of a smaller subdivision, that having a
27 signal at their private drive could lead to some unintended additional traffic. You know, that is a private
28 drive with no outlet. And we've also heard about some concerns with the signal at this location, if that
29 would maybe cause backups...traffic backups during peak periods and completely block the Grand Teton
30 and Paddington intersection.

31 So, given sort of all of these different considerations, the comments, you know, there are maybe
32 potentially a couple of different solutions about where exact access and traffic signal locations could be.
33 Staff is ultimately recommending the major amendment as proposed before you this evening with the
34 signal at Hidden Pond, and some of our key considerations are, first and foremost, we feel that, if there is
35 going to be a signal at Paddington and Grand Teton, it should be associated with a local street connection.
36 However, we have a lot of hesitancy and uncertainty about requiring that particular local street connection
37 given the policy history here with the Master Street Plan updates in 2010. We do support trying to find a
38 location for a signal somewhere along this stretch of Ziegler Road; again, it could help meet some of
39 those Active Modes Plan goals for a bike and pedestrian crossing along this stretch of Ziegler. Really
40 only options to cross safely right now are to go all the way up north to the Horsetooth and Ziegler
41 roundabout, or down south to the Council Tree light. We also do feel that this particular access location
42 and a signal is more preferable than the original ODP approval which had that channelized T intersection
43 further south. It's somewhat of a more unusual type of intersection, and it did result in some impacts to
44 the Front Range Village service access entrance as well. And so, with that, staff is recommending
45 approval of this major amendment to the overall development plan. We do have staff here from Traffic
46 Operations and Engineering as well that can help answer questions.

1 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ryan, I appreciate that. That was a great detailed analysis. At this
2 time, the Commission members have an opportunity to ask clarifying questions to both staff and the
3 applicant. I think I have a couple, but I always yield to my other fellow Commissioners. So, would
4 anybody like to go first?

5 COMMISSIONER MICHELLE HAEFELE: I have a question.

6 CHAIR KATZ: Go ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: So, would there ever be a scenario where the signal at
8 Ziegler/Hidden Pond...the ODP, that new signal...the new one proposed tonight, would be removed or
9 replaced by a signal at Paddington and Ziegler? Is there any scenario under which that might happen in
10 the future under whatever conditions result?

11 MR. MOUNCE: I think it would be unlikely. Not to say that sometimes things don't change
12 within the transportation network, but, you know, this seems like it would be sort of the route forward for
13 the foreseeable future.

14 CHAIR KATZ: Ryan, you did a really good job explaining about the Master Street Plan and
15 the...Council's elimination of the Corbett connection, but, you know, maybe you could turn over to the
16 City's traffic engineers...of why this intersection makes more sense from an engineering perspective.

17 MR. STEVE GILCHREST: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. My name is Steve Gilchrest
18 with Traffic Operations, City of Fort Collins. To give you an idea of...with the signal warrants...with
19 this location, it's, one, the amount of traffic that's going to be generated from this development will meet
20 those warrants. There are nine warrants outlined in the Federal Highway Administration guidelines for
21 Manuals on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. With the Ziegler, Paddington/Grand Teton intersection,
22 those warrants aren't met. And those warrants take into consideration volumes, delays...there's some
23 warrants that aren't really considered, you know, there's some railroad track warrants, those types of
24 things. So, the general warrants at Ziegler and Paddington, ideally, aren't met at this time. It's unlikely
25 to have them meet at any time without adding more traffic to it. You know, that's one of the
26 considerations with this is, if there was that connection from this development up to Paddington, there
27 would potentially warrant those signals at Paddington and Ziegler. But, without that, it's very unlikely.
28 Is this...the Hidden Pond location, the ideal location? No. Within our Land Use Code, within our
29 standards, Paddington would be typically the intersection we signalize. You know, we look at our grid
30 pattern, our arterials are on a mile grid pattern, half mile we have our collectors, in between that we
31 typically have possibly a ped signal at that quarter mile. Unfortunately, the way things developed, with
32 Front Range Village, the Council Tree intersection with the large size development, with the retail there,
33 it warranted a full signal. That would be kind of typically where our quarter mile ped signal would be.
34 Ziegler and Paddington would be, you know, our typical collector street, but with this area, it's a little
35 unusual because Grand Teton, number one, has no other connectivity to the east, very, kind of smaller
36 neighborhood. And same with Paddington, there's no connectivity to get anywhere except out to Ziegler.
37 So, ultimately, yes, Ziegler and Paddington would be the ideal location, but feasibly, from a standpoint by
38 our traffic standards, we wouldn't likely signalize that, you know, to a full signal, unless it met those
39 warrants.

40 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Steve. So, just to clarify, could you repeat who regulates these traffic
41 warrants again? You said it was the federal level?

1 MR. GILCHREST: So, the warrants are outlined in the Federal Highway Administration Manual
2 on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Those warrants are the guidelines the City follows for any new
3 signal installation that we put in in the city.

4 CHAIR KATZ: So, the City's preference would be to have it at Paddington, but because of these
5 federal warrants that we as a City must follow...is why that was chosen. Is that correct?

6 MR. GILCHREST: No, the warrants basically just say that the signal isn't warranted at
7 Paddington. The placement of the signal, and this is where there's some of those details within our Land
8 Use Code...one of the details is that no signal should typically be placed within a thousand feet of each
9 other. Drive anywhere in Fort Collins, we've kind of gone away from that just because of the way things
10 have developed. Our preference, you know, the City's, if we had our ultimate goal of that grid pattern
11 would be, you know, that main half mile street would have that full traffic signal. That just allows for
12 good progression, good access, those types of things. The way Fort Collins developed, it's just not
13 possible in all these scenarios. So, with this development, right now, they will generate enough traffic to
14 warrant a traffic signal and can justify the placement of one at Hidden Pond. Without a connection up to
15 Paddington, Paddington doesn't warrant a traffic signal based on those federal guidelines, and unless
16 there's more traffic added, it probably never would.

17 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, what if there was a connection from the ODP on Edmonds to Paddington?

18 MR. GILCHREST: There's potential for a signal there then at Paddington and Grand Teton, but it
19 would require that connection, which we've kind of stated with Ryan's presentation, is...would that be a
20 collector, or would that be...because it would serve more of a collector standard versus the local street
21 which it would be built as.

22 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, thank you.

23 VICE CHAIR JULIE STACKHOUSE: So, I have a couple of follow-up questions. I think it's
24 really important that everyone is clear that the reason the signal is going in here is because this
25 development creates enough traffic to warrant it and has to do it. So, that's just part of the...part of what
26 you have to present to us, and we understand that. The other piece though, that I continue to maybe
27 struggle with a little bit, or maybe just not understand. I do understand very clearly that this issue of
28 having a connector street from the ODP, Corbett, up north, was considered, was removed from the Master
29 Street Plan, was explicitly discussed with the City Council at some point, apparently, what, in 2010? Can
30 you clarify for me what action would...would the City Council need to take an action to amend that
31 Master Plan again for this Commission to even consider the alternative of a through street there with
32 Corbett?

33 MR. GILCHREST: Are you asking me if they would be required to approve...if it's changed to a
34 collector street, that would be a change to the Master Street Plan then...that would need to be approved
35 by Council. The local connection wouldn't require approval by Council.

36 CHAIR KATZ: Matt Delich, are your findings...I'd like to know if your findings are consistent
37 with City's, just to make sure everybody is on the same page.

38 MR. MATT DELICH: Matt Delich, Delich Associates, we prepared the traffic impact study for
39 this development, as well as a previous one back in 2020, maybe, 2021, I'm not sure. Yes, basically the
40 findings are the same. We did analyses with regard to assigning some traffic with a connection to
41 Paddington, and the only place I might differ is...the slide on the screen earlier was would likely be
42 warranted, and I would change that to may be warranted as opposed to would likely be warranted.

1 And...because the finding was that it was marginally warranted in one peak hour, and as mentioned
2 earlier, the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices...there's nine warrants, but typically, the ones
3 used in intersections such as these are about three or four, and it's only marginally warranted with one of
4 them.

5 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you.

6 MR. DELICH: And, let me also say, the word federal came up. The Manual on Uniform Traffic
7 Control Devices is a document essentially put out by the U.S. DOT, and it requires input from traffic
8 engineers, cities, all over the country. It's not a federal warrant, it is the traffic signal warrants for the
9 United States.

10 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you.

11 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: While you're there, just to be sure I'm clear...you did the traffic
12 study with the first ODP proposal and then the traffic study with this proposal, is that right?

13 MR. DELICH: Correct.

14 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: And, the first proposal did not warrant signalization; the traffic
15 was going to be through channelized T at a different location?

16 MR. DELICH: Correct.

17 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: But by, I assume, changing conditions as well as the movement
18 of the ingress/egress to this development, it changed the outcome and it now warrants signalization...is
19 that correct?

20 MR. DELICH: That's correct. Now, the channelized T was not lined up with Hidden Pond; you
21 saw the graphic I think. And the channelized T...there's one a Milestone and Timberline if you can recall
22 where that is in Fort Collins...there's a bunch of them in Loveland. And, it allows left turns, minor street
23 left turns, to make a two-step turn. You cross, in this case, the southbound traffic...you only have to find
24 gaps in the southbound traffic, and then you enter a median, and then you have to find a gap in the
25 northbound traffic. So, it's two different movements, and that's why the channelized T was a solution
26 before. And now, with it lining up with Hidden Pond with the Young property coming in, it just made
27 sense to do a signal. And I might also point out that, ideally, signals are at half mile spacing. Obviously
28 this section of Ziegler can't do that because we've got one at Council Tree, but know that Hidden Pond is
29 only about four hundred feet south of Paddington, so it's not at the half mile spacing, but it's pretty close.

30 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, Matt. Do any other Commissioners have clarifying
31 questions? Go ahead, York.

32 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes, on the proposed crossing at Hidden Pond, you mentioned that it
33 would be a signal for pedestrians and bicyclists, but you said it would be button-activated. Would that be
34 only button-activated, or would it also have the cameras to be automatic if they're in a traffic lane?

35 MR. GILCHREST: So, our new standard for traffic signals will have video detection if there's
36 bikes there. It depends a little bit on the configuration of the intersection. Hidden Pond, especially on the
37 east side, is just kind of a two-lane road; there's not a great area for detection. There's a possibility we
38 can set that up to collect bike data if they come up. Same with on the west side; we should be able to do it
39 on the west side just because there's going to be a larger cross-section of the street there. But, yeah, bikes
40 should be able to get detected; pedestrians will have to push a button.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, and then a follow-up on that was that currently the low-stress
2 network for the bicycle is on Paddington. How would that connect into that intersection...the Hidden
3 Pond intersection...for the signalization for bicyclists to continue the low-stress network?

4 MR. GILCHREST: There will still be the bike/ped connection where the proposed vehicle
5 connection was. I can't remember, is it Edmonds, I believe is the street? There will still be that bike/ped
6 connection that they can get up from this development to Paddington.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right, but I was talking about crossing at Ziegler actually, because if
8 you're trying to get from Paddington to go north, you would have to go south to cross at the light, and
9 then...or, if you're going north on Ziegler and you want to go west on Paddington, then you would have
10 to cross ahead of time then go against traffic to get up to Paddington. And so, I didn't see that in the
11 documents about how the bicycling and pedestrian routes would be navigated through there. So that's the
12 reason why I was asking what would be the connection.

13 MR. GILCHREST: There isn't one other than what I proposed.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, I'll let somebody else go for a minute.

15 CHAIR KATZ: Anybody else before public input? Ted, do you want to go?

16 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Clarifying question, I think for Steve or for Matt. In the traffic
17 study on page eight, I'm looking at the level of service for the current Ziegler/Paddington/Grand Teton
18 intersection, and I'm seeing that the westbound left through and right are all level of service F. And what
19 really surprises me is that the right turn is an F. I get the through at an unsignalized intersection, and the
20 left being F, but the right turn is an F. And anyway, so I'm looking at these F levels of service currently
21 as it exists out there today, and that doesn't warrant a signal?

22 MR. GILCHREST: No, it doesn't. Part of the reason behind that is the fact that it's a single lane
23 movement, so you're left turns, your through movements, they're all blocking those right turns, typically,
24 as well. So, that compounds that and just the amount of delay with the low volumes of traffic still doesn't
25 warrant a signal.

26 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you. And, it's interesting that the traffic study tells us
27 what the delay is, and that these delays are 54.9 seconds for the A.M., and 79.2 seconds for the P.M. Do
28 we have any similar conditions like that along the arterial network where delays are that significant?

29 MR. GILCHREST: I couldn't name one off the top of my head, but I guarantee there probably
30 are.

31 MR. DELICH: If I could chime in, Matt Delich again. Yeah, there probably are a number of
32 intersections where the delays to the minor streets are that long, and perhaps even longer. A number of
33 years ago, Fort Collins, because it's an arterial street, allows level of service F for minor street
34 movements because there's just absolutely nothing you can do about it.

35 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: What about the two-stage left? You're even prevented...that
36 even accounts for the two-stage left.

37 MR. DELICH: I'm not sure I understand.

38 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Well, the...those delays take into account that the left turn could
39 be a two-stage left.

1 MR. DELICH: It could be in a channelized T, a safe channelized T. To do a two-stage in an open
2 intersection like Paddington/Grand Teton and Ziegler gets a little dicey.

3 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, thank you. While you're there, one other question for
4 clarification purposes. I recall that the mile-by-mile arterial section line grid that we have, that it was
5 acceptable to have signalized intersections at the third mile, so you'd have two within a mile, not just one
6 at the half mile. Did that get deleted as a policy? I always thought the third mile was...so you'd have
7 two signalized intersections within a one mile segment on the arterial system.

8 MR. DELICH: Steve can chime in, but it's my understanding that the better spacing for signals is
9 at or near the half mile.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, thank you.

11 MR. GILCHREST: Just to add to that, so when you talk about the...as I laid out the grid pattern
12 with the half mile spacing for a full signal, you could look at it and...that's where I talked about the
13 potential of two ped signals in between there, you could probably space those out accordingly. I don't
14 know the standard off the top of my head, but yeah, it would probably work if you had probably that third
15 mile spacing on two full signals. It would preclude, probably, any ped signals in between those though.

16 CHAIR KATZ: Yeah, if you have another clarifying question, go ahead.

17 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: Yes. We're focusing on the traffic, and I'm sure we're going to
18 talk about traffic for a while, but the ODP, the change, adds some acreage to the development, and what
19 would be the use for that added property, what isn't being used as an intersection? Is there any change or
20 anything that we should know about for that additional piece of property?

21 MR. SHERRILL: Again, Jason Sherrill. So, it's...the location of it kind of was, in our previous
22 ODP, our kind of mixed-use, commercial area around that, so it will kind of blend into the commercial
23 component. So, what we have in our PDP is actually where the daycare center would go, and some
24 additional detention because our site is burdened by significant off-site detention. So, that's what
25 intended to be there.

26 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: Okay, thank you.

27 CHAIR KATZ: Any other clarifying questions before we jump into public comment? Go ahead.

28 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Ryan, could you put up slide eight? This was the information
29 that you provided for us as a result of the work session. And I'm looking at this, and I'm looking at the
30 Paddington counts, being a 24-hour in the year 2018, at 1,177, and that's less than Kingsley. That's
31 remarkable to me. Paddington is such a short collector; it's only about a third of a mile, where Kingsley
32 is a much longer collector. Is it the difference in years, or...I guess I'm surprised at the high vehicle
33 count on Paddington between Kingsley and Ziegler, and yet I keep hearing that the Paddington/Grand
34 Teton, Ziegler intersection doesn't meet warrants. But, look at those 24-hour vehicle counts on
35 Paddington. That's not a small number.

36 CHAIR KATZ: So, we're asking questions. Is the...what's the question? Can you just clarify
37 the question?

38 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I guess I can't come up with a question.

39 CHAIR KATZ: Is it just what accounts for that discrepancy?

1 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I guess my question is, is Paddington the shortest collector in the
2 city?

3 MR. GILCHREST: I can't truly answer that at this point, but it is one of the shorter ones.

4 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: And it's only a collector east of Kingsley?

5 MR. GILCHREST: Yes, and then in the Master Street Plan, you have Sunstone that actually
6 functions as the other collector that connects over to Caribou.

7 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: But it's built as a local?

8 MR. GILCHREST: It's built as a local; it was built prior to the English Ranch neighborhood
9 being built.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Does Sunstone, since it serves three neighborhoods, does it have
11 a higher vehicle count than Paddington?

12 CHAIR KATZ: Ted, I do want to make sure that we're addressing the major amendment.

13 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, I think Michelle mentioned it, that new acreage is being
14 added to the ODP, which I think cascades into a discussion that is...broadens it for me. So...

15 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, thank you. York?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, you mentioned that Master Street Plan has to be approved by City
17 Council. So, if we...if the light is approved for Hidden Pond Drive, and doing that, does that need to go
18 to City Council as well because that would be changing the Master Street Plan as it's currently
19 established?

20 MR. GILCHREST: That's not changing the Master Street Plan. The Master Street Plan only
21 aligns where the streets go, not where any traffic signals go.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, thank you.

23 CHAIR KATZ: That's a good question. Anybody else have a clarifying question? Okay. As we
24 move into public comment, first I just want to thank you all. It is really important that our community
25 comes out and gives us new evidence. I think we can all see that, when we do zoom out, like physically
26 zoom out, it does look like Paddington makes the most sense, logically; it's consistent with some of the
27 comments we've seen, you know, even City staff said if it wasn't for other factors, that would make
28 sense. But, we do need to...you know, before we start making comments, we need to zoom out again and
29 realize it is a giant chess board, right? And, there's other things at play here, like collector streets being
30 removed, you know, this particular potential development, you know, creating and needing a traffic signal
31 in itself, and it's just kind of the order of the way that development happened. So, just think about that
32 when we're making comments. And I also really want to specify, we are only...we only need to hear
33 comments, please, for things that are relevant to this amendment to the ODP, not the ODP as a whole, we
34 already heard that last year. So, just please, you know, take that into consideration when you comment.
35 You know, make sure that it's within the framework of this amendment and this change to the ODP, and
36 not the ODP as a whole. So, thank you. With that, could I see a show of hands of who would like to
37 address the Commission? Okay, and remember those joining us via Zoom, please raise your hands using
38 the icon, or if you're joining us on the phone, star nine. I will give you a few second to raise your hands
39 now. Shar, are we seeing any hands go up?

1 MS. MANNO: Currently we have three hands raised.

2 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, well we are going to start with members that have joined us today in
3 person. Please line up, if you'd like to address the Commission, at both podiums. You can do that now.
4 And we'll just go back and forth, so please line up at both of them; try to make it as even as possible.
5 Okay, we will start in the middle, we will alternate. Please state your name and address for the record,
6 and you will have three minutes please.

7 MS. JANET ZUNIGA: Hi; I'm Janet Zuniga, and I live at 4026 Mesa Verde Street in Woodland
8 Park. I am not a voice of power or money like these gentleman behind me, but I'm a citizen of Fort
9 Collins; I've been here like thirty-four years. I've been in my home over twenty years. When we moved
10 into our house, the speed limit on Ziegler was twenty-five, and so it was no problem to get to the park, or
11 to take our kids over to sports activities at the school over there. You know, now it's forty miles an hour;
12 you just can't get across the street. Even during COVID, you were likely to get hit by a car when there
13 were hardly any cars on the road, there was that much traffic right there. And the traffic is coming, you
14 know off of I-25, people are still going fast, they're going over the speed limit all the time over there. It's
15 treacherous. And we've been asking for a light at Grand Teton and Paddington for about fifteen years,
16 over and over, we've just been denied. And in Woodland Park, it's just like living on an island; it's really
17 hard to get out of there, and it's just not safe. I don't know, maybe you guys have the information in front
18 of you on how many accidents happen at that intersection, but I know there've been quite a few.

19 So, as I say, I'm not the voice of power, but I'm a citizen of this city; I've been here a long time,
20 and I feel like it's warranted even though nobody else seems to agree with that. I'd like to be able to get
21 out safely, I'd like my kids who are driving now to be able to get out of our neighborhood safely. You
22 just can't hardly turn left. And even turning right is really hard. Thanks for your support, Ted. I know
23 you've been out there, you've supported our neighborhood all along. I just appreciate your positive
24 comments. Thank you.

25 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Janet. Appreciate the comments.

26 MR. JEFF JANELLE: I have a...oh, there it is, there's a visual. My name is Jeff Janelle, and
27 thank you for hearing us, letting us speak. I live at 2709 Sunstone Drive. Real quick, I think the reason
28 for those numbers on Paddington versus the Kingsley, is there's a lot of traffic that filters from Fox
29 Meadows, Sunstone using Caribou, then Sunstone, then they cut into Paddington and/or Sunstone and
30 turn at Kingsley, and there's a steady flow through there. So, that's that.

31 Something to think about...the density has been an issue to everybody in the neighborhood. It's
32 just like...huge red flag. The fact that a single thirty-three acre development warrants a signal versus 556
33 homes in English Ranch, you know, three cars a household, whatever, Woodland Park Estates, doesn't
34 make any sense. And then, to say, oh, well let's do collector, whatever. So, if the development warrants
35 a signal, it sure as heck does not need to go into English Ranch. If you've got something that can warrant
36 a signal, that's crazy...absolute craziness. So, that's just the emotional side...just, it's nuts. There's just
37 no way...Kingsley is a wonderful...we bought a house from Dan, original owners, been there all along,
38 love it. We stayed put; we love it there. The pedestrian flow on Kingsley is amazing, there are even
39 running races that utilize it. To have more traffic there would be horrible. We have a handicapped
40 individual that commutes to work on there, tons of bikes. I'm a cyclist...and the Ziegler thing over there,
41 when I come in from a long ride from the south trying to get in my neighborhood crossing Ziegler, it's
42 horrible. So, whatever.

1 Okay, so what I have over here, I think is...it may not be perfect, but I think it's forward thinking,
2 I think it's Fort Collins, I think it's trailblazing. We can set the bar for different solutions; we don't have
3 to follow a cookie cutter mold. So, let me see if this thing works; I don't want to blind anyone.
4 Okay...oh great, it's not showing on the screen. Well...

5 CHAIR KATZ: You've run out of time...we want to hear what you have to say, but you're
6 running out of time, so if you could do it without the pointer.

7 MR. JANELLE: Okay, bottom right corner, that is a protected turn lane. When it queues up to
8 three or four cars, it triggers that intersection up there. Can I borrow someone else's time?

9 CHAIR KATZ: You can keep going.

10 MR. JANELLE: Thank you, I appreciate that very much. Triggers the intersection where it
11 should be, gives a break to those people coming in, once they have completed their business, Hidden
12 Pond has a fighting chance to get in. There are multiple options within the development. Smart
13 people...I was a UPS driver, you never turn left, it's always right. People that want to go southbound
14 coming out of this corner pocket of businesses, whether it's child care or whatever, typically a distracted
15 driver, just picked up the kids, go out there. Paddington, there's a divider that prevents cut backs, that's
16 what the yellow represents. Those trees go, the visibility, the triangle, is perfect. You've got perfect
17 clearance for that intersection, that merge. There's no reason that can't be done. If someone can't
18 negotiate that, they shouldn't have a driver's license; it is picture perfect, okay? And don't go to DIA,
19 because you'll never make it if you can't work this. That divider down Paddington prevents the cut
20 backs, I probably said that. So then, you've got a dedicated...my original plan had an extra lane that was
21 a flow out. This requires no modification other than the structure for the roadway, a couple culverts, mild
22 deepening of the detention areas, and it's back where it was. Trees relocated, and then you've got the
23 crosswalks. So, I just think it makes a lot more sense. Yes, it's different; this is Fort Collins, we do
24 things differently. We can innovate; let's just do something better. I don't think it's at any extra cost
25 really. That little bit right there where the green trees are, that's English Ranch HOA. We can deed, we
26 can quick claim an easement, whatever it takes, we can make it work, and I know my neighbors would
27 support that. There's, combined, 800 people probably.

28 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you.

29 MR. JANELLE: So, anyway, done, thank you, I appreciate your willingness...

30 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much for the work you put into that, thank you.

31 MR. BRAD KREIKEMEIER: Brad Kreikemeier, 3380 Hidden Pond Drive. I would like the
32 Commission to consider reimplementing the connection road. Hidden Pond only has fourteen lots,
33 fourteen home sites in the neighborhood and, as discussed earlier, a light at Paddington would serve many
34 more neighborhoods, or many more neighborhoods and also a lot more traffic and households.

35 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Brad.

36 MR. DAN BARTRAN: I'm Dan Bartran, I'm the original builder in English Ranch. Jason, what
37 did you do? Skateboarding?

38 Yeah, and Ted, you're right, Paddington has actually three different right-of-way widths on it; it's
39 a very unique road, and a very short road. Background on when Raintree came in...I was active in the
40 approval of that, and the concerns of the neighborhood. Basically, the reason why Edmonds was taken
41 out is, the City said they would do that because the neighborhood was concerned about traffic coming

1 from there and then going through...just like we're getting from the other direction. And they're right,
2 there's a lot of traffic that goes down to Paddington. But, the City agreed that Kingsley, you know,
3 people would cut through and go to Kingsley at that point. What you have right now is, with the
4 roundabout, you've just got a continual grip of traffic going south, and then going northbound especially,
5 because I take it every day. Going north, you've got people turning right off Harmony and going down
6 the road, and unless they get stopped at the light, you wait there quite a while.

7 Looking back at what the City had said originally, my concern would be, if you opened up
8 Edmonds again, and gave the people the ability to turn left, we would get a lot of traffic in that
9 neighborhood again. You know, potentially, I don't know, you know, forcing a right-hand turn through
10 the detention, I don't know, might be...I think it's a tough decision for you guys, to be honest. So, thanks
11 for my time.

12 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Dan.

13 MR. STEPHEN CLARKE: Good evening, my name is Stephen Clarke; I live at 3405 Hidden
14 Pond Drive. I'm also the Hidden Pond HOA president, so I'll be representing most of the neighborhood.
15 I really like that proposal that was just shown a little bit ago. I'm not in favor of having the traffic light in
16 front of our neighborhood. As was mentioned in the proposal, it's a privately owned and maintained
17 road. We get a lot of traffic coming through even though it already has three private, dead end signs on
18 the road, we still get a lot of traffic coming through. One additional no outlet sign won't make a
19 difference. What happens is people come in, turn around and speed out of the neighborhood, because
20 they made a mistake. And I don't want to have more of that traffic. We have a lot of kids in the
21 neighborhood; I don't want to have to deal with that.

22 Lastly, if the proposal to have Hidden Pond light there, I'd like to work with the developers to see
23 how we can mitigate that traffic, how we can mitigate whatever else will come through. What would that
24 take to help minimize that traffic? As well as I'd really like to not have the Hidden Pond name continue
25 on the west side of the road; I'd like to have that separate so when people are plugging in addresses and
26 so forth, they don't make the right turn into our neighborhood by mistake, they go to Jason Lane,
27 whatever, some other name, to go a different direction, to not confuse it with our neighborhood. Thank
28 you for your time.

29 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, Stephen.

30 MS. TAMARA BURNSIDE: Hi, my name is Tamara Burnside; my address is 3902 Glacier
31 Court, I live in Woodland Park Estates. I really like this new photo that you guys saw of cutting onto
32 Paddington, have it be a right turn only onto Paddington so they can't cut through English Ranch. I
33 wanted to make a point about what the developer said about the light at Hidden Pond helping us go north.
34 We don't have a problem going north, we have a problem turning left onto Ziegler going south crossing
35 two lanes of traffic, most of the time going 45 to 50 miles an hour. It's not a problem going north, and if
36 there's a light put at Hidden Pond, it's going to back up the traffic at that light and make it even harder for
37 us to turn south. That's all I wanted to say.

38 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, Tamara.

39 MR. JAMES KING: My name is James King; I live at 2921 Sunstone Drive. The purpose that
40 this meeting, or this discussion, was called, was for a light at Hidden Pond. The discussion of having a
41 light at Paddington seems to be misdirecting what the purpose of the discussion was for. But, I would say
42 that anything that it would add access to Paddington from the new development would create all sorts of

1 havoc in that neighborhood, and I think that it would be best if the focus continued to be on the question
2 of a traffic light at Hidden Pond, and not a traffic light at Paddington. Thank you.

3 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, James.

4 MR. CRAIG LATZKE: My name is Craig Latzke; my address is 3908 Mesa Verde Street, that's
5 in Woodland Park. The staff seems to have done a phenomenal job representing the pros and cons, and
6 tradeoffs, and concerns, with their detailed analysis. I'm glad the developer is working to supply needed
7 housing units to our city, and I'm thankful for your time here tonight; your questions to staff represent an
8 understanding of the topic. I and many of my neighbors share concerns regarding safe pedestrian and
9 bicycle crossings of Ziegler, and the ability to safely exit our neighborhood.

10 My personal primary concern is pedestrian and bike crossing from Grand Teton to Paddington
11 across, to access the neighborhood park and school. This amendment would create a pedestrian crossing
12 closer to us, but that same signal does not make sense for that use, as York's questions illustrated. It
13 would also make a mess of the vehicular traffic out of our neighborhood, for example, by backing up
14 southbound traffic so that it blocks our intersection. Even worse, the signal in the proposed amendment
15 ensures that a signal will never be constructed at the more logical location of Paddington and Grand
16 Teton. Staff appears to have their hands tied by a policy decision in 2010 to modify the Master Street
17 Plan. This is keeping them from being able to consider or recommend a connection from this
18 development to Paddington, and then signaling Paddington and Ziegler. You may, likewise, have your
19 hands tied. If this amendment is approved, I will appeal that decision because the amendment precludes a
20 future signal at Paddington. With that appeal, I hope Council will consider working with you and staff to
21 reevaluate the 2010 policy decision in light of different considerations at play thirteen years later, and
22 because of the negative impacts to these neighborhoods. If I misunderstand the situation, and you are
23 able to recommend to the Council that they reevaluate the 2010 policy decision, and postpone this
24 decision on this amendment to await that review, I ask you to do so.

25 Finally, I wish to contradict or clarify a statement that the developer made that the signal at
26 Paddington is not warranted. To the degree that remains true would be an outcome of the approval of this
27 amendment and placing of this signal. There are other truthful statements made by the developer which
28 similarly missed the mark on context. Thank you.

29 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Craig.

30 MS. SARA OLSEN: Hello, my name is Sara Olsen; I live at 3126 Mesa Verde Street in
31 Woodland Park. And I would just ask you to please let common sense prevail here. It seems like the
32 reasonable thing to do is to put that light at Paddington. It would help all the neighborhoods; those in
33 Hidden Pond are advocating for that also. They say that we can cross safely at the roundabout as
34 pedestrians and bikers. I can tell you I have done that many times, and been nearly hit many times. That
35 is not a safe route for a biker or a pedestrian, or even a car sometimes. So, I would respectfully ask you to
36 consider going to our neighborhood yourself and trying to get out at five or six P.M., or anytime between
37 seven and nine A.M., and see how difficult that is. Thank you.

38 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, Sara. Is there anybody else that would like to speak in
39 person? Go ahead.

40 MS. DEANNA ORTIZ: I'm Deanna Ortiz; I live at 3103 Zion Court in Woodland Park. I just
41 wanted to back up the other comments that have been made about a concern about putting a light lined up

1 with Hidden Pond, that a more logical location I think could be found rather than there as it's really
2 needed to exit that Woodland Park Estates neighborhood. And that's all.

3 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much. I don't see anybody else lined up with us in the Chamber
4 today. So, at this time, we will proceed to those joining us via telephone or Zoom. So, Shar, whenever
5 you are ready.

6 MS. MANNO: Sure. We have Irene Stein up first. Irene, you are able to speak.

7 MS. IRENE STEIN: Hi, I'm Irene Stein; I live at 4050 Kingsley Court...that's the cul-de-sac
8 that's the closest to the bike and walkway that goes up between Affinity up to the Village there. And I've
9 been...I've lived here for about eighteen years, so I was at all the meetings when we talked about taking
10 Edmonds off the Master Traffic [*sic*] Plan, and I remember I was very in favor of taking that off the
11 Master Traffic [*sic*] Plan because we were worried about...in my head, the story I tell myself is the cars
12 coming from the high school, you know, going down Kingsley, and trying to get to the...cut through
13 English Ranch to get to the shopping center. And, it's like, we just don't want that. So, here we are, you
14 know, ten or so years later, and the...Edmonds would not go directly to the shopping center, Edmonds
15 would go particularly to, you know, kind of more of a residential and park area. I speak for myself, but
16 I'm not personally that worried anymore about cars coming, you know, from Horsetooth, down Kingsley,
17 Paddington, to Edmonds, and I see the problems on not having a traffic light at Paddington. I'm very in
18 favor of putting the traffic light at Paddington and Ziegler, and if it means, you know, adding that street in
19 Edmonds, especially if you make it a right turn only onto Paddington from the south, that might solve a
20 lot of problems. A second quick point is the amount of traffic that's coming down Ziegler from
21 Horsetooth at time, if there's a light at Hidden Valley [*sic*], I could see that backing up past Paddington
22 really easily. It's just constant, two lanes that are just constant coming down. So, thank you very much.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Irene.

24 MS. MANNO: Okay, next we have Cindy S. Cindy, you are able to speak.

25 CHAIR KATZ: Cindy, are you there?

26 MS. JENNY SIMPSON: Can you hear me okay?

27 CHAIR KATZ: Yep, we can hear you now, thank you.

28 MS. SIMPSON: Alright. Hi, I'm Jenny Simpson; I'm at 2638 Stonehaven in English Ranch
29 subdivision and I have a lot of concerns about a light at Hidden Pond for many of the same reasons that
30 our neighbors have already expressed. The Woodland Park neighborhood has been asking for a light at
31 Paddington for years and years because of how difficult it really is to get out of our neighborhoods. And
32 there are three ways through English Ranch from Caribou, from Kingsley, and from Paddington, and
33 depending on what time of day it is, and if I'm coming in or out of the neighborhood, I have to adjust
34 where I enter, where I exit, because the traffic is that bad.

35 I am thrilled that the channelized T has been taken off the table because that was a terrible plan
36 that the neighbors were not in favor of. A light at Paddington would be the most ideal...I actually would
37 really like it if the exhibition that one of my neighbors...I didn't catch his name, but the gentleman in the
38 blue shirt...provided that shows a median in Paddington. That, I think, should be explored; I thought that
39 was a fantastic proposition. And, we the neighbors are who live here. We care about our neighborhoods
40 and the traffic, and we feel like we haven't been heard by this Council. I like what someone said about
41 how...this is Fort Collins, and we can innovate, and we can find a better solution. And while this is an

1 improvement than the previous proposition...this is improvement, but I think we can do better. I think, as
2 a city, we can do better.

3 And so, to the Board, please listen to the residents. You know, we fought very, very hard to not
4 have a connection to the Front Range Village shopping center at Kingsley...both at Kingsley and at
5 Edmonton [*sic*] because of the traffic through the neighborhood...that we know, it would still happen.
6 People would come off of Horsetooth, down Kingsley, out off to Paddington, to Ziegler...they do that
7 now. So, having no connection through the neighborhood, I understand, might go against the Master Plan
8 for the City, but we've had other exceptions before based on the needs of the location, and I think we can
9 do that again. I think there is a better solution than what is proposed here tonight that would make the
10 residents happy, including the new residents for the new development. So, thank you.

11 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Jenny. Anyone else Shar?

12 MS. MANNO: No, there are no other hands raised.

13 CHAIR KATZ: Okay, alright. Public participation is closed. We will go to the applicant first to
14 have a chance to answer some questions or provide any rebuttals.

15 MR. SHERRILL: First...again, Jason Sherrill. It's kind of...it's certainly complicated, right? In
16 that by us having the ability, which I think everyone agrees, moving the connection to Hidden Pond is a
17 plus, right? The fact is, it generates the warrants for a signal. So, that's the condition that we are held by,
18 and so, that's...you know, and the fact is, we're funding the light. So, it feels like to me...I know one of
19 the residents made mention that they didn't have issues turning northbound, and I made mention of
20 that...I might not have made myself clear, but the point is, a light at Hidden Pond will still provide some
21 relief because those that are turning southbound out of English Ranch, or even out of Woodland Park,
22 they still now only have one lane of traffic to navigate because the one lane northbound has been stopped
23 with the light at Hidden Pond. So now, they have to still navigate the southbound, but obviously the one
24 bigger concern is navigating northbound and southbound, so I think there's some benefit there that can be
25 recognized even with the light at Hidden Pond, not at Paddington.

26 You know, I'd like to address the gentleman, and we've seen it before, so I appreciate the
27 concept, but the reality is...I know that we learned today that the HOA would provide us access, an
28 easement or whatever, but the geometry of that connection through that pond, I don't really feel like is
29 realistic. Our traffic engineer tells us it's not realistic, our civil engineer tells us it's not realistic, and the
30 reality is, and Jason, I don't know if you want to speak to detention and the effects on detention?
31 Okay...I'll talk in general and if you want to ask Jason specific questions, our civil, but there are already
32 detention issues in the English Ranch neighborhood, so by removing part of that detention pond for this
33 access will only exacerbate their own detention problems, and we are already burdened with significant
34 detention issues to the west of us that we're burdened by.

35 So, you know, I'm happy to answer your questions. I don't know that there's a better solution;
36 this is the best solution that we have, that we actually control. If we had access at Edmonds, full
37 movement access, which I think makes sense. I know that ten years ago maybe, there's was a lot of push
38 for it not to make sense, but I feel like with the way that the communities have evolved, a connection at
39 Edmonds, you know, might be, you know, the best solution. You know, we're trying to find the best
40 solution given all the variables, and so everyone is going to give something, and maybe that is the best
41 solution. But, we don't control that. You know, we don't control an access through Edmonds; what we
42 control is, by purchasing this property, we now can move the connection to Hidden Pond...I'm being a
43 little redundant...and that's what the staff wanted, and that generated a light. We can go back to the

1 channelized T and still buy that property, and still use the channelized T. I mean, that's certainly an
2 option for us. Staff didn't necessarily like that, and so it felt like this was the best solution. So,
3 hopefully, the Planning and Zoning Commission will recognize that there's winners and losers on all
4 sides, and we're just trying to find the best alternative with the conditions that we're subject to.

5 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Jason. So, Ryan, would you like to respond at all?

6 MR. MOUNCE: Yeah, there's kind of a couple points we can expand on. So, wanted to start
7 with sort of the exhibit that was shared, sort of the neighborhood proposal. You know, we really
8 appreciate kind of the creativity behind that, and we have kind of discussed some of that proposal, that
9 concept, before...kind of even before the neighborhood meeting for this project. As we started looking at
10 that as staff, we...as mentioned, we do have some concerns about the viability of that. One of the big
11 ones is going to be featured around, or centered around, stormwater. That is stormwater for the English
12 Ranch development right now. You know, based on current standards, it appears to be undersized, and
13 so, if there is going to be that connection through it, that has to be made up in some manner, and that's the
14 potential concern. There's also some potential concerns about just the exact location of where it would be
15 in terms of, again, things like intersection spacing, how close it would be to Ziegler, if people could cut
16 across, for instance, if there was a left hand turn at that intersection.

17 The other potential issue, and I guess kind of zooming out again from the staff perspective is, you
18 know, we do have these connectivity standards in the Land Use Code, we do want to knit neighborhoods
19 together, and that's kind of the terminology we use, is knitting. And we certainly recognize that, you
20 know, no one necessarily wants more traffic in their development, or their neighborhood, but that is kind
21 of the intent, and kind of the philosophy behind communities...that these different developments, they
22 aren't partitioned amongst themselves, they are woven together, and there should be multiple access
23 points to different arterial streets within your, sort of, section mile. And so, you know, hearing a lot of
24 support for the idea of a signal at Paddington and Grand Teton, and we've talked a little bit about how,
25 sort of under the ideal scenarios, that's where it would be located and, kind of, that's how the
26 transportation network is kind of set up and designed. You know, we are working with some constraints;
27 we do feel like we have a lot of uncertainty at the staff level around, sort of, whether that connection
28 between this site and English Ranch to Paddington can be made or not. But, you know, if there is going
29 to be the work to look at a proposal to connect somehow between this neighborhood...the ODP site and
30 the neighborhood to the north, English Ranch, you know, I guess the staff perspective is we would really
31 like to see as much connectivity as possible at that point. That is sort of the base standard in the Land Use
32 Code, and as mentioned, there are different amenities, like the park and school, that would be beneficial
33 to, you know, get people to and from.

34 I did want to pull up a couple other comments related to some of the...what we heard. There was
35 a sort of a comment about sort of the density. You know, this is in the Harmony Corridor zone district. If
36 you look at, sort of, the policy plan for the Harmony Corridor zone district, it's basis, it does talk a lot
37 about sort of concentrated activity, a place for higher density development, that's why the zone district
38 standards do have that minimum density requirement versus a lot of our other residential zones have
39 maximums. You know, it even limits the amount of single-family dwellings that you can do in the
40 Harmony Corridor. And this, you know, we have an ODP so far, so we have a density range of 400 to
41 700 units, and if you kind of average that out across the new numbers with this expanded ODP, that's
42 about twelve to twenty-one units per acre, so that's very similar to Affinity, just to the west, which is
43 about nineteen units per acre. It's very similar to other MMN, or multi-family style developments, which
44 we have also seen in the Harmony Corridor. So, I guess from the staff perspective, certainly it's a very
45 large site, and because of that, it is a little higher density, and it is generating a lot of additional, you

1 know, potential trips here, but it's not necessarily out of the ordinary in terms of what we've seen and
2 experienced in the Harmony Corridor zone district in the past.

3 And I think...I just really want to mention, kind of, from the staff perspective, we've been talking
4 with a lot of neighbors, and it's been, you know, a great conversation, sometimes frustratingly so about
5 some of the different options, or lack of options, it feels like there is, kind of reviewing this. But,
6 everyone has been very, you know, very great...kind of coming out with these ideas, not moving to just
7 sort of...or moving to, sort of, this creativity aspect and collaboration process, which sometimes we don't
8 always see with some of these developments. So, I also wanted to express that. Thanks.

9 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you so much, Ryan. We're going to give the Commission members one
10 last opportunity to ask clarifying questions, and this will be the last opportunity that the Commission has
11 to engage with the applicant. So, before we get into any deliberation, do any Commission members have
12 any final clarifying questions.

13 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Mr. Chair, I would just like to...first of all, thank you to
14 everyone who spoke tonight. In my year on this Commission, the comments made tonight were just on
15 point, so thank you for doing your homework on that; it really helps us a great deal. There was one
16 comment made...I can't paraphrase it fully, but essentially raised the question of whether a signal would
17 ever be warranted at Paddington and Ziegler. And I believe at our last Commission meeting, we asked
18 that question, and without traffic flowing through to Paddington, the answer was it was unlikely that a
19 signal would ever be warranted there. Is that correct Ryan?

20 MR. MOUNCE: Yeah, I may have Steve kind of come in and chime in here, but my
21 understanding is, you know, based on current conditions, the warrant is not there. The area around, you
22 know, Paddington, is mostly developed, and we wouldn't necessarily expect to see redevelopment of
23 single-family homes, and so, I believe there's one remaining development site there, that's Mr. Bartran's
24 property, as mentioned, and you know, it's on several acres. And so, I don't know if that, on its own,
25 would generate that additional traffic, but it seems like without additional development or that connection,
26 it wouldn't generate the warrants for a signal in the future. And...okay.

27 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yeah, and I ask that question for the benefit of the audience
28 understanding. What we have dealt with in the past, and our own frustration in knowing the fact that
29 without that through traffic, it just limits the options at that intersection.

30 CHAIR KATZ: York, go ahead. I think you had a question?

31 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. I believe looking at the proposal that the neighborhood
32 brought in, that the intersection going onto Paddington, that would be a one-way road, is that correct? Do
33 I understand the drawing?

34 MR. MOUNCE: I believe so, and there may be some nods, yeah.

35 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. So then my question is, what rules or regulations do we have
36 for one-way roads in Fort Collins for connections. Are there any that we need to think about while we're
37 deliberating on this?

38 MR. GILCHREST: Honestly, I would have to look into that to see if there's more standards.
39 We'd have to look at, you know, some different signage, those types of things, but typically we don't
40 have a lot of one-way streets unless it's kind of a very isolated type scenario where we have one entrance
41 and one exit. But, this is not something we typically do is just put a one-way street in an area.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay, thank you.

2 CHAIR KATZ: Any last, final questions?

3 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I think a couple of the folks...I recall a comment from
4 Craig...let's just confirm that a local street that moves around an overall development plan does not
5 require amending a Master Street Plan, does not require going to City Council. City Council and the
6 Master Street Plan, I'm asking, only deals with arterials and collectors...is that true?

7 MR. MOUNCE: Yes, that's true.

8 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay.

9 CHAIR KATZ: Sam, I think you had a question?

10 COMMISSIONER SAMANTHA STEGNER: I just wanted to have a clarifying thing. It sounds
11 like you've done a lot of, like, engagement within that community, the English Stone [*sic*], right? Or the
12 one that's connecting on Edmonds there. And, but listening to a lot of this public comment, I mean, is
13 there a chance for you guys to recommunicate with that neighborhood about putting Edmonds as a
14 through way with this, at this point?

15 MR. MOUNCE: Certainly there's always additional opportunities for more engagement, and that
16 is, you know, this was a big factor in the original ODP approval, because the question came up about
17 whether to have that local street connection, and ultimately it was determined to have the alternative
18 compliance for just bike/ped. You know, and we did talk about some kind of multiple scenarios, and
19 we're trying to frame the discussion around tradeoffs at the neighborhood meeting for this major
20 amendment as well. And really, what we've been finding as staff...it's been very consistent with the,
21 kind of legacy comments that we have access to from the 2010 era discussions, about a lot of concern
22 about sort of cut through, additional neighborhood traffic, potential safety issues with the additional
23 traffic that would come from this site or Front Range Village...areas further kind of south and west. And
24 so, that seemed to be a very consistent theme, you know, for the past decade or so.

25 COMMISSIONER STEGNER: Even still to this day, it seems like? Okay.

26 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Sam. So, I think with that, unless somebody wants to jump in, we're
27 going to probably move into deliberation. No, we'll just push through. So, unless you have a long-
28 winded comment...okay, thanks.

29 Thank everybody...you know, what comes to mind is...I think Ms. Wilson [*sic*] made a comment
30 when she was at the podium...it was a conversation I had today with a client and he was asking me a
31 bunch of questions, very analytical, he's a civil engineer, and I said I'm not saying this to make you
32 laugh, but, logic rarely prevails. And I think Ms. Wilson [*sic*] said common sense rarely prevails. When
33 you zoom out and look at the map, Paddington does make the most sense, it does. However, we have to
34 look bigger than that. We have constraints, they are facts. The facts are the Hidden Pond warrants a
35 light. We can only really discuss what we can control. We're past that, that's what the report said. We
36 cannot control that. And again, because this was a pretty hot topic, I kind of let it slide, but we really
37 should just be discussing the amendment to the ODP. And as much as...for no other reasons but as safety
38 for the people in Woodland Park to get across, I wish this light could be at Paddington. But, from the
39 comments and the evidence today, it just seems like there's facts that we're constrained by, and that it
40 needs to be at Hidden Pond, even though, looking at it on the surface, and maybe even deeper than the
41 surface, Paddington seems to make the most sense. So, with that, I'm comfortable where it is on Hidden

1 Pond, although from a safety aspect, I really wish it was at Paddington. But, because of the evidence
2 we've heard today, I will support it...the light being at Hidden Pond...and therefore, I will be supporting
3 the major amendment.

4 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Mr. Chair, based on our comments tonight, I wonder if it might
5 be helpful if we held a discussion on a couple of items, again just so everyone leaves with a lot of clarity.
6 One is this alternative plan, and I know we've heard a little bit from staff on some of the issues with it,
7 but perhaps that warrants discussion on the part of the Commission. And then the other is this issue of the
8 Master Street Plan and what the Commission can and can't do. I want to be sure that's very clear to
9 everyone. So, I would just suggest that we might want to take those two items for discussion.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I'd like to echo on that. Ryan, would it be possible for you to
11 pull up...I think it's your slide fifteen during your presentation...not your overview, your
12 presentation...and I wrote it down as slide fifteen; I think it's a word slide. And there was a bullet there
13 that caught my eye that I'd like to emphasize.

14 CHAIR KATZ: And while Ryan is pulling that, I do also want to emphasize that, remember, let's
15 focus on what we are considering here, and it is the change, it is the amendment. We are not discussing a
16 light that was at Paddington and is now moving down here. If we were discussing the channelized versus
17 this, I would feel more comfortable, but it's important, it's a concern to the community, and that's why I
18 did want to hear everybody and have some discussion, but I do need to kind of, you know, adjust the
19 magnifying glass and focus us to the actual amendments that we are discussing.

20 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let's see if I can recall which bullet it is.
21 The...I think it's the third bullet. If Corbett Drive is removed from the Master Street Plan, which it has
22 been, so there's no Corbett to Kingsley, that was decided during the Front Range Village deliberation
23 before Front Range Village was even developed. So, that came off the Master Street Plan, and it was
24 offset, but it still came off. The Land Use Code may require a non-Corbett street connection to the
25 property north of Front Range Village; it depends on land uses. And there was also something in the
26 packet...Ryan, thank you for putting in the packet the staff report from last year. And, in that packet,
27 there was a reference to the development agreement. There was an original development agreement for
28 Front Range Village that was going to pledge \$75,000 for traffic calming in English Ranch, and that was
29 in conjunction with the Master Street Plan being amended. I don't think the \$75,000 was ever spent; I
30 don't know...I lost track of that. But, in that development agreement, there is a statement, and it's in the
31 development agreement, so this is a recorded document between the City and the developer, and the
32 developer in this case was Front Range Village, in response to the concerns of English Ranch. And I'll
33 read it, it's on page 318 of our packet. A local street connection from within the currently vacant
34 property, which is this ODP, south of English Ranch, may still be necessary and required by the Land Use
35 Code at the time the vacant property south of English Ranch develops, regardless of the removal of the
36 collector street designation from the Master Street Plan, end quote.

37 And so, that bullet there, and this development agreement language, indicates to me that a local
38 street connection is still on the table. And, what I think is important is that the Young property changes
39 the ODP, and it changes it significantly from a land planning perspective. The applicant has more land on
40 which to be flexibly creative, and it changes a whole lot about access onto Ziegler Road. So, I think the
41 topic is open. Without the Young property being added to this ODP, we're back to the channelized T.
42 But, here we are with the Young pasture, and kudos to the applicant, or owner, for picking up the Young
43 property. That's laudable, thank you for that. And so, I think for discussion purposes and deliberation,

1 I'm open to a conversation about a local street connection to Paddington which would then warrant a
2 signal at Paddington/Grand Teton, Ziegler which isn't warranted now.

3 CHAIR KATZ: I would also like...I'm open to that, but let's also not forget the engineering
4 challenges with the detention with that. So, I think that needs to be in the conversation too, because if
5 we're going to play, you know, we need to play with a full deck, so...

6 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: So it was my understanding that the drainage issue was only with
7 connecting near Carrick; Edmonds wouldn't necessarily have that same challenge? Maybe that's a
8 clarifying question.

9 CHAIR KATZ: Is that correct, Ryan?

10 MR. MOUNCE: I don't know the full details on that, I'm waiting to see if we have any other staff
11 that might want to respond to that. You know, that was the original identified spot for a connection,
12 originally as a collector street. There...you know, if you look at the English Ranch ODP from the '90's,
13 it identifies that as the spot for that connection. And so, there has been, you know, thinking and planning
14 for it. And certainly just another kind of topic or element I would introduce to this is, you know, there is
15 that intervening parcel in English Ranch as well, so there could be some interim conditions, or, you know,
16 it is potentially also wrapped up around what happens with development on that intervening parcel as
17 well, that connection piece. But, if there was a connection, it would sort of lay the beginnings of that.
18 And certainly, you know, that...during the PDP phase, both for the ODP site and for that other
19 intervening parcel, whenever there is development proposed, that's typically when we see those more
20 detailed analyses on stormwater, engineering, civil, kind of requirements.

21 And we do have a message from Sophie Buckingham in Engineering saying that Edmonds would
22 not present the same stormwater issues.

23 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: A question for our stormwater engineer. I heard a reference that
25 the English Ranch South detention pond at Paddington and Carrick and Edmonds...well, not
26 Edmonds...is inadequate or deficient, or something like that. But, isn't it not the case that the standards
27 have changed? And that when English Ranch South was developed, or English Ranch, or both, that the
28 pond met the stormwater criteria at the time? So, maybe it's only deficient by current standards, but it
29 was approved with the subdivision. But, be that as it may, I guess the real question is, does it overtop in
30 the hundred year flood? Does it cause erosion? Is it flooding the street? I'm not hearing that; I'm only
31 hearing that it's deficient by what I think are today's standards, but it met the Code at the time that it was
32 developed.

33 CHAIR KATZ: No, sorry. Trying to follow the rules. Do we have anyone from Stormwater
34 available?

35 MR. PAUL SIZEMORE: We do have Sophie joining us online via Zoom that can kind of respond
36 to that comment and question as well.

37 MS. SOPHIE BUCKINGHAM: Good evening, everyone. Sophie Buckingham with Engineering,
38 I hope everybody can hear me okay. I am not a stormwater engineer; I'm not intimately familiar with the
39 stormwater details, but it certainly seems possible that the standards could have changed. I think any
40 work that's done now, the current standards would be applied. I don't think it really makes a big
41 difference whether previous standards were applied. Since it's an existing condition, if no changes were

1 made, I don't think we would require it to be brought up to current standards. But, if changes were made
2 such as making a street connection through the detention pond, any new detention areas to make up for
3 the loss would have to be brought up to current standards I believe. Does that answer the question?

4 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Yes, thank you. And I recall working on some pretty tight sites.
5 I understand that if the local street connection is made over the pond, and instead of a wide open pond,
6 there's culverts, and that there's diminished detention pond volume capacity, that's perfectly
7 understandable. And, Jason, correct me if I'm wrong, but there's also a way to gain volume, and I've
8 seen tight urban sites where volume has been gained by raising the walls, by building masonry walls that
9 are impervious, adding two or three feet to the verticality of the height of the pond adds volume. And you
10 don't want to deepen the pond because then you don't get the outfall, but I just throw that out there as an
11 engineering problem that could perhaps be solved in a way, if we go that way.

12 CHAIR KATZ: Thanks, Ted. Ryan, could you remind me specifically what the alternative
13 compliance was in 2022, is that right?

14 MR. MOUNCE: Yes, that's right. So, there are standards in the Land Use Code for sites that are
15 of a certain length, that they need to have mid-block connections. And so, in this case, that would be sort
16 of aligning with where Edmonds and Paddington intersection. And so, typically a local street would have
17 been required there. The alternative compliance in, you know, a lot of recognition of both kind of some
18 of the opposition we heard about that connection, and the policy history of removing the collector level
19 street connection, the alternative compliance request converted that to a bike and pedestrian connection
20 only. So, it was not for a local street that would carry vehicles.

21 CHAIR KATZ: And that's at Edmonds, right?

22 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Edmonds.

23 CHAIR KATZ: So, I just want to remind the Commission, and Paul, maybe you could jump in.
24 When we heard the group home recently, there was an alternative compliance, and we specifically kind of
25 had to remove that from the conversation because it was already...was that an alternative compliance, or
26 was that...it was an alternative use?

27 MR. SIZEMORE: I think you're talking about a reasonable accommodation.

28 CHAIR KATZ: Maybe that was it...that was my mistake, excuse me.

29 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: So, if I might. First of all, Commissioner Shepard, like to thank
30 you for your in-depth knowledge; I can tell you were a City Planner in the past, you know this stuff. I
31 will admit that on the alternative plan presented by the residents, I have pause simply because it is
32 stormwater. And, you know, we're balancing a lot of ugly things here tonight. We are not going to make
33 everyone happy no matter what decision is made. But, to add potentially significant cost without any
34 certainty that the issues could be mitigated makes me very uncomfortable. I am certainly open to talking
35 more about, though, the connection at Edmonds and whether or not that's something the Commission
36 wants to consider.

37 CHAIR KATZ: We better also confirm that we have the authority to add that condition, that there
38 be a connection at Edmonds.

39 MR. BRAD YATABE: Yeah, I've been keeping an eye, trying to understand where the
40 conversation is going, and I'm not quite sure if Commissioner Shepard is suggesting a...in lieu of the
41 intersection, that the connection be made. I will...would like to remind the Commission that...well, one,

1 I'm not a planner; I can't tell you if that is a feasible solution or not. I think the planners, traffic,
2 engineering, everybody could give you a better read on that. I do...at least looking...my understanding
3 is, I don't think that's right-of-way through there, so there's going to have to be acquisition of some kind
4 of property right to even make that connection, and that is not certain. A private developer does not have
5 eminent domain powers, so that is a fairly uncertain aspect.

6 But, I think going back to the original application before you, you know, if the applicant is not
7 willing to entertain a condition like that, I think you need to make a decision on the application that is
8 before you. I know there's been a lot of concern, I know, from the neighborhood, in terms of the issue
9 with the location of that intersection, but you do have a proposal from the developer, and to the extent it
10 satisfies the criteria for a major amendment, I think that is something you're going to have to grant,
11 because it simply satisfies the criteria. And, if you don't think it does, you're going to have to articulate
12 why you do not think it satisfies the criteria.

13 But, I think that...and so, I think having some discussion and input on these different alternatives
14 to understand the full scope of what is occurring, I think that's fine, I think that is important. But, I do
15 want to focus you back, much as Chair Katz has tried to focus you back, a little bit on what the
16 application is before you, before you start to run off in a lot of different directions.

17 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you for articulating that much better than I can, Brad. I appreciate you.
18 The private property is a good point. You know, we cannot sit here and say, hey, applicant, do that
19 because he doesn't own the land. We can't tell the City right now to impose eminent domain to do it
20 right now, and we do have a proposal in front of us even if most of us think that there are alternatives that
21 are potentially better. I want to circle back to the comment that was made by the applicant that we have
22 constraints, and we can only make a decision on what we have control over. And right now, we have a
23 proposal in front of us, and does it or does it not meet the Land Use Code? So I'm trying to make this a
24 little bit more binary so we don't run all over the place.

25 COMMISSIONER STEGNER: I guess my only challenge is that I kind of feel like maybe the
26 neighborhoods didn't fully realize that by implementing the stop light at Hidden Pond that it would
27 deduce [*sic*] that ability at Paddington, and that's my only concern and challenge with this, is
28 by...because I do feel that there is a big need for more traffic control in that spot, and that's where I'm a
29 little challenged in that I get that this is for Hidden Pond, but I'm also really challenged with that fact of
30 knowing how bad that intersection can be myself, and the fact that if it deducts that in future, maybe that
31 neighborhood would be more willing to talk about the Edmonds situation now more knowing that part of
32 it. That's just where I'm kind of at.

33 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: If I might add a little bit of history. We did discuss that point at
34 the first hearing, quite extensively. And while no one can be a hundred percent certain about what the
35 future will hold, it seemed pretty convincing, at least to me, that if there wasn't the ability to make that
36 connection at Edmonds, there would be virtually no likelihood that there would be a light at the
37 intersection of Paddington. So, that was a disappointment to a lot of people at the time, and certainly a
38 frustration to us. This proposal does bring a light in, not at the desired location, but we have the same
39 issue of needing to get that traffic from the development through to Paddington or there may never be a
40 light at Paddington.

41 CHAIR KATZ: Yeah, we hear the concerns. And that's why this is a tough one...feel a little
42 handcuffed here.

1 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: I'm still not clear...if I might build on the question of what
2 authority we have. First of all, I'm not clear who owns that land in question, where now we have the
3 bike/ped connection rather than the ability to create a local street. So, maybe we could clarify who owns
4 that and who has rights to that.

5 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: The owner is...gave us some citizen input tonight. He's here in
6 the audience. For purposes of our conversation, maybe what we can do is not specifically refer to
7 Edmonds, not specifically refer to Carrington, not specifically refer to the detention pond. Maybe we just
8 refer more broadly as a local street connection. I think I heard from an HOA person earlier, one of our
9 speakers. I didn't get the name, but would it be 2790 Sunstone? 2709...and I think I heard that there is a
10 willingness on the part of the English Ranch South HOA to negotiate easement or acquisition as a willing
11 seller. And also speaking tonight, the fourth speaker, owner of the property at Paddington and Edmonds,
12 I thought I heard him speak somewhat willingly as to look for a creative...I think I heard the word
13 innovative...solution. So, that's pretty remarkable. We've come a long way in a year. There's been a
14 dramatic amount of communication and collaboration that's occurred in the last year, and I think it's
15 because everyone is so well-informed. And so, that's a credit to the applicant team, the consultants, and
16 the surrounding property owners. So, without getting into specifics, maybe just refer to a local street
17 connection to as to enable the warrants to be met so a traffic signal could be constructed at Paddington
18 and Teton, where in the big picture of our community, the arterial system, is where it's needed.

19 CHAIR KATZ: So, how would you suggest moving forward mechanically, Ted?

20 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Mechanically speaking, there could possibly be a Commission
21 member who makes a motion that approves the amended ODP with the condition that a local street
22 connection to Paddington Road from Union Park, in any conceivable alignment that's practical with
23 willing parties, would be a superior overall development plan attribute than the alternative compliance
24 that was approved in February of 2022. In February of '22, we didn't have the information that we have
25 now, and the information that we have now is critical. The...well, I'll leave it at that and let the Board
26 members...

27 CHAIR KATZ: Before you go away here, clarify the condition, because I'm not...I'm not sure
28 what the condition is that the applicant can unilaterally take action on.

29 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Well, one option would be to approve with a condition, another
30 option would be to deny the amended ODP, which I don't want to do. But, I think to clarify, the
31 condition would be, to comply with Section 3.6.3 of the Land Use Code, provide a local street connection
32 to English Ranch South to...in lieu of the signal location as proposed at Hidden Pond.

33 CHAIR KATZ: And are you requesting this condition because you feel that the proposal in front
34 of us does not comply with the Land Use Code?

35 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Yeah, the proposal in front of us relies on alternative compliance.
36 Now that we have a new parcel, three acres added to the ODP, which I think changes the ODP
37 significantly, we now have a chance to improve compliance with the Land Use Code by moving from
38 alternative compliance to full compliance with 3.6.3, which is the standard at issue.

39 CHAIR KATZ: So, I agree with that. But, I'm not clear what the condition is because the
40 applicant doesn't have...the condition is contingent on something that they don't have control over.
41 That's my challenge there.

1 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Very good question. I'm reminded of a project that we worked
2 on up northeast along Red Mountain Drive, and Suniga, and Conifer, and there was a desire to not impact
3 an existing neighborhood that was, I think, approved in the County, to provide another local street
4 connection, and in this case, it was a private drive out to Conifer which required off-site acquisition from
5 Neighbor to Neighbor, of all organizations. And that was a condition that was made, or it was agreed to
6 by the applicant that they would pursue that acquisition. I recall, my goodness, we have a source here. I
7 recall Neighbor to Neighbor was a willing conveyor of an easement.

8 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yeah, are you talking about the one on Redwood? I don't think
9 that was pursued.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Was it not pursued because the applicant withdrew the whole
11 project?

12 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: I believe that when we discussed that, Neighbor to Neighbor
13 indicated they would consider that for an affordable housing development, which this was not. And, also,
14 there were many questions about how feasible it would be to build that connector. If that's...

15 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you for that clarification.

16 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: If I might ask, Commissioner Shepard, when you talk about a
17 condition, are you talking about a good faith effort? Because the outcome of all this is not to move the
18 road, and we will actually end up with everyone in a worse situation. So, is that the best we can do?

19 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I didn't understand what you said...I'm not following you.

20 CHAIR KATZ: If this was denied, basically it would go...the amendment was denied, then we're
21 back to the channelized T, which is a worse...

22 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: That's true. I agree with that.

23 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: So, I guess to go back to my question, are you saying, make a
24 good faith effort? I mean, because, you know, at some point here, there needs to be clarity for those
25 developing, and there needs to be certainty in what costs are going to be, and those sorts of things. And
26 so, I'm struggling a little bit with a condition that is fairly onerous. Obviously a lot of economics go into
27 play once you have a condition like that. Land prices go up, and things like that. So, I think we have to
28 be careful.

29 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Sure. I'm persuaded by the...I'm optimistic that there's a good
30 faith effort that could result in a local street connection from what I've heard tonight. And just a word
31 about off-sites: it's pretty common in land development for a developer to have to pursue and off-site
32 acquisition.

33 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: So, I agree with you Ted...your suggestion. And the way I see it,
34 there are three possible outcomes, not necessarily ones that are available to us. The worst possible is
35 probably a channelized T, the best possible outcome is a connection from English Ranch to the new
36 neighborhood and a light at Paddington and Grand Teton at Ziegler. And then the middle option, the
37 alternative or the...what's the word...almost like the compromise, is the light at Hidden Pond and Ziegler
38 into the new neighborhood. And so...and I get that we don't necessarily have all of those options on the
39 table for us. It's either deny the ODP change tonight, and we're back to the channelized T, which might
40 be the worse possible, or approve this requested change with some kind of...I mean, can...and maybe this
41 is a question for Brad...can there be language added to the motion that encourages seeking that best

1 alternative, which is a connection through into the new neighborhood from Paddington that facilitates the
2 light at Paddington, which the English Ranch and other neighborhoods that are already existing would
3 prefer. Because I think the notion that we don't have a connection, or we have this completely
4 challenging connection that was brought by one of the neighborhood residents, which would more strictly
5 limit movement in the new neighborhood with a light at Paddington is probably asking for too much
6 considering that the English Ranch neighborhood ten years, twelve years ago, secured a change to the
7 Master Street Plan that eliminated the possibility of connections to Paddington in to their neighborhood.
8 So, in a sense of fairness, it doesn't seem fair to ask for all of that anyway. So, I tend to agree with you. I
9 think the best solution is to approve this ODP change and then suggest, formally, somehow, if that's
10 appropriate, that a better alternative would be to pursue a connection somewhere from Paddington, taking
11 into consideration the challenges with drainage that would then facilitate a light at Paddington and
12 Ziegler. Did I say that right? Did that make sense?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think so...I think it also goes to a question I had, which was if we
14 approve the amendment as presented, that doesn't preclude the developer from pursuing the normal
15 compliance, right? It doesn't force them to do the light at Hidden Pond and Ziegler? They could
16 actually, if they were able to get the access into Paddington, they could do that without having to come
17 back, is that right?

18 MR. YATABE: I think Ryan may be able to better answer, but...and he can check me on
19 this...but I think if you approve the ODP as presented with the light, they would have to come back in to
20 amend the plan.

21 MR. MOUNCE: So, my understanding is that would be accurate. So, if this is approved as
22 presented, and there was the additional connection point to Paddington, or to the north, likely...I think
23 that would rise to the level of what we consider a change in character given, sort of, the feedback and
24 input we've heard about the scrutiny on that potential connection tonight. And so, I feel like it would
25 come back to this Board again...or this Commission, excuse me.

26 COMMISSIONER YORK: Thank you.

27 MR. YATABE: Well, I do want to suggest that, one, if you are thinking of imposing a condition,
28 I suggest that you ask the developer if they are amenable to that condition. Because if they are not
29 amendable to that condition, I think you're just going to have to take the...I think you're better off taking
30 the application as it stands. I mean, if they just say, this is not feasible, or this is not something we're
31 willing to do...you might want to consider that. Another possibility is, you may consider whether,
32 if...well, my understanding is there has been quite a bit of conversation about this leading up to this
33 hearing, so I don't know that there are necessarily more alternatives if this were to be continued to allow
34 some additional conversation, but that is a possibility as well. And, so, again, just kind of trying to focus
35 you on the application before you.

36 CHAIR KATZ: And, again, that's why I think...we've heard the public. If it was...if there was a
37 clear path to putting it there, I think we all agree...there being Paddington, excuse me...we would all
38 prefer that, most people, maybe not everybody. But, we have a proposal in front of us, so let's consider
39 what's in front of us.

40 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Could we hear from the developer? Their reaction to our
41 discussion?

1 CHAIR KATZ: If Jason would like to speak to that, I would invite him up. Come on up. I mean,
2 I work with a lot of developers, and I know what I'm about to hear.

3 MR. SHERRILL: Yeah, appreciate that, but again, it's...we don't control it, right? So trying to
4 commit to something that we don't control that could have an effect on a whole development is...it's
5 really not feasible for us, right? So, again, you know, we've submitted our plans to meet the Land
6 Development Code, and it meets the Land Development Code, and you know, we would really ask you to
7 consider that and approve that because that's what we can control, and we're doing our best to meet those
8 standards.

9 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Jason.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: A question for Mr. Gilchrest...going to brainstorm here for just a
11 moment. Would there ever be any consideration for a variance to traffic signal spacing based on local
12 conditions that would result in a traffic signal at Paddington and Grand Teton in addition to the proposed
13 traffic signal?

14 MR. GILCHREST: Given the minimum distance that it is, it's probably unlikely.

15 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Okay, thank you.

16 MR. GILCHREST: It would be considered, possibly, for restricted movement though.

17 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you.

18 CHAIR KATZ: I think we've had really good discussion on this. Again, we're never going to
19 make everybody happy as much as some of us would like to. I really think we need to get back and focus
20 on the proposal that's in front of us. Does it or does it not meet the Land Use Code? And somebody
21 needs to make a motion on that. And I say that, and I do hear Ted's comment about it improving
22 compliance; that did not fall on deaf ears. I do agree with that, and I appreciate that, and the way he
23 phrased that helped me. However, there's...it's not that easy, it's more complicated. So, at this point, I
24 would personally like to hear a motion as is.

25 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Okay, well I will do that. I will say though, the motion I'm
26 going to make, I don't like, I'm going to tell you up front. Because I don't think we're solving the real
27 problem here, and that bothers me. So, I will make a motion...I'll read it first and then I'll add some
28 commentary, and there can be a second or not as the Commission wishes.

29 I move that the Fort Collins Planning and Zoning Commission approve the Ziegler-Corbett ODP
30 Major Amendment, MJA220004. The Commission finds in consideration of the approved modification
31 that the major amendment complies with all applicable Land Use Code requirements. The decision is
32 based upon the agenda materials, the information and materials presented during the work session and this
33 hearing, and the Commission discussion on this item, and further, this Commission hereby adopts the
34 information, analysis, findings of fact, and conclusions regarding this major amendment contained in the
35 staff report included in the agenda materials for this hearing. I believe we need a second and then we can
36 discuss.

37 MR. YATABE: And I did want to state, my apologies, I think there was an artifact in there about
38 an approved modification.

39 CHAIR KATZ: Could we get a friendly amendment to strike that?

1 MR. YATABE: Strike that, my apologies.

2 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: I'm glad to see you make mistakes, too.

3 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: I'll second.

4 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Thank you. Now, on my own amendment...I still think that the
5 right outcome here is a connection from the ODP to Paddington, and I'd love to see that still happen.
6 And I know that's not desirable on the part of everyone, but honestly, if we step back and look at it in a
7 holistic way, for the betterment of the city of Fort Collins, it's the right thing to do. But, that's not the
8 proposal that we have in front of us tonight. And the proposal we have in front of us tonight is better than
9 the proposal we had previously. And Michelle, thank you for making that so clear. So, I'm going to hold
10 out a little bit of hope that there's still some room for negotiation on this, and that we could come back
11 with whatever is needed swiftly and get a great outcome for everyone, but in the meantime, I feel like we
12 need to move forward with the proposal as is.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, I have a question on the motion. And, you know, being kind of
14 new at this...would it be possible to amend the motion to also include not precluding the option to extend
15 Paddington and have both of those in the same motion or not? I'm just asking for clarification because I
16 don't know what...

17 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Sure...and I would not be inclined to do that because we don't
18 know what that would look like. And until we'd have a specific plan, personally, I would not be
19 comfortable with adding that.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIR KATZ: So we have a motion and second. Any last final comments before we ask for a
22 roll call?

23 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will not be supporting the motion. The
24 motion...the ODP as amended, and it's significantly amended with the new parcel, doesn't comply with
25 3.6.3...3.6.3(E) and (F), and I think the alternative compliance that we did last year is now inapplicable
26 and it also...the amended ODP, as amended, doesn't comply with City Plan policy that talks about...LIV
27 4.2...LIV stands for livability, neighborhood livability, which says: compatibility of adjacent
28 development, that's the subtitle...continue established block patterns and streets to improve access to
29 services and amenities from the adjacent neighborhood. And I'm looking at a childcare center on one
30 side of the property line, a park and a school on the other side of the property line, and to not connect
31 these neighborhoods, I think, violates a Land Use Code standard and City Plan policy.

32 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Can I ask a point of clarification, Commissioner Shepard? And
33 you are clear that if this proposal were denied, we would have a proposal with a channelized T
34 intersection?

35 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: I can't make that assumption.

36 CHAIR KATZ: It's not an assumption, it's what we're amending from. It's a material fact. And
37 also recall that there is a ped/bike connection.

38 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: So, the question you're asking is, I guess, to not connect the
39 neighborhoods...

1 CHAIR KATZ: Which leaves them still not connected.

2 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: No...I'm not...I think that's a zero-sum proposition. I'm not
3 going to agree with that statement.

4 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Just wanted to be sure it was clear.

5 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: That's zero-sum to me. The City Code and the principles and
6 policies weren't meant to be zero-sum. We're building a community, and that requires collaboration, it
7 requires off-site improvements, it's not onerous. We can't even get into onerous; that's economics, we
8 don't do economics in the Land Use Code. So, I will not be supporting the motion.

9 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: You know we did approve it the first time.

10 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Under alternative compliance without the Young parcel.

11 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: I tend to agree with Ted, but denying this...and I guess maybe I
12 need clarification on this...denying this puts us back to the worst possible intersection scenario unless
13 something happens in the background, and if they come back...hopefully they will come back with
14 another proposal that is the best possible, which is connecting the neighborhoods. And I, you know,
15 going back historically, I wasn't involved in 2010, I would not have changed the Master Street Plan. You
16 know, that just seems to have made, as I look at the map, this...a lot of streets that just dead end
17 somewhere and don't connect. There are just a lot of these little snakes, and you know, I realize that in
18 the era when this area was developed, that was the style. So, I will probably support the motion, but you
19 know, as I said, because it's not the worst possible intersection solution and it's not the best.

20 CHAIR KATZ: Yeah, I kind of agree with Michelle. I think, you know, this development is kind
21 of a lag measure to previous, maybe misguided planning. So, I will be supporting. You're good?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would say that I agree with Ted that I don't think it meets the goals
23 of the Land Use Code for the reasons that he stated, and, you know, looking at it from a transportation
24 point, I don't think it meets that either, so I won't be supporting it.

25 CHAIR KATZ: Any last comments?

26 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Thank you, Michelle, for that comment. I would like to say
27 something about that 2010 Master Street Plan amendment; that was not staff-driven.

28 CHAIR KATZ: I believe we are ready for a roll call please?

29 MS. MANNO: Stackhouse?

30 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Yes.

31 MS. MANNO: Stegner?

32 COMMISSIONER STEGNER: Yes.

33 MS. MANNO: York

34 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

35 MS. MANNO: Shepard.

36 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: No.

1 MS. MANNO: Haefele?

2 COMMISSIONER HAEFELE: Yes.

3 MS. MANNO: Katz?

4 CHAIR KATZ: Yes. And with that, the motion to approve the major amendment for the Ziegler
5 and Corbett ODP is approved. Want to thank all the community members that came out...you came out
6 with logic, you came out with emotion. I don't think anybody disagrees with you, but we were kind of
7 dealt a funky hand here, and because it was last to be developed, in my opinion, the proposal that was
8 brought before us was compliant. So, apologize for that.

9 VICE CHAIR STACKHOUSE: Mr. Chair, I'd also like to thank everyone for coming out tonight.
10 And, as I said, I still think you all have the right outcome here of where the light should be, and I would
11 really...I know this stuff costs money, believe me, finance is my background, I know it costs you money.
12 I really would still like to see discussions with the neighborhood about going in this other direction. You
13 know, at the end of the day, it is all about the best outcome for everyone. I know it takes a little bit more
14 time and a little bit more money, I understand that totally, but at least that good faith effort goes a long
15 way with people. So, I will just leave you with that closing thought.

16 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER SHEPARD: Mr. Chair, I just want to acknowledge that we did receive and
18 read these emails that came in today from Eskin Avrim, Theresa Varn, Kathy Kulesa, Pam Starling, Andy
19 Pulsen, and again, Kathy Kulesa, and Robert Schutzius and his wife. We did receive these emails even
20 though they came in today. And Peter Melby. So, we did get them, and we did read them.

21 CHAIR KATZ: Thank you, Ted.