



BLUE RIVER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, July 7, 2026

5:30 PM

0110 Whispering Pines Circle, Blue River, CO

Minutes

Call to Order, Roll Call

Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:42 PM.

PRESENT:

Commissioner Beck
Commissioner Carlsted
Commissioner Cleary
Commissioner Johnson
Commissioner O'Brien
Commissioner Manin

ABSENT:

None

Also present:

Town Manager Chad Hull
Town Attorney Robert Widner – virtual attendance

Approval of Minutes

A. Minutes – June 2, 2026

Commissioner Cleary moved and Commissioner Carlsted provided a second to approve the minutes of the June 2026 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting. All ayes – motion passed.

Project Approval

B. 6871 Highway 9 - Addition

The Building Official submitted a Planning/Zoning/Architectural Guidelines Review in the agenda packet indicating the proposed project's full or partial compliance with all Development Standards.

The Commission reviewed the application for proposed porch additions, roof work, siding, decks, and related exterior improvements at 6871 Highway 9.

The Commission discussed whether the proposed work triggered requirements under the Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code, including the threshold that may require broader compliance when 25% or more of exterior walls or roof coverings are repaired, reconstructed, or effectively replaced. Members noted that the staff review referenced the possible 25% threshold but did not include a calculation, conclusion, or clear analysis. The Commission stated that the applicant, staff, or plan reviewer should provide the necessary measurements and determination before the application is presented for Commission review.

Members reviewed the submitted elevations and discussed the proposed roofing, siding, and deck materials. The Commission noted that new roof sections appeared to be metal, but the siding information was unclear. The plans showed existing siding to be re-stained in some areas and vertical natural wood or board-and-batten siding in other areas, including the garage and entry areas. Members stated that the packet did not provide enough information to determine whether the proposed siding replacement exceeded the applicable threshold. Members also noted that deck materials were not adequately specified for determining compliance with wildfire-resiliency requirements.

The Commission also discussed the completeness of other provided application materials. Concerns included the lack of a current topographic survey, missing setbacks, failure to show easements and other encumbrances, incomplete driveway and access information, lack of clear parking information, and lack of details regarding the second Highway 9 access point. Members noted that Type A applications should include required materials under Section 16C-2-50 unless specific items are waived by staff under the Land Use Code.

The Commission discussed the existing second driveway/access point on Highway 9 and whether the Highway 9 Access Control Plan would require removal of the second access. Town Attorney Bob Widner advised that the Commission may request information necessary to apply the approval criteria. He further advised that requiring correction of an existing nonconforming access point is generally appropriate when the proposed project implicates access, parking, circulation, or a larger redevelopment, but may not be appropriate for a limited porch or entry improvements that do not modify parking or access. He noted that the access-control policy encourages reduction of access points but does not necessarily require removal for every minor project.

The Commission also discussed a separate interior remodel reportedly underway at the property, including possible bedroom-count changes, egress work, and excavation. The Town Attorney advised that interior improvements do not necessarily implicate a change to access or parking unless they affect the use, parking demand, circulation, grading, or exterior site conditions in a way that brings those issues into review.

After discussion, the Commission determined that the application lacked sufficient information for decision-making. The Commission identified needed information including a current survey or site plan showing property lines, setbacks, easements, encumbrances, existing driveway/access layout, parking spots, snow storage if relevant, siding-replacement percentages, roof and exterior-wall replacement calculations, deck materials, and intended material documentation sufficient to determine compliance with the Colorado Wildfire Resiliency Code and the Town Land Use Code.

Commissioner O'Brien moved to table the application until the noted information and other items as stated in the Land Use Code are provided in the application and noted in the plan review. Commissioner Manin provided a second. All ayes – motion passed.

Work Sessions

C. Setbacks and Wetlands Terminology Land Use Code Discussion

The Commissioners discussed the goals of a wetlands policy, noting the need to balance environmental protection while ensuring homeowners can obtain appropriate engineering guidance. The Commissioners favored a broader, rather than a fixed, definition of wetlands, noting that conditions are not static and that no set list of agencies currently governs which data sets a professional surveyor must consult. The Town Attorney summarized the 2023 U.S. Supreme Court decision narrowing federal authority over “waters of the United States,” noting that most federal jurisdiction over Colorado waterways was removed and that authority over non-federal waters now rests with the State of Colorado, which has since adopted its own wetlands regulations. The Town Attorney advised that the Town may identify a general area where a certified wetlands delineation is required, and that the Town could retain an engineer to verify delineations or serve as the primary delineator at the applicant's cost. The Town Attorney also noted that an interim buffer standard could be adopted now, ahead of a final town-wide wetlands policy.

Following discussion of buffer distances ranging from 10 to 15 feet, the Commissioners reached consensus on an interim standard of a 12-foot no-soil-disturbance buffer from the delineated wetland edge, with no overhangs, cantilevers, or drip-edge encroachment permitted. The Commissioners agreed the buffer may be reduced only where it would otherwise render a lot completely undevelopable and the applicant demonstrates no feasible alternative, and that a construction management plan should be required as a later step toward a permanent wetlands standard. The Commissioners directed that this interim language be utilized by the Town Attorney for formal drafting.

D. Garage and Large Shed Land Use Code Discussion

The Commissioners discussed reverting shed regulations to the prior Land Use Code standard in order to eliminate a perceived loophole allowing oversized garage-like structures. The Commissioners discussed replacing the current “encouraged” design-matching language with a “required” standard, so that sheds must match the style, materials, and color of the principal structure on the property.

The Town Attorney advised that a full repeal of Ordinance 2025-03 would remove the current shed provisions entirely, but that the Ordinance could instead be revised to retain any elements the Commission wishes to keep. The Commissioners reached consensus to recommend repeal of Ordinance 2025-03, reverting to a maximum of two sheds at 200 square feet each and removing the 400-square-foot “large shed” option, with the design-matching requirement is also changed from “encouraged” to “required.” The Commissioners directed the Town Attorney to confirm the proposed repeal and revisions and to prepare draft language for consideration at the August meeting.

Adjourn

Commissioner Beck moved to adjourn the meeting and Commissioner O’Brien provided a second. All Ayes - Motion passed.

Chairman Johnson adjourned the meeting at 8:00 PM.