



AGENDA MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Design Review Board

From: Julie Kirkpatrick, PLA, ASLA, Long Range Project Manager

Date: August 28, 2019

Subject: Addendum to August 14, 2019, Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

A request has been made to amend the August 14, 2019, Design Review Board Meeting Minutes regarding public comments on the Encore Site Development Plan application. The following members of the public spoke:

- Larissa Sharbori, resident at 777 N. Gilbert Street, opposed project
- John Manka, owner of One Stop Auto, 414 Wilcox Street, DDA member, supports project
- Nick Lucey, 708 Fourth Street, DMA member, supports project
- Matt Frary, downtown business owner, 340 Third Street, and resident, supports project
- Andrew Wasson, downtown business owner, 519 N. Wilcox, and resident, supports project
- Marcus Notheisen, EDC, supports project
- Kevin Tilson, DMA/DDA/Downtown Alliance, supports project
- Jared Oldenberg, pastor of Eternal Rock Evangelical Lutheran Church, 2 Phelps Street, supports project
- John Witt, church member, 2 Phelps Street, supports project
- Trish Kakenmaster, resident at 1718 Paonia Court, concerned with traffic, parking, likes building design

Councilmember Caryn Johnson offered the following regarding the draft minutes:

I was reading the Draft 8.14.19 DRB meeting minutes and the minutes do not include the names of those who spoke, and if they are a resident of Castle Rock, their association with the project, or if they have any financial or personal interest in the project as is requested by the DRB Chair (at about minute 47:00 or so). I'm not sure why the names of those who spoke are not in the DRB minutes, these individuals took the time to come to this meeting and signed up to speak so the Town has a record of their names and their names need to be included in these minutes and should always be in the minutes.

In the draft minutes, under Public Comment, it states "many residents, business owners and business associations spoke in support of the project and one resident

spoke in opposition". This statement is generally true when you lump it all together like this, but if the minutes read something like what I have written in the next paragraph, someone reading them would be able to better form their own opinion of the public comments given at the meeting, rather than the staff's synopsis/opinion of the public comments. The minutes as written do not give the complete picture of the public comments. Council wants all meetings to be transparent. These minutes are not showing transparency. They are missing the details requested by the chair before the public comments began - residency, association with the project, and financial or personal interest in the project. My understanding is that staff is to ensure that the required criteria for each project has been met and remain objective/neutral throughout the entire process. The sentence as drafted is not objective/neutral.

This is what I heard, Larissa ?, a resident, against the project; John Manka, not a resident, a downtown business owner, supports the project; Nick Lucey, a resident, supports the project; Matt ?, a resident, a business owner, supports the project; Andrew, a resident, a downtown business owner, supports the project; Markus, EDC, supports the project; Kevin, DDA, supports the project; Jared ?, Eternal Rock Church, supports the project; John Witt, a resident, a business owner, supports the project; Trish K, a long-time resident, against the project, but I will admit that her statements were a bit mixed and could have been construed to mean that she was in support of the project, mostly she was concerned about the traffic this would add and she expressed that she doesn't go downtown anymore because of the traffic.

Please let me know if I am off base on my request about the minutes. For me it is always better to provide more information than too little.

Caryn