

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

CITY OF LOVELAND
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
June 27, 2011

A meeting of the City of Loveland Planning Commission was held in the City Council Chambers on June 27, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. Members present: Chairman Molloy; Vice Chairman Meyers; and Commissioners Dowding, Fancher, Leadbetter and Middleton. Commissioners Crescibene, Krenning and Ray were absent. City Staff present: Troy Bliss, Current Planning; Robert Paulsen, Current Planning Manager; Sunita Sharma, Assistant City Attorney.

These minutes are a general summary of the meeting. For more detailed information, audio and videotapes of the meeting are available for review in the Community Services office.

CITIZEN REPORTS

There were no citizen reports.

STAFF REPORTS

Bob Paulsen, Current Planning Manager, reported that his office had received a petition addressed to Planning Commission regarding a joint City/County effort to identify an alignment for the extension of Boyd Lake Road from 5th Street to Highway 60. He stated that the petition was handed out to all the Commissioners. He further commented that the alignment project would be discussed when the Public Works Department presents the 2030 Transportation Plan to the Planning Commission in the fall.

Chair Molloy stated that he would like to hear about the alignment by the Public Works department before it is done.

Mr. Paulsen stated that he would ask if they could email the Commission further information on the alignment.

Vice Chair Meyers reported on a recent meeting that he and Commissioners Dowding and Middleton had worked with Planning staff on prioritizing the Comprehensive Plan and Objectives as part of the Comprehensive Plan update process. He indicated that the meeting had been productive.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1 *Commissioner Fancher moved to approve the Minutes of the June 13, 2011 Planning*
2 *Commission meeting. Upon a second by Commissioner Dowding the motion passed*
3 *unanimously. (Chairman Molloy abstained.)*

4 **Mr. Paulsen** requested that Regular Item #2 be continued to July 11, 2011.

5 6 **REGULAR AGENDA**

7 8 **1. Amendments to Title 18 regarding sign definitions, temporary sign regulations, and sign** 9 **enforcement, legal procedures and penalties.**

10
11 SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM: This is a public hearing to review temporary signs. The purpose
12 in bringing forward this amendment to the municipal code is that City staff has seen an increase in
13 the use of temporary signs throughout the community. For the most part, issues have not been related
14 to volume but relate to the City's abilities to fairly enforce the sign regulations. There are also issues
15 of clarity and currency with the existing temporary sign regulations. This application involves
16 legislative action by the Planning Commission; the Commission's recommendation will be
17 forwarded to the City Council for a final decision.

18
19 **Troy Bliss, Project Planner**, gave a brief background report on this item. He stated that staff was
20 directed by the City Council to move forward on the Temporary Sign Regulations. He spoke of the
21 outreach that was done and of the numerous community groups that staff met with, commenting that
22 staff received a large amount of feedback. He commented that there were requests to simplify the
23 definitions so that they are understandable. He clarified that the sign companies are in general
24 support the proposed amendments.

25
26 He stated that the proposed amendments are focused around the City's temporary sign regulations,
27 and are specifically structured in three main areas:

- 28 • Adding definitions to types of temporary signs;
- 29 • Providing expanded allowance to businesses for the use of temporary signs and providing
30 clearer temporary sign regulations; and
- 31 • Making a small adjustment to the enforcement, legal procedures and penalties associated
32 with the sign code.

33
34 **Mr. Bliss** stated that he received an email from Mr. Greg Muhonen requesting amendment to the
35 height and square footage of flying banners.

36
37 **Ron Busby, 1441 39th Place**, thanked Mr. Bliss and staff for their hard work and stated that the
38 modifications made by staff will help his tenants. He was specifically pleased with expanded
39 allowance for portable, sandwich board-type signs. He urged the Planning Commission to
40 recommend adoption by City Council.

1 **Greg Muhonen, 2085 Quillan**, also thanked staff, the Title 18 Committee, and City Council for
2 their efforts. He spoke of a proposed amendment which would increase banner height allowance
3 from 10 ft. to 13 ft. and the width from 20 ft. to 25 ft. He indicated his overall support of the
4 proposed amendments.

5
6 **Commissioner Middleton** questioned if Mr. Muhonen, who serves on the Title 18 Committee, did
7 not agree with the Committee's recommendation.

8
9 **Mr. Muhonen** stated over several months of Title 18 Committee meetings and in their previous
10 discussions about the size of the banners being 13ft. x 25 feet, he had assumed that the Committee
11 was in agreement with the height and size of the banners he was advocating. He stated that he was
12 surprised to see that the size had not been adjusted to reflect this discussion.

13
14 After a brief discussion, **Mr. Bliss** stated that there are no specific industry size standards for pendent
15 signs; he stated that these types of signs are made in various heights and sizes by the various
16 manufacturers. **Mr. Paulsen** stated the increased sign height advocated by Mr. Muhonen is not a
17 crucial matter. He emphasized, however, that the standards be clearly defined.

18
19 **Mr. Bliss** clarified that there is no application fee for a temporary sign. He reported that that staff,
20 Title 18 Committee, sign companies, the public and members of the Chamber of Commerce have
21 been working on this amendment for approximately two years

22
23 After a discussion regarding flags, **Mr. Bliss** stated that American flags are placed in the category of
24 exempt signs by the code. He noted that the review of regulations concerning government flags had
25 not been part of this effort.

26
27 **Commission Dowding** indicated support for changing the height and width of teardrop banners
28 (flying banners) as proposed by Mr. Muhonen.

29
30 **Commissioner Leadbetter** commented that he liked that the new code language was straightforward
31 and easy to understand, and he concurred with Commissioner Dowding regarding Mr. Muhonen's
32 request.

33
34 **Vice Chair Meyers** agreed with previous speakers.

35
36 **Commissioner Middleton** supported the item with the proposed amendment by Mr. Muhonen.

37
38 **Chair Molloy** spoke in support of the amendments.

39
40 **Commissioner Fancher made a motion to recommend that City Council approve the amendments**
41 **to Title 18 regarding temporary signs as described in the June 27, 2011 Planning Commission**

1 *staff report, and as amended on the record. Upon a second by Commissioner Middleton the*
2 *motion was unanimously adopted.*

3
4 **Following completion of the previous agenda item, a general discussion about the frequency,**
5 **format and duration of Planning Commission meetings occurred.**

6
7 **Commissioner Leadbetter** suggested that the format of the commission meetings be changed by
8 holding one regular hearing and a worksession per month. He felt that would be a more efficient use
9 of staff and the Planning Commissions time.

10
11 **Assistant City Attorney Sharma** stated she would review the Charter to see if that recommendation
12 would be allowed by the City Charter.

13
14 **Commissioner Middleton** stated he would support putting a time limit on the length of the
15 meetings.

16
17 **2. Amendments to Titles 16, 17, 18 and 19 of the Loveland Municipal Code.**

18
19 SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM: Amendments to Titles 16-19 of the City of Loveland Municipal
20 Code that will implement a new process for application, review and approval of site development
21 plans and site work permits. The proposed amendments would affect all development except single-
22 family detached dwellings, single-family attached dwellings for no more than two units, and two-
23 family dwellings. This application involves legislative action by the Planning Commission; the
24 Commission's recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for a final decision.

25
26 **Staff is requested that this item be continued to the July 11, 2011 meeting so that final City**
27 **staff review can be completed.**

28
29 *Vice Chair Meyers made a motion to open and continue Item #2 to the July 11, 2011. Upon a*
30 *second by Commissioner Fancher the motion was unanimously adopted.*

31
32 **ADJOURNMENT**

33
34 **Commissioner Middleton made a motion to adjourn. Upon a second by Vice Chair Meyers the**
35 **motion was unanimously adopted.**

36
37 _____
38 Robert Molloy, Chair

39
40 _____
41 Vicki Mesa, Secretary

1
2

DRAFT